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In accordance with the “Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) May 10, 2021 – June 30, 2024” (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document is developed to provide reappointment, promotion and tenure (RPT) guidelines for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. This document incorporates the position appointment titles for tenure-track, and tenured faculty as described in Article 14, Section 1 of the Union Contract.
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# Department Considerations

The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering is an academic unit dedicated to scholarship and teaching. The mission of the Department is to promote effective teaching and cultivate excellence in engineering innovation and leadership to serve and benefit the local and global community. The department takes pride in the personal, experiential, professional learning experiences provided to students; its research, educational and outreach activities that address critical engineering challenges and societal needs; and being a technical resource for the state of Vermont and beyond. The Department leverages unique opportunities for collaborations in research with other areas in the University.

The Department is committed to supporting the teacher-scholar model for its faculty. Each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is expected to be both an effective teacher in their sub discipline and active scholar in their research area, complemented by University and professional service. The quality criteria for effective teaching, active research and meaningful service can be found in the Union Contract (Article 14, Section 5.e); however, the Department’s perspective regarding teaching, scholarship and service is detailed further in subsequent sections of these guidelines. The Department also supports the overarching expectation and responsibility of faculty in their commitment to continued development and application of practices that foster diversity and inclusion and the values of Our Common Ground[[1]](#footnote-1). The following RPT guidelines have been developed to support these goals.

# Timelines

A tenure track Assistant Professor will be appointed for an initial three-year term and may be reappointed for up to two additional two-year terms (Union Contract, Article 14, Section 5.(a). At the start of the second and fourth years of service, the Chair will notify the candidate for reappointment in writing that the review process must begin. At the end of the second semester of the fifth year of service, the candidate is required to apply for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Any request for an extension of the probationary period for tenure-track is governed by Article 14, Section 5(d) as described in the Union Contract.

An untenured Associate Professor may be hired with an initial two-year appointment, and may be reappointed for an additional two-year period. The procedure for the first reappointment of an untenured Associate Professor (not the tenure review) will follow the same protocol and timeline as for the first reappointment of an Assistant Professor except that the review process commences at the end of the second semester of the initial appointment.

At the discretion of the candidate and the Chair, an expedited tenure review may be requested for those candidates joining the University who previously held a tenured position at a peer institution.

A faculty member may become a candidate for the appropriate action at an earlier date than mandated by the preceding paragraphs. In such a non-mandatory tenure case, the faculty member must notify the Chair and Dean according to the schedule established in Section 9 of this document. The Chair may provide informal advice after possible consultation with tenured members in the Department, but the decision for non-mandatory tenure and/or promotion application rests with the candidate. Following discussion with the Chair, a non-mandatory tenure candidate may choose to withdraw their current tenure and promotion application.

The evaluation procedures are identical for both mandatory and non-mandatory tenure reviews. The documentation prepared by the candidate, in coordination with the Chair, will be consistent with the format defined in this document. Candidates are requested to explicitly address in the RPT documentation any areas recommended for performance improvement or enhancement identified in the prior RPT review.

An Associate Professor who wishes to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor must notify the Chair according to the schedule established in Section 9 of this document in order that arm's-length evaluations can be organized over the summer.

While no minimum time at the rank of Associate Professor is required, promotion to the rank of Professor implies a well-established and documented record in teaching, scholarship and service. A candidate for promotion to Professor should enjoy a recognized national or international reputation through demonstrated scholarship in the candidate’s technical area(s) of expertise or scholarship in engineering education, or both.

Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the Chair’s Evaluation (Section 3.2 of this document), a candidate for promotion to Professor may choose to withdraw their current application.

# RPT Evaluations in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

For RPT evaluations, the Department applies the Evaluation of Faculty and Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures in the Union Contract (Article 14), and in addition has the following:

## The RPT Committee

The Department’s RPT Committee will consist of all of its tenure-track, tenured and non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., the committee of the whole) with full-time primary appointment in the Department excluding the candidate. Once the RPT dossier is complete, the RPT Committee will meet in the presence of the Department Chair to consider and to vote as described in the following sections. Voting eligibility for particular cases is outlined in Section 3.4 of this document. The result of the ballot of eligible voters on a particular candidate will constitute the collective assessment and recommendation of the Department’s faculty.

## Duties of the Chair

The Chair will set an appropriate schedule (Section 9 of this document) for each dossier review. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that all required sections of the dossier are present and ready for faculty review prior to the RPT meeting for that candidate per the schedule outlined in Section 9 of this document. Once the dossier is ready for review, all full-time faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share in confidence their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate at the RPT committee meeting called by the Chair per the schedule outlined in Section 9 of this document. The Chair will (i) attend the meeting but not vote, (ii) provide factual information as requested, and (iii) record prior to the adjournment of the meeting all of the comments and an anonymous tally of the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted. The Chair will summarize the discussion and share the document in confidence with the voting members of the RPT committee to ensure that the discussion is accurately summarized per the schedule outlined in Section 9. This summary document and tally of the votes will be included in the Chair’s Evaluation.

After considering the feedback from the RPT committee and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application, and will prepare the Chair’s Evaluation statement. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement will also be made available to those voting members of the committee (Section 3.5) who request it in writing (Section 9 outlines the schedule).

## RPT Meeting

After the dossier is complete, the Chair will convene a meeting of the RPT committee (per schedule in Section 9 of this document) at which the following will take place: (i) the RPT committee members will discuss the material in the dossier, and (ii) all eligible voters (as defined in Section 3.4 of this document) will discuss the material in the dossier in closed session and then vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend the candidate's application during the meeting. The vote will be considered complete when votes cast at the meeting are provided to the Chair at the end of the meeting. Of the Department faculty eligible to vote on the candidate’s application, only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, shall be allowed to vote.

## Eligible Voters for RPT Reviews

When a candidate applies for promotion to a particular rank, only those faculty members who are already at this rank or above are eligible voters. When a candidate applies for reappointment at a particular rank, only those faculty members who have successfully passed their reappointment at this rank are eligible voters.

* For a first tenure-track reappointment review, only tenured faculty members and those faculty who have successfully passed their first reappointment review are eligible voters.
* For a second reappointment review, only tenured faculty members and those faculty who have successfully passed their second reappointment review are eligible voters.
* For a tenure application, only tenured faculty members are eligible voters.
* For a promotion application to Associate Professor with tenure, only Associate Professors with tenure and Professors are eligible voters.
* For a promotion application to Professor, only Professors are eligible voters.
* The Department Chair is not an eligible voter, but is required to be present as an observer at the discussion and the vote of the committee of eligible voters.
* As the College’s by-laws require that one of the Department’s faculty must serve on the College’s Faculty Standard’s Committee that elected member must recuse themselves from voting in the RPT process at either the Department or College level.
* Full-time faculty on academic leave and on sabbatical are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document***.***
* Only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.

# Teaching

Effective teaching is absolutely necessary to accomplish the mission of the Department. No one should expect to be recommended for tenure or promotion without a record of good to excellent teaching at both undergraduate and graduate levels. This should be considered as a necessary, but not sufficient criterion. Examples of prime indicators of effective teaching are provided in Article 14, Section 5(e)(i) of the Union Contract. As a minimum, the following information (Sections 4.1 through 4.3 of this document) will be included in the dossier.

## Individual Student Input on Candidate’s Teaching and Advising

Candidates will provide a summary of the numerical scores for their teaching evaluations for a minimum of the preceding 5 years or for all preceding years if the candidate has taught for less than 5 years. The Chair’s office will provide copies of all of the students’ anecdotal comments for each of the courses listed by the candidate since the last RPT action.

The candidate has the option of providing to the Chair the names of students and alumni who may be able to comment anonymously on the candidate’s teaching and advising. The Chair will solicit up to six such letters from this set. The candidate must not suggest names of students enrolled in the candidate’s classes in the semester when such letters are to be solicited.

## Peer Teaching Evaluations

The Peer Teaching evaluations and observations will be conducted in the manner prescribed by the Department’s policy on Peer observation guidelines.

The Chair will arrange to have peer-teaching evaluations such that there is a total of 2-3 new evaluations available since the last RPT action and strive for at least one evaluation for each different course taught by the candidate. The frequency is expected to be at least one new peer evaluation per year for untenured faculty and at least one evaluation per two years for Associate Professors with tenure. All peer teaching evaluations will be conducted by tenured faculty eligible to vote on the proposed personnel action. The Chair, in consultation with the candidate, may invite appropriate faculty members from other Departments, Schools or Colleges to provide peer-teaching evaluations. The candidate may confidentially identify faculty members who for reasonable cause stated should not be invited for this purpose. The peer evaluators shall be advised to review the candidate's course materials/teaching portfolio as well as to attend a minimum of one of the candidate's lectures. For online classes, the candidate is expected to provide peer evaluators access to the online content and the peer evaluators are requested to go through at least one online module in addition to evaluating overall organization of the online course.

Candidate’s teaching is evaluated according to the following:

* Peer teaching evaluations.
* Student evaluation surveys conducted by the College at the end of each semester to assess student reactions in the classroom and to the course contents, level of rigor and teaching effectiveness of the instructor from the students’ perspective.
* Meeting desired accreditation requirements and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
* Letters from students/alumni.
* Descriptions of the course content and learning goals, and examples of syllabi, reading lists, and laboratory exercises will be made available, in addition to other material that the faculty member may choose to submit.
* Any teaching awards.
* Development of learning assessment tools.
* Participation in professional teaching development activities (e.g., workshops).
* Implementation of innovative teaching methods and high-impact pedagogies; for example, service-learning and project-based learning.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom as appropriate.

## Advising & Mentoring

### Undergraduate

Candidates preparing their dossier will include a separate section on advising and mentoring undergraduates. In addition to student advisee numbers, it is important to include details with regard to both undergraduate and graduate advising, such as:

* Availability for student contact.
* Frequency of meetings and other interactions with advisees.
* In-service training for advising.
* Efforts to support the Department in advising.
* Having sufficient knowledge about Civil and Environmental Engineering degree requirements and courses of study.
* Mentoring and involvement in undergraduate research, organizations and projects.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in advising and/or mentoring.

### Graduate

In addition to graduate student advisee numbers, it is important to include details such as:

* Ensuring that graduate students take proposal and comprehensive exams in a timely manner.
* Assisting graduate students in developing presentation and writing skills.
* Evidence of students’ scholarly research dissemination.
* Evidence of graduate students’ graduation.
* Participation in graduate student committees.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in advising and/or mentoring.

# Research & Scholarship

According to the Article 14 Section 5(e)(ii) of the Union Contract, "Substantial and sustained scholarship/research/creative activity of high quality is an essential criterion for reappointment, promotion and tenure." All tenure-track and tenured faculty members must provide evidence responsive to this requirement for their RPT reviews. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Department are expected to actively engage in high-quality research and scholarship consistent with the Mission of the Department and in support of the graduate education program in the Department. The criteria for evaluation of research and scholarship are:

* Publication of original research articles in major peer-reviewed journals in the field of expertise of the candidate is required. Professional publications include authorship of books and articles in refereed journals, books, and book chapters. Other evidence of scholarly activities may include peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Websites, blogs are not equivalent to publications. Up to five examples of peer-reviewed publications, preferably those that showcase candidate’s work at UVM, will be made available to the RPT committee and external arms-length evaluators.
* Patents and Disclosures – successful translation of research products into commercial or public applications is evidence of innovative research, although it is not expected that all research programs will yield patentable discoveries.
* Acquisition of competitive grants from major federal agencies, scientific foundations or societies and contract support is considered an indication of recognized research competence and productivity; however, this record of support cannot stand alone as evidence of scholarship.
* Professional opinion of extramural, arm’s length evaluators (Section 7).
* Additional evidence may include:
  + Impact factor of journals where articles appear, the number of citations to individual publications and author level metrics such as the h-index or total number of citations.
  + Invitations to present seminars at national and international scientific meetings, at other universities and to present talks within UVM.
  + Research awards or other special recognition of scholarship.
  + Invitations to serve as a reviewer for research manuscripts and extramural research grants.
  + Service as a major officer in a professional society.
  + Editorial board memberships to major journals, conferences, books.
  + Evidence of how the candidate’s research helps to advance diversity, equity and inclusion.

The Department does not simply count the number of publications, nor does it take a restrictive, static view of what constitutes Engineering research. The emphasis in all instances is on research quality.

The Union Contract states: “In cases involving tenure and promotion to Associate or (Full) Professor the quality and significance of the work must be evaluated.” This also applies for reappointment cases. Accordingly, the candidate is required to provide evidence of the quality and significance of their scholarly products. For peer-reviewed journal publications, common methods for evaluating quality of a publication are the impact factor of the journal where the publication appears and the number of external citations garnered by the publication. The candidate may provide other information as desired to establish the quality and significance of the work, such as acceptance rates and other information on the standards of the journal and its standing in the discipline. Candidates may also provide aggregate level data on the significance and impact of their published research by providing aggregate citation totals, h-index and other author level metrics. For conference proceedings, the candidate is asked to distinguish the level of peer-review (either fully-refereed, abstract-refereed, or non-refereed) and to provide information about the conference acceptance rates, if possible. For monographs and book chapters, the candidate is advised to provide information regarding the review process of the press, and whether or not the work was invited. Candidates are encouraged to outline the significant contributions of each major publication. For multi-author publications, the candidate should state the degree of their contribution towards the research.

Collaborative, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary research is encouraged. For joint publications and grants, the candidate should describe their role in, and contributions to, the joint effort. The Chair has the prerogative to contact selected co-authors for comments on the candidate’s contribution to the specific collaboration. For interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary work, the candidate is advised to describe the nature of the publication venue and the relationship of the research to Engineering.

# Service

Candidates must provide evidence of their involvement in service activities to their profession, to the University (including the College, and the Department), and external service to the community/public. Service patterns are unique and individual, and are expected to grow in both extent and breadth at each stage of reappointment. The expectation for an Assistant Professor applying for reappointments could remain modest, with light University service and external service that contribute directly to building the candidate’s tenure case (e.g. federal agency funding review panel, journal refereeing). For promotion to Associate Professor, in addition to the involvement in the Department, College or University committees, there should be clear and well-documented service to the Profession. For promotion to Professor, the service contributions should be consistent, of high quality, and should have clear impact at the national or international level. If applicable, candidates should also include a description of how their service activities align with the inclusive excellence plan or initiatives of the Department, College or University or other ways they support diversity and inclusion.

# Arm’s-Length Evaluation

## Selection of Arm's-Length Evaluators for Promotion and Tenure

For the following tenure-track/tenured faculty dossier reviews, "arm's-length" evaluators will be solicited to provide confidential external reports that will be shared with the RTP committee:

* Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and
* Promotion to the rank of Professor.

An ”arm's-length” evaluator is a person who is not compromised in their ability to provide an objective evaluation of the professional performance and reputation of the individual being evaluated (Union Contract, Article 14, Section 5(e)(ii)). Former students, thesis advisors, colleagues, co- authors, or collaborators, for example, generally do not constitute arm's-length evaluators. In addition, arm's-length evaluators should:

1. Be acknowledged scholars and practitioners in the discipline of the candidate at other institutions. These scholars and practitioners should be capable of providing an objective, informed assessment of the candidate's work.
2. Be tenured at their home universities (and for promotion to the rank of Professor, have the same or an equivalent rank), if they come from academia.
3. Have expertise in at least one of the candidate's research areas, and in the case of evaluators not from academia, their standing in the research area must be clearly identified.

The Chair will inform the arm's-length reviewers of all pertinent facts regarding the candidate, with the candidate's representative publications and other creative work, and will ask them for their assessments of:

1. The quality of the candidate's research,
2. The candidate's research contributions to, and its impact on, their research field,
3. The candidate's productivity relative to other academics at a similar stage in their career,
4. The candidate's potential as a research leader, and
5. A general assessment of the publication and review standards of the journals and conference proceedings in which the candidate has published, and their standings in the discipline.

## The Selection Process for reviewers:

1. The candidate is asked to provide the names of 10 potential reviewers.
2. The Chair compiles 10 other names from other sources.
3. The Chair shows the10 other names to the candidate and asks the candidate to identify (i) any names that are not at arm’s-length, and (ii) any names that the candidate deems inappropriate as evaluators (for reasonable cause). The Chair may repeat steps 2-3 in order to have a sufficient number of names.
4. The Chair selects and contacts 10 names from the combined list, with at least half selected from the candidate’s list.
5. The candidate shall not reach out to any arm’s-length reviewers during the RPT process and ask if they would be willing to provide evaluations.

In extraordinary cases, exceptions to these guidelines may be made by mutual agreement of the Chair and the candidate, and in such instances the Chair will document reasons for all adjustments.

## Portfolio/Extended CV Contents

Although external evaluators are asked to comment specifically on the research contributions of the faculty candidate, the final portfolio provided to evaluators should paint a full picture of the candidate’s responsibilities to contextualize their research output. Therefore, the portfolio prepared by the candidate should include at least the following components:

1. *Extended CV*. The description at <https://www.uvm.edu/~facrsrcs/CV_guidelines.pdf>, recommends a list of components to be included in the CV.
2. *Research statement*. This should include a summary of the candidate’s research interests, a selection of up to 5 representative publications, and a summary of major contributions the candidate has made to their field of research. The statement should also summarize external research support and other accomplishments that illustrate the sustainability of the candidate’s research program.
3. *Teaching/advising statement*. This should include a summary of courses taught since at least the last RPT action of the candidate, including information of credits, any laboratory components, enrollments and instructor evaluation scores. The statement should also include a summary of advising activities especially of graduate students.
4. *Service statement.* This should include a summary of service assignments since at least the last RPT action of the candidate, along with a description of associated responsibilities and commitments.

The candidate is encouraged to consider expectations of the UVM Green Sheets to inform content and structure of the research, teaching/advising, and service statements, including the expectation that candidates support diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom, advising and or/mentoring. The candidate is also free to include any additional information in their dossier that they feel may support their case, including accomplishments that align with the tenets of Our Common Ground[[2]](#footnote-2).

# General Guidance on Expectations

The requirements for personnel decisions are progressive from one rank to the next. Successful achievement at one stage cannot be taken as an assurance that there will be no new concerns at the next stage. In the probationary stages, the performance must build toward the high standard required for promotions and tenure. The level of commitment must be sustained and high, and the level of accomplishment consistently increasing through the point of promotion to the rank of Professor.

## First Reappointment

*Teaching* ***–*** Commitment to effective education of students must be evident. A strategy to develop effective teaching methods with the goal of achieving excellence in classroom performance is expected. This should include responsiveness to constructive critique from peer and student evaluations and the pursuit of on-campus or external professional development related to development as a teacher.

*Research –* There should be evidence of continuous scholarship, building of an independent research program since appointment at UVM and efforts to establish on-campus and/or external collaborations. Successful candidates generally have one or more publications in high quality refereed journals since appointment at UVM and are able to demonstrate the pursuit of competitive external funding and recruitment of graduate students.

*Service* – Service as a professional reviewer, active participant in professional associations and joining department committees is expected.

## Second Reappointment

*Teaching* – Significant progress toward excellence in teaching performance is expected at undergraduate and graduate level, as reflected in peer teaching evaluations, student teaching evaluations, and documentation of teaching techniques and continuous quality improvements. Any concerns raised at first reappointment should have been satisfactorily addressed or there should be evidence of significant progress. A plan to develop a portfolio of courses that include a diversity of teaching formats or academic levels is expected.

At second reappointment, documentation of advising of both graduate and undergraduate students is expected. This should include academic advising of undergraduate students, and advising undergraduate and graduate researchers.

*Research* – Successful candidates typically have four or more high quality refereed journal publications of which a majority of the research, data analysis, and manuscript preparation has been carried out since appointment at UVM. There should be active conference participation. Successful candidates often have established a regular pattern of application for independent or collaborative research funding, and often a funded project in which the candidate serves as principal investigator. It is expected that the candidate targets diverse funding agencies for competitive funding applications.

*Service* – Moderate on-campus service should be presented as well as professional activities at the state or national level (e.g. manuscript and proposal reviewer/panelist).

## Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

*Teaching* – Successful candidates often have a strong record of good to excellent classroom teaching and advising, and have corrected deficiencies identified in earlier reviews. The candidate should have developed a portfolio of courses that include a diversity of teaching formats or academic levels. Expertise about departmental and university general requirements should be adequate for good advising of undergraduate and graduate students. Successful candidates are often able to demonstrate excellence in graduate and undergraduate student mentoring.

*Research* – Successful candidates often average approximately two high quality refereed journal publications/patents/book chapters per year after beginning at UVM. Most of these products are often based on research conducted at UVM and with UVM student researchers as co-authors. In situations where faculty join the department with prior research experience outside of UVM and face an accelerated timeline to a tenure decision, products based on research conducted outside of UVM will also be considered. There is evidence of conference participation and invited presentations on and off-campus. It is expected that the candidate has graduated some graduate students that they mentored on research and preferably have also mentored a doctoral student. Successful candidates typically have at least one major competitive research grant (e.g., peer-reviewed or from a federal agency) in which the candidate serves as principal investigator by the time of the tenure and promotion decision. For collaborative grants, documentation of role and contribution to the research should be clarified. Efforts for continuing a sustained level of extramural support in the form of a detailed research plan is often evident. Other evidence may include any research-related awards and recognition. A major element in making the case for national stature of the research program will be the arm’s-length letters, solicited in confidence from extramural colleagues. These arm’s-length evaluation letters are often uniformly favorable for successful candidates.

*Service* – For promotion to Associate Professor, in addition to the involvement in the Department, College or University committees, there should be clear and well-documented service to the profession, such as reviewing technical articles, review panels on proposals submitted to funding agencies and organizing sessions at conferences.

The key question at this juncture concerns past momentum as a predictor of future achievement. Is there a self-sustaining pattern of professional growth? Are the patterns of strong performance in teaching, research productivity, and service self-reinforcing and indicate an upward trajectory towards continued professional accomplishments beyond tenure? A short spurt of excellence in the fifth year will not compensate for deficiencies in earlier years.

## Promotion to Professor:

Professional growth must have continued beyond the standard achieved for promotion to Associate Professor. The research contributions must be excellent, showing a sustained pattern of productivity as demonstrated in refereed journal publications, conference involvement, repeated extramural competitive funding, and growing national or international professional stature. Extramural evaluations must be solicited at the time of this decision. These arm’s-length evaluation letters are often unequivocally favorable for successful candidates. The teaching contributions must reflect experience and effectiveness at many levels. Advising activities should exceed those for probationary faculty. A strong record of mentoring and graduating doctoral students is expected. The service contributions should be consistent, of high quality, and should have clear impact at the national or international level. For promotion to the rank of Professor significant involvement in the Department, College and University committees is expected. Service contributions at UVM may include administrative roles. In addition, there should be clear and well-documented service to the Profession, such as journal editorship, chair of a national conference, chair of professional standard committees, or service as a major officer in a professional society.

# Key Dates

The following table summarizes the schedule that is generally followed by the Department for conducting RPT evaluations of tenure-track and tenured faculty up to the submission deadline to the Dean’s Office.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Action** |
| April 15 | * Chair notifies the candidates up for mandatory RPT action in the following academic year. * Candidates notify the Chair in writing if they wish to apply for early tenure or early promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor in the following academic year. |
| May 1 | * Candidate provides to Chair their CV and 10 nominations for external arm’s –length evaluators including their name, rank, affiliation, email address and link to webpage if such exists. * Chair invites RPT committee members to suggest arm’s-length reviewers. |
| May 15 | * Chair and candidate agree on 20 final names, and the Chair contacts (via email) about 10 individuals (with at least half the individuals from the candidate’s list) to request their evaluations. Typically, at least five arm’s-length evaluation letters are obtained. |
| August 1 | * In the event that an insufficient number of evaluators have agreed to provide arm’s-length evaluation letters, the Chair in consultation with the candidate will identify additional (beyond the first 10) evaluators to contact, again by selecting at least half the individuals suggested by the candidate. |
| August 15 | * The candidate provides a complete portfolio (Section 7.3) to the Chair. * The candidate may provide a list of students/alumni for soliciting comments on the candidate’s teaching and advising. * The Chair solicits six students/alumni letters from the list provided by the candidate. |
| October 1 | * The candidate provides completed green sheets to the Chair. * The chair gathers external arm’s-length evaluation letters. * If the candidate requests, the chair collects up to six students/alumni letters. |
| October 15 | * The Chair assembles the dossier. |
| November 10 | * The review by the RPT committee and vote of the eligible voters completed. |
| November 15 | * The Chair summarizes the RPT committee discussion and shares the document with the voting members of the RPT committee. |
| November 20 | * A voting member of the RPT committee may request in writing a copy of Chair’s summary statement. |
| November 30 | * Chair prepares a summary statement of their assessment and includes a tally of the vote. * The Chair provides the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and makes this statement available to those voting members of the RPT committee who request it by November 20. * Chair submits their evaluation to the Dean’s Office. |

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering

Reappointment & Promotion Guidelines for Full-time Lecturers & Senior Lecturers

**Department Approved 11/23/2021**

**Office of the Provost Final Approval 02/23/2023**

**1. Introduction**

In accordance with the Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) dated 12/12/2014 (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document provides reappointment and promotion guidelines for Full-Time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (hereinafter referred to as the Department). A Full-Time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer who is eligible for reappointment shall be reviewed for that reappointment before his or her present appointment expires. The reappointment review shall be conducted by the Chair of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (hereinafter referred to as the Chair).

The mission of the Department is to promote effective teaching and cultivate excellence in engineering innovation and leadership to serve and benefit the local and global community. The Department also supports the overarching expectation and responsibility of faculty in their commitment to continued development and application of practices that foster diversity and inclusion and the values of Our Common Ground[[3]](#footnote-3).

The Department applies the quality criteria for teaching, advising and service that are listed in Article 14 Section 10 in the Union Contract, Appointments & Evaluation: Non-Tenure Track Faculty and has the following additional specifications.

The candidate is encouraged to consider expectations of the UVM Green/Blue Sheets to inform content and structure of the teaching/advising and service statements, including the expectation that candidates support diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom, advising, mentoring and service. The candidate is also free to include any additional information in their dossier that they feel may support their case, including accomplishments that align with the tenets of Our Common Ground1.

1. **Faculty Input and Eligible Voters for RP Reviews**

***2.1 RP Committee and Meeting***

The RP committee shall consist of all full-time tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., the Committee of the Whole) of the Department excluding the candidate.

At the RP committee meeting: (i) all Department faculty members discuss the material in the candidate’s dossier, and (ii) all eligible voters (as defined in Section 2.3) discuss the material in the dossier in closed session and then vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend the candidate's application during the meeting. The vote will be considered complete when votes cast at the meeting are provided to the Chair at the end of the meeting. Of the Department faculty eligible to vote on the candidate’s application, only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, shall be allowed to vote.

***2.2 Duties of the Chair***

For pink sheet reviews the Chair will inform the Department faculty via email that a case is being considered six (6) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office.  If any faculty requests a full department review and vote in writing to the Chair within a week of Chair’s notification, a full department review and vote will be conducted.  Otherwise, the Chair will review these cases.

The Chair will set an appropriate schedule for a review, such that the complete dossier will be ready for faculty review at least two (2) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the dossier for faculty review prior to the RP meeting for that candidate. Once the dossier is ready for review, all faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate at the RP committee meeting called by the Chair at least one (1) week before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will (i) attend the meeting but not vote, (ii) provide factual information as requested, and (iii) record all of the comments and an anonymous tally of the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted prior to the adjournment of the meeting. The Chair will summarize the discussion and share the document with the voting members of the RP committee via email within three (3) business days of the committee meeting to ensure that the discussion is accurately summarized. This summary document and tally of the votes will be included in the Chair’s Evaluation.

After considering the feedback from the RP committee and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application and will prepare the Chair’s Evaluation statement. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement will also be made available to those voting members of the committee (Section 2.1) who request it in writing.

***2.3 Eligible Voters for Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Reviews***

* For a Lecturer reappointment with a review: Senior Lecturers, tenure-track/tenured faculty members, and those Lecturers who have successfully passed a reappointment review in the past and are not themselves applying for a reappointment in the current year, are eligible voters.
* For a Senior Lecturer application: Senior Lecturers and tenure-track/tenured faculty members are eligible voters.
* For a Senior Lecturer reappointment with a blue sheet review: tenure-track/tenured faculty members, and those Senior Lecturers who have successfully passed a reappointment review in the past and are not applying for a reappointment in the current year, are eligible voters.
* The Chair is not an eligible voter.
* As the College’s by-laws require that one of the Department’s faculty must serve on the College’s Faculty Standard’s Committee that elected member must recuse themselves from voting in the RPT process at either the Department or College level.
* Full-time faculty on academic leave and on sabbatical are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document***.***
* Only those present at the RP meeting (Section 2.3), or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.

**3. Guidelines for Reappointment as Lecturer**

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for evaluation criteria. In addition, reappointment as a Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

* Subject to a regular reappointment review (without explicit expectations for technical research).
* Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.
* Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department (consistent with workloads). Examples include committee membership, active participation in Department meetings and events, etc.
* Evidence of maintaining currency in their field of expertise. Examples include professional development activities/training, conference participation, publications, etc.
* Evidence of sustained quality and innovation in teaching (e.g., new courses, laboratory experiments and/or new methods). The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from students and peers as described in Section 6.
* Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
* Evidence of quality student advising/mentoring. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom, advising, mentoring and service as appropriate.

**4. Guidelines for Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for evaluation criteria. In addition, an application for Senior Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

* A minimum of 6 years (within an eight-year period) of service, as specified in the Union Contract.
* Subject to a regular reappointment and promotion review.
* Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.
* Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department (consistent with workloads). Examples include committee leadership, active participation in Department meetings and events, developing and leading Department initiatives, etc.
* Evidence of significant activity to maintain currency in their field of expertise. Examples include professional development activities/training, conference participation, publications, or other scholarly activities (e.g., technical or pedagogical research).
* Evidence of sustained and highest quality teaching since last review (e.g., consistently good peer and student teaching evaluations, teaching awards, etc.). The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from peers and students as described in Section 6 to assist the candidate in preparing supporting material.
* Demonstration of significant innovation in teaching since last review (e.g., new courses, new experiments and/or laboratories, and/or new methods).
* Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
* Demonstration of exemplary student advising/mentoring since last review. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.
* Evidence of working knowledge of Program and College requirements, procedures, policies, and standards.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom, advising, mentoring and service as appropriate.

**5. Guidelines for Reappointment as Senior Lecturer**

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for evaluation criteria. In addition, reappointment as a Senior Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

* Subject to a regular reappointment review.
* Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.
* Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department since the last review.
* Evidence of maintaining currency in their field of expertise since last review, for example as demonstrated through professional development activities, publications, etc.
* Evidence of sustained and highest quality teaching since last review (e.g., consistently good peer and student teaching evaluations, teaching awards, etc.). Demonstration of sustained innovation in classroom since last review (e.g., new courses and/or new methods) teaching. The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from students and peers as described in Section 6 to assist the candidate in preparing supporting material.
* Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
* Demonstration of exemplary student advising/mentoring since last review. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom, advising, mentoring and service as appropriate.

**6. Teaching Evaluations**

***6.1 Peer evaluations***

Prior to each review, the Chair will invite faculty members to observe the candidate’s teaching on no less than an annual basis and to provide written observations. Courses taught on a regular basis by the candidate should be evaluated by peers at least once between reviews. The candidate has the option of requesting that specific faculty colleagues not be invited to provide these teaching observations. The final decision on the reviewers rests with the Chair.

All peer teaching observations will be done by qualified faculty. (e. g., senior lecturers or tenured faculty in the candidate’s Department). The Chair, in consultation with the candidate, may invite appropriate faculty members from other Departments to provide teaching observations.

The peer evaluators are requested to examine the candidate’s course materials as well as attend at least one of the candidate’s lectures. For online classes, the candidate is expected to provide peer evaluators access to the online content and the peer evaluators are requested to go through at least one online module in addition to evaluating overall organization of the online course. The written reviews shall be presented so as to follow the College’s guidelines on peer teaching reviews.

***6.2 Student evaluations***

Candidates will provide a summary of the numerical scores regarding (i) course quality, (ii) course rigor, and (iii) instructor quality from the teaching evaluations of all courses for the minimum of (i) the preceding five (5) years, (ii) the duration of the candidate’s employment if it has been for less than five (5) years, and (iii) the duration since the candidate’s reappointment or promotion action. The Chair’s office will provide copies of all of the students’ anecdotal comments for each of the courses taught by the candidate for the preceding two (2) years.

The candidate has the option of providing to the Chair the names of students and alumni who may be able to comment anonymously on the candidate’s teaching and advising. The Chair will solicit up to six such letters from this set. The candidate must not suggest names of students enrolled in the candidate’s classes in the semester when such letters are to be solicited.

Candidate’s teaching is evaluated according to the following:

* Peer teaching evaluations.
* Student evaluation surveys conducted by the College at the end of each semester to assess student reactions in the classroom and to the course contents, level of rigor and teaching effectiveness of the instructor from the students’ perspective.
* Meeting desired accreditation requirements and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
* Letters from students/alumni.
* Descriptions of the course content and learning goals, and examples of syllabi, reading lists, and laboratory exercises will be made available, in addition to other material that the faculty member may choose to submit.
* Any teaching awards.
* Development of learning assessment tools.
* Participation in professional teaching development activities (e.g., workshops).
* Implementation of innovative teaching methods and high-impact pedagogies; for example, service-learning and project-based learning.
* Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in the classroom as appropriate.

**7. Advising**

Candidates preparing their review dossier are advised to have a separate section on advising. In addition to student numbers, it is useful to include other information such as

1. Evidence of knowledge of major, minor, College and University degree requirements,
2. Documentation of availability for student contact,
3. Frequency of meetings and other interactions with advisees,
4. Documented in-service training for advising,
5. Documentation of efforts to support the Department in advising, and
6. Evidence of consideration and/or incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness in advising and/or mentoring.

Although not a requirement, lecturers can be mentors and be involved in undergraduate research, organizations, and projects. If candidates are, they should report on this activity.
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# Introduction

In accordance with the “Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) May 10, 2021 – June 30, 2024” (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document provides reappointment and promotion (RP) guidelines for Research Faculty in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (hereinafter referred to as the Department).

Research faculty are reviewed only relative to the quality of performance in scholarship and research and other duties as expressly assigned and commensurate with assignment distributions as recorded in the annual workload plan. The Department applies the quality criteria listed in Article 14 Section 10 in the Union Contract, Appointments & Evaluation: Non-Tenure Track Faculty and has the following additional specifications.

A research faculty may progress through the following ranks: Research Associate, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. At the discretion of the Chair in consultation with the Dean’s Office, deviations from this progression are possible if the candidate previously held a similar position at a peer institution.

The mission of the Department is to promote effective teaching and cultivate excellence in engineering innovation and leadership to serve and benefit the local and global community. The Department also supports the overarching expectation and responsibility of faculty in their commitment to continued development and application of practices that foster diversity and inclusion and the values of Our Common Ground[[4]](#footnote-4).

The candidate is encouraged to include a discussion in their dossier on how their research, scholarship and mentoring activities support diversity and inclusiveness, if applicable. The candidate may also include any additional information in their dossier that they feel may support their case, including accomplishments that align with the tenets of Our Common Ground1.

# Faculty Input and Eligible Voters for RP Reviews

## RP Committee and Meeting

The RP committee shall consist of all full-time tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., the Committee of the Whole) of the Department, excluding the candidate.

At the RP committee meeting: (i) all full-time Department faculty members discuss the material in the candidate’s dossier, and (ii) all eligible voters (as defined in Section 2.3) discuss the material in the dossier in closed session and then vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend the candidate's application during the meeting. The vote will be considered complete when votes cast at the meeting are provided to the Department Chair (hereafter “Chair”) at the end of the meeting.

## Duties of the Chair

For pink sheet reviews the Chair will inform the Department faculty via email that a case is being considered six (6) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office.  If any faculty requests a full department review and vote in writing to the Chair within a week of Chair’s notification, a full department review and vote will be conducted.  Otherwise, the Chair will review these cases.

The Chair will set an appropriate schedule for a review, such that the complete dossier will be ready for faculty review at least two weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the dossier for faculty review prior to the RP meeting for that candidate. Once the dossier is ready for review, all full-time faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate at the RP committee meeting called by the Chair at least one week before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will (i) attend the meeting but not vote, (ii) provide factual information as requested, and (iii) record all of the comments and an anonymous tally of the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted prior to the adjournment of the meeting. The comments and vote will be included in the Chair’s Evaluation. The Chair will summarize the discussion and share the document with the voting members of the RPT committee via email within three business days of the committee meeting to ensure that the discussion is accurately summarized.

After considering the feedback from the RP committee and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application and will prepare a summary statement of their assessment and include a tally of the vote. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement will also be made available to those voting members of the committee (Section 2.1) who request it in writing.

## Eligible Voters for Research Faculty Reviews

* Only full-time Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty members and Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty members who have successfully passed the stage for which the candidate is applying are eligible voters.
* Full-time faculty on academic leave and on sabbatical are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document***.***
* Only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.
* The Chair is not an eligible voter.
* As the College’s by-laws require that one of the Department’s faculty must serve on the College’s Faculty Standard’s Committee, that elected member must recuse themselves from voting in the RP process at either the Department or College level.

# Guidelines for Evaluating Research and Scholarship and Departmental Contributions

## Evaluation Criteria

Research faculty are reviewed only relative to the quality of performance in (1) scholarship and research and (2) other duties expressly assigned. Other duties expressly assigned cannot be taken as a substitute for the candidate’s scholarship and research. Metrics for scholarship and research productivity may include refereed articles in archival journals and conferences, book chapters, patents, invited technical presentations, extramural support for research and contracts and research awards; some examples include:

* Publications of original research articles in peer-reviewed journals in the field of expertise of the candidate. Professional publications also include authorship of books or book chapters. Other evidence of scholarly activities may include peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Websites, blogs are not equivalent to publications.
* Patents and Disclosures – successful translation of research products into commercial or public applications is evidence of innovative research, although it is not expected that all research programs will yield patentable discoveries.
* Acquisition of or participation in competitive grants and research work.
* Presenting research at scientific meetings, invitations to present seminars at other universities or within UVM.
* Any research awards or other special recognition of scholarship.
* Service as a reviewer for research manuscripts and extramural research grants, and participation and service in professional societies.

Research faculty are also expected to contribute to the Department in ways such as:

* Training graduate students
* Training undergraduate researchers
* Attendance at seminars and department meetings
* Presentation of research to the Department

## Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

Evidence of research activity can take the form of the following. These are examples, and not all are required, except publications, in a single year. However, there should be substantial evidence of research activity.

* Annual description of research progress
* Attendance at professional meetings or workshops
* Submission of conference abstracts as author, co-author
* Submission of grant applications as PI, co-PI, co-I or Key Personnel
* Submission of patents and/or disclosures or other intellectual products
* Publication of manuscripts (at least one per year)
* Sponsor gives positive evaluation of work and assurance of continued funding for the position

## Appointment to Research Associate

Generally, a Postdoctoral Associate can be promoted to Research Associate if the Research Associate is:

1. productive in research as evidenced by the items listed in Section 3.1
2. has a commitment from the sponsoring tenure-track faculty member for space (desk, access to phone and Internet connection, and research space)
3. intends to submit grant applications
4. intends to remain at UVM with the faculty sponsor for at least 2 years
5. faculty sponsor gives positive evaluation of work
6. there is assurance of continued funding for the position

The Research Faculty track, from the ranks of Research Assistant Professor through Research Professor, is meant to provide a research-intensive path for career advancement. Although each individual is different, the timeline for promotions from one rank to the next is expected to roughly mirror that of tenure-track faculty.

## Promotion to Research Assistant Professor

Generally, a Research Associate is promoted to Research Assistant Professor if the Research Associate:

1. is productive in research as evidenced by the items under Section 3.1
2. demonstrates assurance of continued self-funding
3. contributes to the Department in significant ways such as:

* training graduate students
* training undergraduate students
* offering colloquia
* attendance at seminars and department meetings
* presentation of research to the Department

## Promotion to Research Associate Professor:

Generally, a Research Assistant Professor is promoted to Research Associate Professor if the candidate:

1. is able to demonstrate research and scholarship activities that are viewed as productive and significant by the Department faculty members
2. demonstrates assurance of continued self-funding
3. produces high-quality publications on a regular basis (on average at least one per year)
4. mentors graduate student research
5. participates in the Department in a sustained and significant way (Section 3.1)

## Promotion to Research Professor

Generally, a Research Associate Professor is promoted to Research Professor if the candidate:

1. is able to demonstrate research and scholarship activities since the last promotion that are viewed as productive and significant by the Department faculty members
2. demonstrates assurance of continued self-funding
3. there are high-quality publications on a regular basis (on average at least one per year) for at least six years following promotion to Research Associate Professor
4. mentors graduate student research
5. participation in the Department is sustained and significant (Section 3.1)

1. UVM’s *Our Common Ground* values: <https://www.uvm.edu/president/our-common-ground> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.uvm.edu/president/our-common-ground> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. UVM’s *Our Common Ground* values: <https://www.uvm.edu/president/our-common-ground> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UVM’s *Our Common Ground* values: <https://www.uvm.edu/president/our-common-ground> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)