

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) Promotion

Guidance for the Preparation of Promotion Dossiers



UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

December 22, 2014
prepared by Kenneth M. Doxsee
Office of Academic Affairs

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) Promotion

Guidance for the Preparation of Promotion Dossiers

Introduction

Preparation and evaluation of files supporting the promotion of our faculty is one of the more complex tasks we face. Well-prepared files can move quickly through the review, recommendation, and decision processes. This document parallels the series of documents circulated earlier under the title, “Promotion and/or Tenure Guidance.” While those earlier documents were relevant to the preparation of promotion (and/or tenure) files for both tenure-related faculty and non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), many of the issues covered were specific to the consideration of tenure-related faculty. This document removes those elements and elaborates on the provision of guidelines and recommendations for the preparation of NTTF promotion files that properly support effective review and evaluation while also complying with legal requirements.

This document focuses primarily on the administrative aspects of preparing and reviewing an NTTF promotion dossier. However, prospective candidates for promotion will find valuable guidance for their contributions to the process and may also appreciate the clarity provided herein regarding the evaluation process.

Our NTTF work in a wide variety of positions and a range of settings – academic departments, schools, or colleges, research centers, etc. Throughout this document, when reference is made to the unit or to the unit head, this should be interpreted appropriately for the particular position and setting.

General matters regarding evaluation for promotion

1. Evaluation and promotion criteria
 - a. Each unit is expected to have an approved statement of criteria for NTTF evaluation and promotion.
 - b. If the unit’s criteria statement was revised more recently than six years prior to initiation of the candidate’s consideration for promotion at the University of Oregon, the candidate and unit must mutually agree in writing on which criteria will be applied – the older criteria or the revised criteria – and must document that agreement in the promotion file.
 - c. If the candidate has multiple or joint appointments, a memorandum should have been prepared, signed and approved by the candidate and the provost or designee, and be on file that identifies expectations for promotion review and establishes how the promotion process will be handled. Recognizing that many of our NTTF may have been hired into their positions before this expectation was made explicit, the candidate and relevant unit heads should establish such a memorandum if one does not currently exist.

2. For all NTTF promotions, *with the exception of Assistant Librarians seeking promotion to Associate Librarian*, the review for promotion is elective, and unsuccessful candidates may continue employment at their current rank. (In colloquial terms, the review is not an “up or out” process.) Assistant Librarians are *required* to undergo review for promotion to Associate Librarian when they become eligible. Unsuccessful candidates for promotion to Associate Librarian will receive a two-year contract at the rank of Assistant Librarian and must be reevaluated for promotion during the second year. If promotion is denied again, the candidate will receive a one-year non-renewable contract at the rank of Assistant Librarian.
3. Timelines
 - a. To repeat, for clarity, with the exception of Assistant Librarians, all other NTTF (including Associate Librarians) may elect whether or not to undergo review for promotion.
 - b. For a “normal” review period, by the end of the academic year in which the review will be concluded, the candidate must have accrued six years of service at an average of 0.4 FTE or greater, accrued at no greater than three academic quarters (or two semesters) per academic year (if on 9-month contract) or four academic quarters (or three semesters) per year (if on 12-month contract). Human Resources can provide accurate accounting of accrued service if there is uncertainty.
 - c. If the candidate was awarded credit for prior service, regardless of whether the candidate chooses to use all, some, or none of this credit, the review period will be considered “normal” if the candidate has accrued at least six years of service at an average of 0.4 FTE or greater accrued through a combination of the assigned years of credit and service at the University of Oregon. As for tenure-related faculty, if the candidate chooses to forgo usage of years of credit, the primary focus of the review will be on accomplishments at the University of Oregon, and if the candidate chooses to use only some of the years of credit, the focus of the review will adjust so that, for example, four years at the University of Oregon would mean that accomplishments during at most two years of prior service would receive full consideration.
 - d. Accelerated (“early”) review for promotion is possible. Such review is reserved for particularly meritorious cases and should occur only after consultation with and agreement among the candidate, his or her unit head, the appropriate vice president, vice provost, or dean, and the provost or designee.
 - e. A candidate for promotion may withdraw his/her application at any time before the provost’s decision by communicating the desire to withdraw the application in writing to the provost and the appropriate dean, vice president, or vice provost. For Assistant Librarians, who are required to undergo review, such a withdrawal will be treated as an unsuccessful review (see point 2 above).

Beginning the process

The candidate is expected to initiate the process of consideration for promotion during the academic year prior to the academic year in which the review will be concluded. To do so, the candidate should notify

his/her unit head and provide the materials listed below, each of which is discussed in a separate section in this document. Please note that while the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) does not provide special wording regarding initiation of the process for Assistant Librarians, they are *required* to undergo review for promotion to Associate Librarian when they become eligible. To ensure compliance with this requirement, the unit head and/or dean should notify the candidate rather than waiting for the candidate to initiate the process, providing sufficient time for the candidate to prepare the required materials.

The candidate must submit the following.

- Curriculum vitae (CV)
- Personal statement
- Portfolios for teaching, scholarship, service, and/or professional activities (if applicable)
- Waiver/non-waiver/partial-waiver letter
- List of suggested external reviewers (if applicable)

The candidate's curriculum vitae (CV)

The CV should be current and comprehensive, presenting the candidate's education and employment history and all items relevant to the candidate's professional activity in the pertinent areas of scholarship, teaching, and/or service. Please note that "scholarship" can be represented by research and/or creative activity, as appropriate to the candidate's position and discipline.

The candidate's statement

The statement, for which 3-6 pages will typically be sufficient, should present the candidate's personal evaluation of his or her performance as measured against the applicable criteria for promotion. It should include discussions of the pertinent areas of scholarship, teaching, and/or service, as appropriate for the candidate's position. The statement should also include a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. Note that the University broadly interprets institutional equity and inclusion. The Division of Equity and Inclusion provides additional reference materials online at <http://inclusion.uoregon.edu/EquityandInclusioninPersonalStatementsforReviewsofBargainingUnitFaculty>.

- Contributions may address a wide range of equity and inclusion issues.
- These contributions may be made through scholarship, teaching, and/or service.
- Activities are relevant whether carried out at the UO or externally – *e.g.*, within academic or professional associations, non-profit, governmental, and/or private sector organizations.
- Impacts may be at the individual level (work with individual students, faculty, community members, or organizations), programmatic level (establishment or provision of leadership to a formalized program), or institutional level (strengthening of institutional policy or practice toward equity and inclusion).

Supplementary portfolios

Which portfolios are needed and what materials to include in them are determined by the candidate's position and/or job description. Any of the following areas in which a candidate is expected to perform should be supported by a candidate-prepared portfolio.

- a. **Teaching portfolio.** The teaching portfolio should be representative, not comprehensive. Candidates often include sample course materials such as syllabi, exams, homework assignments, *etc.*, in order to illustrate their approaches to and innovations in teaching. Other materials, such as websites for courses and other presentations of teaching efforts and innovations, may also be included.
- b. **Scholarship portfolio.** The scholarship portfolio presents comprehensive evidence of the candidate's professional activity – *i.e.*, scholarship, research and creative activity – and appropriate evidence of the candidate's recognition or impact. The portfolio typically includes such evidence as copies of published books and manuscripts, recordings of performances or productions, photographs of works of art, installations or exhibits, program notes, *etc.* It is permissible for the candidate also to include evidence of work in progress.

If the scholarship record includes a book that has not yet been published as an indication of completed scholarship (as opposed to work in progress), the file must include 1) a copy of the signed contract for publication, and 2) a copy of the completed manuscript, which must be in final form – *i.e.*, not subject to further revision beyond galley proofing or indexing.

- c. **Service portfolio.** The service portfolio should provide evidence of the candidate's service contributions to his or her academic department, center or institute, school or college, university, profession and the community. Each candidate's appropriate level of service will differ based upon his or her professional responsibilities as defined by the candidate's job description and the unit workload policies. The portfolio need not be comprehensive, but should provide illustrative examples of the candidate's service to the university, which can include university committees, elected bodies, advisory groups, task forces, and/or other activities serving the university's mission. The portfolio may also contain examples of service to the profession and community. Documentation of service can be included, such as white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, op ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation. The portfolio may include a short narrative elaborating on the candidate's unique service experiences or obligations. Candidates may wish to comment on the significance and quality of their work and provide a rationale for the choice of examples in the portfolio, the significance of those choices, the role played by the candidate, and the amount of time devoted to the activity.
- d. **Professional activities portfolio.** Documentation of professional or consulting activities related to the candidate's discipline should be included here.

Waiver

By Oregon law, promotion files are considered to be part of the candidate's personnel file and must be made available to the candidate upon request unless the candidate specifically waives access. ***Prior to solicitation of reviewers*** for NTTF promotion files – either internal or external to the UO – the candidate must decide and communicate in writing, signed and dated, his/her decision regarding access to the evaluation file. Sample waiver statements are provided below.

If a candidate asks for guidance in choosing which waiver option to declare, he/she may be provided with factual information but cannot be pressured to choose a particular option. It is a fact that most candidates choose the full waiver, but some do choose to retain full access, and others choose to retain partial access – most often to evaluations prepared by evaluators affiliated with UO. It is also a fact that some individuals decline to review files for which access has not been waived, and it is for this reason that the waiver status ***must*** be communicated to the reviewers.

Sample Full Waiver Letter

Dear Unit Head:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351.065, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion. However, it is my view that such evaluations should be kept confidential.

Consequently, I hereby waive in advance my legal right of access to see the evaluative materials submitted by all reviewers in conjunction with my review. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon Law and without duress.

I understand that you will inform prospective reviewers that I have submitted this waiver and agreed voluntarily to forego any legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

Sincerely,

[Candidate] [Date]

Sample Non-waiver Letter

Dear Unit Head:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351.065, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion, and of the possibility of waiving this right for certain categories of material.

I wish to retain my legal right of access to all materials in my file.

I understand that you will inform prospective reviewers that I have retained the legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

Sincerely,

[Candidate] [Date]

Sample Partial Waiver Letter

Dear Unit Head:

I have been informed of my rights of access, pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 351.065, to the full evaluative file being prepared for consideration of my case for promotion. It is my view that external reviewers' evaluations should be kept confidential.

I hereby waive in advance my legal right of access to see the evaluative materials submitted by all reviewers external to the University of Oregon in conjunction with my promotion review. I make this waiver with full knowledge of my legal rights under Oregon Law and without duress.

I wish, however, to retain my legal right of access to all evaluative materials submitted by individuals affiliated with the University of Oregon.

I understand that you will inform prospective external reviewers that I have submitted this partial waiver and have agreed voluntarily to forego any legal rights of access to these materials which I possess under Oregon Law.

Sincerely,

[Candidate] [Date]

Selection of reviewers

In many cases, evaluations of NTTF for promotion are carried out internally; that is to say, letters of evaluation are obtained from only supervisors and/or other UO employees and there are no letters from reviewers external to the University of Oregon. At a minimum, a letter of evaluation from the candidate's supervisor is required (*e.g.*, department head for instructors, research mentor for research NTTF). Details of the review process will be enunciated in each unit's NTTF evaluation and promotion criteria documents currently being developed. As these documents are completed and approved, they will be made available online at the Academic Affairs website and in the unit; until they are approved, units should carry out the promotion review according to their prior practice.

For those NTTF whose evaluation for promotion includes external review, the process for selection and recruitment of those reviewers closely parallels that for tenure-related faculty. Discussions of the process by which external reviewers may be selected and recruited are provided in Appendix 1. If external reviewers are called for by unit policy, please ensure that reviewer selection is consistent with the requirements presented in Appendix 1. Experience shows that failure to do so can weaken an otherwise compelling case for (or against) promotion.

Preparing the dossier for review

After the candidate has provided the required materials, the unit should begin preparing the dossier for internal review. If external evaluations are called for by the unit's NTTF promotion policy, dossier preparation can occur while awaiting receipt of the appropriate complement of external evaluations. To begin the process of file assembly, please provide the Office of Academic Affairs the following via email:

- candidate's full name
- unit name
- candidate's current and proposed rank (*e.g.*, promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor I)

Academic Affairs will supply two or three tabbed folders—one blue and one or two black (one if only the relevant dean, vice president, or vice provost wishes to retain a copy; two if the unit also wishes to retain a copy) – which when completed should be forwarded to the office of the relevant dean, vice president, or vice provost.

A PDF document allowing the construction of digital dossiers is available upon request from the Office of Academic Affairs. We encourage digital dossier preparation, but during the transition from printed to digital format, we still ask that printed copies be submitted along with the digital file.

As the initial dossier is prepared, please consult the following discussions for guidance and details.

NTTF Promotion Criteria Tab

Insert the written statement explaining the criteria used within the unit to evaluate NTTF for promotion. These criteria are available on the Academic Affairs website and in the unit. If the unit's criteria statement was revised more recently than five years prior to the candidate's consideration for promotion at the University of Oregon, the candidate and department must mutually agree in writing on which criteria will be applied – the older criteria or the revised criteria – and must document that agreement in the dossier.

Letters of Evaluation Tab

Please provide the following documentation, as appropriate for the particular candidate's promotion consideration, in the listed order.

1. Evaluation letters from supervisor(s), as called for by unit NTTF promotion policy.
2. If letters other than those from supervisor(s) are received from within the University of Oregon, whether solicited or unsolicited, they should be included here. Again, any letters from students or former students should be placed under the Teaching Evaluations tab. As a rule, additional internal letters are only helpful to a case when they document some exceptional contribution that falls outside the conventional expectations of research or creative practice, teaching, or service. In particular, letters from unit colleagues that elaborate individual faculty analysis of the candidate's merits are not helpful, as it is expected that such considerations have been expressed and discussed within the unit and should not require individual elaboration in the file itself.
3. If external review was conducted, provide the following documentation.
 - a. **Communications with external reviewers.** Provide one example of the initial inquiry regarding availability/willingness to review and of the official request to review. Additional correspondence – *e.g.*, reminder or thank you letters – need not be included in the file.
 - b. **List of materials sent to reviewers.** The list is expected to include the unit's NTTF promotion criteria statement, the candidate's CV and statement, and the relevant portfolios.
 - c. **Biographical sketch of each reviewer.** Keep the biographies brief; full CVs can be included in the supplementary file. Include the reviewer's name and affiliation and provide sufficient information to establish their standing in the field.

For each reviewer, indicate any professional or personal relationship to the candidate, whether known beforehand or revealed in the reviewer's letter. It is not sufficient to rely on relationship statements contained within the external letters of evaluation. Comment explicitly on any relationships, or note "no known relationship."

Finally, explicitly identify any reviewers who were suggested by the candidate. Note that if a reviewer was independently identified by the department or unit head but also suggested by the candidate, that reviewer is not recorded as having been suggested by the candidate. Please also

note that while the candidate is always welcome to suggest reviewers, the actual selection of reviewers is carried out by the department or unit head.

Examples:

Noam Chomsky, Professor of Linguistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (selected by the department). Chomsky is one of the three or four most important modern scholars of linguistics. He is the originator (along with his teacher Zellig Harns) of the theoretical framework for linguistic analysis known as “generative linguistics.” Professor Chomsky reports having met the candidate at several conferences.

Edward Sapir, Professor of Linguistics, University of Chicago (suggested by candidate). Sapir is a pre-eminent scholar of American Indian languages and a seminal figure in the history of linguistics. He is the author of six major books in the field as well as dozens of articles. Professor Sapir has no known relationship to the candidate.

- d. **Review letters.** All letters received must be included, including those that are negative, neutral, or simply indicate unwillingness (or inability) to offer a judgment. When letters from external reviewers are submitted electronically and unsigned, a copy of the transmittal email correspondence from the reviewer should accompany the letter of evaluation in the dossier. If unsolicited external reviews are received, they should also be included here, clearly identified as “unsolicited,” unless they are from current or former students – these should be placed under the Teaching Evaluations tab.
4. All declinations to participate in the review process must be recorded and included in the file. These declinations are most often received in response to the initial inquiry to potential external reviewers regarding their availability. Place a copy of the reviewer’s declination message in the dossier. If the declination is received orally – *e.g.*, by telephone – provide a note in the dossier to that effect, including any reason(s) stated for the declination.

Vita Tab

Include the candidate’s full CV, as seen by the external reviewers if external review was utilized. The CV should have been signed and dated before being sent to the reviewers; if it was not, ask the candidate to sign and date it, and include a statement that the CV is that which was sent to the reviewers. Updates may be provided by the candidate, ideally in the form of a signed and dated list of specific changes rather than as a full additional CV – this both helps to maintain a more concise dossier and facilitates review by highlighting the changes.

Candidate's Statement Tab

Include the candidate's full statement, *as seen by the external reviewers if external review was utilized*. The statement should have been signed and dated before being sent to the reviewers; if it was not, ask the candidate to sign and date it, and include a statement that the statement is that which was sent to the reviewers. Updates may be provided by the candidate, ideally in the form of a signed and dated list of specific changes rather than as a full additional statement – this both helps to maintain a more concise dossier and facilitates review by highlighting the changes. *Note the requirement that the statement include a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. If external review was utilized and the statement sent to external reviewers neglected to address this issue, please ask the candidate to submit a signed and dated update, to be included in the dossier, before forwarding the dossier to the next level of review.*

Statement of Waiver/Non-waiver Tab

Include the candidate's signed and dated statement of waiver. The occasional problems that arise in this section of the dossier generally relate to the fact that the waiver status must be established and communicated to the reviewers *before* their reviews are prepared or submitted. In particular, if the reviewers were led to believe their reviews would be submitted in confidence but in fact the waiver status allows candidate access to the reviews, each reviewer who responded will need to be contacted, informed of the actual waiver status (e.g., "the candidate has retained access to external reviews"), and asked if he/she would like to 1) have the review retained as originally submitted, 2) revise and resubmit the review, or 3) decline to serve as a reviewer. This additional communication with external reviewers will need to be documented in the dossier.

Duties & Responsibilities Tab

This should be an objective statement, purely factual, that summarizes the faculty member's duties. It should be no longer than a page, typically a paragraph or two. It should delineate the expectations of scholarship, teaching, and/or service and the central activities for the candidate's appointment in each, as appropriate. If there are any special agreements about expectations of the candidate, those should be stated clearly here.

There is no prescribed format for this statement. It can often be appropriately provided in the form of the position description as advertised at the time of the candidate's hire. While some departments have historically taken a minimalist approach, along the lines of, "There are no duties or responsibilities associated with this position beyond those expected of any faculty member in the Department of X," review committees generally prefer more detail. Policies now being developed regarding the assignment of professional responsibilities will clearly be relevant to this topic, and in future years providing the relevant portion of that policy under this tab, along with the position description, would be appropriate.

Conditions of Appointment Tab

Ordinarily, this will provide the most recent contract or notice of appointment. If the candidate has joint or multiple appointments, a memorandum should have been completed at the time of hire or assignment specifying expectations for promotion and tenure review and identifying how the tenure and promotion process will be handled by the units. That memorandum, which is not valid unless approved in writing by the faculty member and the provost or designee, should be included here. Other documents which may be included are official administrative letters of understanding that limit the range of activities on which promotion will be based, grant credit for prior service at other institutions, or extend the time frame for review.

While it is not uncommon to include the informal offer letter in this section, such a letter often contains information irrelevant to the promotion review process and may be better replaced by a brief statement covering any special circumstances, as described above.

Teaching Evaluations Tab

If the candidate has instructional responsibilities, relevant information regarding the evaluation of the candidate's performance should be included here. These materials should be provided by the supervisor or unit head, not by the candidate.

Given the wide range of positions and instructional responsibilities held by NTTF, it is difficult to be prescriptive regarding what documentation to provide. Please provide in the primary dossier those materials listed below that are relevant to the particular candidate for promotion.

- a. **UO checklist for the evaluation of teaching.** The checklist should be placed at the front of this section. The checklist is available online at http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/Teaching_Evaluation_Checklist.pdf.
- b. **List of all courses taught.** Beginning in the Winter term of 2008, student evaluations of teaching have been carried out through an on-line submission process. The Registrar's Office provides a table containing a term-by-term listing of course number, student enrollment, percentage of enrolled students providing evaluations, and quantitative scores for the instructor and the department. The electronic evaluation system is currently configured to provide evaluation data for the prior five years, meaning that most candidates will have complete electronic evaluation records. If the period of review includes teaching prior to Winter term, 2008, provide an analogous table from the hard-copy data available for those courses. It is likely that future submissions will focus only on the five years of teaching preceding the promotion review, but current requirements call for inclusion of all evaluations since the time of hire or last promotion.
- c. **List of any/all teaching awards.** The candidate, or the candidate's CV, may be consulted to ensure all appropriate awards are listed here. Teaching awards from the unit, the school or college, the university, or external sources should be included; research awards or grants or awards for

service should *not* be included. Include the date and the basis for the award if that is not clearly identified by the name of the award. If no awards have been received, include a page with the simple notation, “None.”

- d. **List of all supervised dissertations, theses, and undergraduate honors papers.** List each type of project separately, and for each project, identify the student, the year, and the candidate’s role (*e.g.*, committee chair, committee member, *etc.*). A separate listing for exam committees should be provided if appropriate.
- e. **Sample course evaluation questions.** Include a sample of each version of questions used by the unit for the candidate. Date each version for its period of use.
- f. **Statistical summary page for each course taught.** The electronic system provides these automatically. Evaluations carried out prior to Winter term, 2008, were documented by quantitative summary sheets in print form that should be included here. Please ensure that written student comments are not included in the primary dossier.
- g. **Peer evaluations of teaching.** The CBA calls for at least one peer evaluation of instructional career NTTF per contract period or every three years, whichever is shorter. Detailed reports of classroom visits and review of course documents (*e.g.*, syllabi, exams, on-line course materials, *etc.*) can be very useful to both the candidate and the colleague carrying out the peer evaluation. Ensure that each peer evaluation includes the faculty member’s name, the course number and name, and the date(s) of the review. Ideally, both the reviewer and the faculty member should sign and date the review, providing a clear record that the evaluation was shared with the faculty member. Note that additional peer evaluations can be added to the file as it progresses, if needed, so evaluations can be carried out during Spring term of the year preceding the promotion review and even during the Fall or Winter terms of the promotion review year.
- h. **Letters from students.** Include both solicited and unsolicited letters from students here, but only if they are signed and dated. A copy of an email message of transmittal is acceptable for any letters that are not otherwise signed. Note that such letters are not required, and that orchestrated “campaigns” to sway review committees are both inappropriate and rarely persuasive.

The supplementary file

The supplementary file provides additional evidence relevant to the consideration for promotion. The materials contained in the supplementary file will be returned to the candidate following final action on the promotion review. Thus, in order to provide a record of what materials were made available to reviewers, we recommend that a table of contents for the supplementary file be prepared and included as the final page in the primary dossier. This need not be exhaustive, but might include a full list of any publications or recordings included in the scholarship portfolio and summaries of other items contained in the file – *e.g.*, “photographs of candidate’s artistic creations,” “program notes from candidate’s performances,” *etc.*

Please provide in the supplementary file those of the following materials that are relevant to the candidate for promotion.

- a. *Scholarship portfolio.*
- b. *Teaching portfolio.*
- c. *Service portfolio.*
- d. *Signed written student evaluations of teaching.* The online teaching evaluation system provides evaluation packets, including a quantitative summary pages and written student comments, for each course taught by the candidate. (The instructor has access to *all* student comments; the unit should have access *only* to those student comments that were signed.) Inclusion in the supplementary file of the entire packet for each course, including the quantitative summary pages, is acceptable and often preferred, in that it facilitates file preparation and more clearly identifies the courses for which written student comments apply. Evaluations carried out prior to Winter term, 2008, included hand-written student comment sheets – those that were signed should be included here.

Please ensure that the following requirements are met:

1. written student comments are **not** included in the primary dossier;
2. only **signed** student comments are included in the supplementary file; and
3. **no** summary or evaluation statements associated with the review quote from unsigned evaluations.

Unlike the primary dossier, which is retained for ten years (as called for by State records retention law), the materials in the supplementary file are returned to the candidate following final action on the promotion review. Many of the materials included in the supplementary file are provided by the candidate, to whom these materials – which may include copies of published books and manuscripts and/or recordings of performances or productions – should be returned. However, the supplementary file may also include confidential materials. Thus, careful review is required before returning any materials to the candidate, to ensure no inadvertent disclosure of confidential information.

Unit committee review and recommendation

Most but not all units constitute personnel or promotion committees to carry out the initial review of the dossier. (Some units simply define *all* eligible faculty in the unit as the committee responsible for the initial review.) The unit's shared governance policy will clearly establish whether or not such a committee is to be convened. If such a committee is used, it should of course include only faculty eligible to vote on the case. If there are too few eligible faculty members to form a review committee within the candidate's unit, the unit head should consult with the dean (or vice president or vice provost, as appropriate) to establish a committee, drawing appropriate faculty members from outside the unit. While there is no requirement to consult with the candidate regarding the selection of members for such a committee, it is reasonable to do so in order to avoid any potential concerns about the appropriateness of the committee.

The unit committee should review, evaluate, and critically discuss the full file. Following this discussion, the committee should conduct a vote by signed ballot. The signed ballots should be confidentially retained; only the final vote tally is to be revealed in the committee's report.

Given the wide range of positions and instructional responsibilities held by NTTF, it is difficult to provide general guidance for the review and analysis of an NTTF promotion file. Representative matters for consideration are listed below; relevant elements from this list should be complemented by other considerations appropriate to the particular candidate for promotion.

- The report from the unit committee should provide an analysis of the case that goes beyond what may be gleaned from the candidate's curriculum vitae. Since this is the first of several stages of internal review, it is important that the committee present all aspects of the case fully. The review should be one of analysis, not advocacy, and it should present a critical evaluation of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the standards of the unit and discipline.
- Any discrepancies or contradictory opinions within the reviewers' letters should be addressed in a forthright fashion. Simply ignoring negative remarks does not advantage the candidate, nor does the rejection of comments from an "outlier" reviewer simply because they are not consistent with other comments received. In the absence of meaningful engagement with such comments in the report, subsequent reviewers may be left wondering if the "outlier" was in fact the only reviewer who was able to identify a real and critical issue in the case – whether in support of or arguing against the promotion.
- For instructional NTTF, the unit committee plays a significant role in the analysis of the candidate's teaching record. The committee must evaluate carefully all evidence related to teaching.
 - The committee should feel empowered to interpret and present quantitative student evaluation data in meaningful ways and should use this information to make appropriate comparisons of the candidate with the rest of the unit and/or to faculty teaching courses of similar size, character or content.
 - The committee should read all signed written comments submitted by students and provide an evaluative summary of these written statements. *It is **not** permissible to quote from unsigned evaluations in any summary or evaluation statements associated with the review.*
 - The committee should also review and comment on all materials submitted by the candidate documenting his or her teaching activities (*i.e.*, the Teaching Portfolio).
 - The committee should discuss any discrepancies between student and peer evaluations.
- For research NTTF, the unit committee's evaluation will place significant focus on the expectations detailed in the candidate's position description.
- As appropriate, the report should include an appropriate discussion of the candidate's record of service, as summarized in the candidate's CV and statement and exemplified in the service portfolio.
- The report should include commentary on the candidate's discussion of contributions to equity and inclusion and any evidence of these contributions provided by the candidate.

The unit committee report must be signed by all members of the committee, and it must be dated.

Unit review and recommendation

If a unit committee carried out the initial review, that committee's report should be reviewed and voted on by all eligible faculty within the unit. It is not expected that this review will be accompanied by a separate report, but the unit head's report (discussed below) should include a summary of any meetings of the eligible faculty held to discuss the case. As for the unit committee vote, the vote by all eligible faculty must be by signed ballot, and the signed ballots should be confidentially retained, with only the final vote tally revealed in the unit head's report.

Typically, tenure-related faculty and NTTF at or above the rank being sought are allowed to vote on NTTF promotion cases. These and other details, including who is allowed to review a promotion file and voting rights for faculty on leave, are or will be established by unit shared governance documents. These governance documents are currently in the process of review, revision, and approval. Those units with approved governance policies will carry out unit-level review in accord with their approved policy; those without final, approved governance policies will follow current unit practice.

Multiple or joint appointments

If the candidate holds multiple or joint appointments, a memorandum should be on file, dating from the time of hire or negotiation of the additional appointment(s), specifying expectations for promotion review and clearly identifying how the review process will be handled among the units. Shared governance policies should also address such issues, particularly for candidates holding positions within both a department and a center or institute. Typically, recommendations are made by relevant units to the "home" unit of the candidate, often in the form of a report and vote tally from the eligible members of the second department, center, or institute.

Unit head review and recommendation

The unit head must prepare an independent report and recommendation. This report should consist of two parts: (1) an administrative summary of the unit's handling of and position on the case, and (2) the unit head's independent evaluation of the case.

- *Administrative Summary.* If the unit committee report does not do so, the unit head, should provide a brief explanation of the unit's review process and any special processes or considerations involved with the review. This summary should clarify any special conditions of the appointment or special duties and obligations for which the candidate's performance is to be particularly evaluated. It should include an explanation of who in the unit was eligible to vote on the particular candidate (consistent with the unit's shared governance policy), and it must include a summary of any formal faculty discussion preceding the official vote. Votes at the unit level on promotion cases must be by signed and secret ballot, with only the tally revealed to the voting faculty and recorded on the Voting Summary. The unit head should provide an explanation for any abstentions and/or reasons

why some faculty may not have participated in the review and voting process (*e.g.*, spouse, sabbatical leave, *etc.*).

- *Unit head's evaluation.* The unit head should include his or her independent evaluation and recommendation including analyses of scholarship, teaching, service, and contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. This review should be independent from that of the unit committee, and the unit head's recommendation need not coincide with either the unit committee or the vote of the eligible members of the unit. The unit head should objectively and honestly discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. As discussed for the unit committee, the unit head's review should be one of analysis, not advocacy. (As noted above, a candidate is not well-served when negative statements are ignored or comments from an "outlier" reviewer are rejected simply because they are not consistent with other comments received.)

It is neither necessary nor desirable to duplicate material presented by the unit committee. Internal reviewers will appreciate *additional* insights provided by the unit head that help them to interpret the file, particularly in cases of conflicting opinions among the reviewers and/or unit faculty. It is the responsibility of the unit head to independently analyze any such diverging opinions and to indicate the reasoning that led to his or her conclusions as to the merits of the case.

The unit head's report should also address any matters not adequately addressed by the unit committee report.

The report from the unit head must be signed and dated.

Voting summary

The outcome of the unit vote should be entered on the Voting Summary sheet and included in the dossier, with any explanatory notes included.

Forwarding the dossier

Requests to provide additional information or clarifications to the file after it leaves the unit often contribute significant stress and anxiety to an already emotionally-charged process. Thus, the complete dossier and all supplementary files should be carefully reviewed to ensure all required documents are provided and in the correct locations before sending it forward.

At this point, it is essential to recognize the different pathways for review based on the nature of the NTTF position. Librarians and instructional NTTF for the most part do not represent complexities – their files will pass through the appropriate dean and then to Academic Affairs and the provost. Research NTTF, however, face a greater diversity of review pathways, depending on the nature of the appointment and the unit. The following pages provide guidance regarding the review of research NTTF promotion files beyond the unit level.

Procedures for processing and reviewing research NTTF promotion files

General principles:

- Every case receives 3 levels of review (unit head; dean or equivalent; and Senior Vice Provost (SVP) in Academic Affairs).
 - In order to bring additional research expertise into the review process, the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) reviews all faculty in the research professor classification, even if this leads to an additional review beyond the standard 3 levels.
 - The VPRI is available to the SVP and Academic Affairs for consultation on all files, including those the VPRI is not reviewing directly.
 - The SVP always makes the recommendation to the provost.
-

For research faculty who are in school and colleges:

For research assistant and research associate classifications,

- Unit head provides review and evaluation; forwards complete dossier to dean
- Dean provides report and recommendation; forwards complete dossier to Academic Affairs
- Academic Affairs does intake, confirms that all elements are present (in consultation with VPRI as needed)
- SVP reviews and recommends to the provost (without VPRI review, unless there are questions)

For research professor classification,

- Unit head provides review and evaluation; forwards complete dossier to dean
- Dean provides report and recommendation; forwards dossier to Academic Affairs
- Academic Affairs does intake, confirms that all elements are present (in consultation with VPRI as needed)
- Academic Affairs forwards to VPRI
- VPRI reviews and recommends to SVP
- SVP reviews and recommends to the provost

For research faculty who are in VPRI centers, institutes, and core facilities:

- Unit director provides review and evaluation; forwards dossier to OVPRI (missing the “dean” recommendation)
- VPRI plays the role of “dean,” provides report and recommendation

- VPRI ensures that dossier is complete and forwards complete dossier to Academic Affairs.
- SVP reviews and recommends to the provost

For research faculty who are in units that report to a vice provost:

For research assistant and research associate classifications,

- Unit director provides review and evaluation; forwards dossier to unit supervisor (*e.g.* vice provost)
- Unit supervisor (*e.g.* vice provost) plays the role of “dean,” provides report and recommendation; forwards dossier to Academic Affairs
- Academic Affairs does intake, confirms that all elements are present (in consultation with VPRI as needed)
- SVP reviews and recommends to the provost

For research professor classification,

- Unit director provides review and evaluation; forwards dossier to unit supervisor (*e.g.* vice provost)
- Unit supervisor (*e.g.* vice provost) plays the role of “dean,” provides report and recommendation; forwards dossier to Academic Affairs
- Academic Affairs forwards to VPRI
- VPRI reviews and recommends to Academic Affairs
- SVP reviews and recommends to the provost

For research faculty who are in units that report directly to a senior vice provost:

For all classifications,

- Unit director provides review and evaluation; forwards dossier to Academic Affairs
- Academic Affairs ensures file is complete except for “dean” review, and then forwards file to VPRI
- VPRI plays the role of “dean,” provides report and recommendation; forwards dossier to Academic Affairs
- SVP reviews and recommends to the provost

Appendix 1 – External Reviewers

External Reviewers - Requirements

- The candidate may provide a list of suggested external reviewers. Encourage the candidate to suggest the most-qualified people in his/her field, including those that may not be obvious choices to non-specialists, while avoiding those with overly-close relationships.
- The unit must independently create a list of possible external reviewers. If the candidate suggests a reviewer who independently appears on the unit list, that reviewer is *NOT* considered to have been suggested by the candidate.
- Identify reviewers of appropriate rank. While easily established for tenure-related faculty as “at or above the rank being sought,” it is understood that the complexity of NTTF ranks at the UO and elsewhere can make this a more difficult consideration.
- Identify reviewers at comparable institutions. Remember, the UO is an AAU university with very high research activity. That said, it is fully recognized that in some fields, the best reviewers may be at institutions that do not have the same profile.
- The unit selects the external reviewers. While there is no obligation to include reviewers suggested by the candidate, it is highly advisable to do so unless the candidate has provided names only of individuals that appear to be inappropriate.
- Unit criteria will establish the number of substantive reviews required for a file to move forward.
- Maintain a clear majority of reviewers 1) with no more than a professional knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, and 2) that were not suggested by the candidate.
 - If declinations to review or disclosure of overly-close relationships with the candidate result in less than a clear majority, then more letters should be sought immediately. *All* letters received must be included in the dossier, however.
 - What is an overly-close relationship? Relationships such as dissertation supervisor, research collaborator within the past five years, or co-author within the past five years should be viewed as disqualifying, just as they are under federal conflict of interest guidelines. Personal relationships – close friendship, for example – are also problematic. Many other relationships are generally acceptable, though prospective reviewers who express concern about their ability to present an unbiased evaluation or are uncomfortable playing the role of an evaluator should be excused. Further guidance will be provided upon request.
- The dossier must include brief biographical sketches for each external reviewer that provides a letter, identifying their rank and institution and providing a brief explanation of why they were selected. Any identified relationships with the candidate must also be explicitly stated here, regardless of whether

they were unknown until after a letter was received (*e.g.*, “While we were unaware of any relationship, Reviewer X ‘s letter of evaluation revealed that he co-authored a manuscript with the candidate, published in 2008.”).

- The dossier must also include correspondence from any potential reviewers who were contacted but declined to serve. If the declination was received orally – in person or by telephone – a note to that effect should be included in the dossier.

Identifying expert reviewers

While identifying appropriate expert reviewers can be something of an art form, particularly in the context of all the preceding requirements, the Internet has greatly simplified the process, even if a candidate’s area of scholarship or creative practice is relatively foreign to those selecting the reviewers.

- Google! Type words representative of the candidate’s professional activity into an Internet search engine. (If the search results *don’t* seem to include the candidate’s contributions, reconsider the search terms.) This is guaranteed to provide interesting ideas for reviewers.
- If the candidate’s scholarship has appeared in the form of published documents (including books), examine the reference lists in these documents. Look in particular for scholars whose work is cited several times. If necessary, Google them to determine whether their scholarship is appropriately related to the candidate’s or only marginally so.
- Searching citation indices for published articles that cite the candidate’s work is also guaranteed to identify potential reviewers. Many such indices are available through the UO Library (<http://onesearch.uoregon.edu/databases/alphabetical>).
- What if the candidate’s work is so narrowly-defined that there are only a few potential reviewers worldwide, and they all seem to work together? While some input from this community is appropriate, it is wise to take a step away from the area, identifying “generalists” who can comment on the position of the candidate’s field more broadly. Perhaps the candidate is viewed as THE world expert in “area X” ... but perhaps the broader scholarly community no longer views “area X” as a legitimate endeavor. This context is very important to ascertain.
- Cross-check to avoid inadvertent conflicts, particularly in the form of co-authors, former mentors, or former students.
- Try to avoid asking the candidate’s close friends or former classmates to serve as reviewers, though it can be difficult to recognize such relationships *a priori*. Should a potential reviewer reveal such a relationship in advance of providing a letter of evaluation, it is best to excuse them from serving as an evaluator.

- Similarly, avoid asking those who may be biased due to academic or artistic competition, though again this can be difficult to anticipate in advance. One useful way to help avoid these situations is to invite the candidate to provide a short list of those that he/she would prefer *NOT* be used as external reviewers.
- Is the potential reviewer outside the US? In general, this is not a problem. While the reviewer may or may not be familiar with the promotion process or its requirements, the primary information sought from an external reviewer is a critical evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or creative practice. The reviewer's professional evaluation should be valid regardless of where he or she lives or works, and that evaluation is then weighed internally in the context of other evaluations received.

Once the list of prospective reviewers has been constructed, draw from this list to recruit reviewers. Typically, there will be three communications with those selected to serve as external reviewers; one example of each communication should be placed in the dossier.

- Inquiry regarding availability to serve
- Formal request for evaluation
- Acknowledgement of receipt of letter

It is common to send an initial inquiry to more prospective reviewers than are needed, with the assumption that some of those contacted will say no. However, one's best professional judgment should be exercised – if scholars in the candidate's discipline are generally receptive to such requests, or conversely if they are notorious for their unwillingness to serve as reviewers, adjust the number of initial inquiries accordingly.

If a prospective reviewer declines to serve as a reviewer:

- Retain a copy of that reviewer's declination message, to serve as required documentation in the dossier. If the declination is received orally – *e.g.*, by telephone – provide a note in the dossier to that effect, including any reason(s) stated for the declination.
- As needed, contact additional prospective reviewers in order to ensure timely receipt of an appropriate complement of reviews, ensuring that a clear majority of the reviewers do not appear only on the candidate's list of suggested reviewers.

Templates for each communication are provided on the following page. Modification is acceptable, but it is very important not to “lead the witness” – avoid making statements in the vein of, “We are trying to promote NAME.”

Sample Inquiry Regarding Availability to Serve as External Reviewer

Subject Line: Request for promotion review

DATE

NAME

Department of X

University of Y

Address

Dear NAME:

The Department of X at the University of Oregon is evaluating NAME, TITLE, for promotion to NEW TITLE. The faculty have identified you as a scholar who could provide particularly valuable insights regarding NAME's candidacy for promotion. I sincerely hope that you will be able to accept my invitation to participate in this important evaluation. I have attached a copy of NAME's vita for your reference.

[Select one of the two following sentences in order to reflect the candidate's waiver status, which must be expressed in writing before external letters are solicited.]

Because NAME has waived access to the evaluative file, this will be a closed, confidential process.

or

Because Oregon law permits an employee full access to his or her personnel file unless such access is voluntarily waived, your letter will be seen by NAME should [he/she] request access to [his/her] file.

Please let me know by DATE, whether or not you will be able to serve as a reviewer. If you agree to provide a review, I will forward a package containing NAME's personal statement and CV and representative examples of NAME's *[scholarship and/or other appropriate evidence of professional activity]*, as well as the department's statement of criteria for promotion. Should you accept, I would need your evaluation by DATE.

I sincerely hope you will be able to assist in this important decision and look forward to your response.

With my best wishes,

_____, Title

Address

Telephone

e-mail address

Sample Letter upon Agreement to Provide the Requested Evaluation

DATE

NAME

Department of X

University of Y

Address

Dear NAME:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate NAME, TITLE, who is being considered for promotion to NEW TITLE at the University of Oregon. As part of our evaluation process, we seek outside assessments from highly regarded faculty to help us assess the candidate's scholarly contributions to the field. When you submit your evaluation – by DATE, as previously agreed – please also provide a copy of your current curriculum vita or biographical sketch.

Enclosed you will find NAME's current CV, personal statement, and representative examples of scholarship, as well as the department's statement of criteria for promotion. It will be very helpful to us if your written evaluation addresses the following questions.

- What is the nature of your relationship, if any, to NAME? (e.g., co-author, thesis advisor, etc.)
- What are the most significant scholarly results produced by NAME, and what impact have those results had on the discipline?
- How does NAME's record of scholarship compare – both qualitatively and quantitatively – with other scholars in the field at comparable stages in their academic careers?
- How do you assess NAME's potential for producing high-quality scholarship going forward?
- Would NAME's record of scholarship support a recommendation for promotion at your institution?

[Insert paragraph regarding waiver status here, choosing from one of the two options below.]

[If appropriate, insert a paragraph here that clarifies the time period for which review is requested. See examples below.]

I sincerely appreciate your time and effort, and thank you in advance for your evaluation.

Sincerely,

_____, Title

Address

Telephone

e-mail address

Sample Paragraph if Candidate Waives Access to the External Letters

Your letter will become part of the official personnel review file. NAME has voluntarily waived in advance access to the evaluative file, with the expectation that this waiver will enable reviewers to provide thorough and candid evaluations. This waiver has been reviewed for its legality, and I can assure you that the University will not disclose your letter to the candidate, although we cannot predict whether a court challenge might result in disclosure. With the waiver, NAME retains the right to request a substantive summary of all evaluative remarks, carefully edited to avoid disclosure of the identity of the referee.

Sample Paragraph if Candidate Retains Access to the External Letters

Your letter will become part of the official personnel review file. Oregon law permits full access of a faculty member to his or her personnel files unless such access is voluntarily waived. I must tell you that your letter will be seen by NAME should [he/she] request access to [his/her] file.

Sample Paragraph for Candidates who Have Taken Leave(s) of Absence

It is University of Oregon policy not to count leave-of-absence periods toward the promotion “clock.” However, all professional activity reported during or arising from a leave period should be included in the promotion evaluation. NAME ____ was credited with a one-year leave of absence, and thus the primary focus for your review should be from [year]-present.

Sample Paragraph for Candidates who are using Credit for Prior Service

NAME was hired with credit for prior experience. The primary focus for your review should be from [year]-present. While you are of course welcome to comment on earlier activities, these activities will receive secondary consideration in our internal processes.

[If the candidate is using all the initially allotted years of credit for prior service, identify the year at which the employment leading to this assignment of credit began. If the candidate is using only some of the allotted credit years, identify the year that, when combined with the candidate’s years of service at UO, provides a six-year “window” as the period of primary consideration.]

Sample Thank You Letter upon Receipt of Letter of Evaluation

DATE

NAME

Department of X

University of Y

Address

Dear NAME:

On behalf of the Department of X, I am writing to express our sincere appreciation for your review of NAME's qualifications for promotion.

I recognize that reading an extensive file like this, and preparing a thorough and thoughtful evaluation, takes time and adds to the burden of many tasks that you face each day. I can assure you that your input is extremely valuable and will play an important role in our decision-making processes both within the Department and at the College and University levels.

Sincerely,

_____, Title

Address

Telephone

e-mail address