

Demystifying RPT Experience at UVM: Second Reappointment Review

Presenters:

- Nicole Conroy, *Associate Professor*, Department of Counseling, Human Development and Family Science, College of Education & Social Services (CESS)
- Carolyn Bonifield, *Associate Professor of Marketing, Grossman School of Business (CAS); Chair, Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee (PSC)*
- Jane Okech, *Professor of Counselor Education & Supervision (CESS); Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.*

We want you to be successful at UVM!

- Map out your Reappointment & Promotion/Tenure Timeline with your Chair/AD
 - Know your timeline for 1st Reappointment
 - Know your timeline for 2nd Reappointment
 - Know your timeline for Promotion
 - Know your timeline for Tenure
- Each Academic unit has RPT Guidelines, Annual Performance Review Guidelines, and Course Equivalency Guidelines. Obtain a current copy & familiarize yourself with it.
- Know your CBA, Article 14
 - ❖ RP Process, timelines procedures for voting, rebuttals, etc.

Reappointment Actions

For most **NTT positions** there are 3 types of RP action:

- **Reappointment Review** = Occurring at the conclusion of the contract cycle
- **Formal Peer Review** = Unit-level reappointment review, typically every 4 years **(Blue Sheets)**
- **Promotion Review** = University-level review, by request (typically 6th year or later) **(Green Sheets)**
 - *Know your timeline to prepare effectively for the review*

RPT Schedule

For most **TT positions**, the reappointment schedule is:

1st reappointment = Spring of 2nd year

2nd reappointment = Initiated Fall of 4th year

Tenure review = Initiated Fall of 6th year

**Requires External Review for all faculty*

The **TT timeline can be extended up to 3 years** (for approved medical leaves, etc.)

Institutional Structures Involved in RPT Actions

1st Reappointment: Unit-Level Review Only: **BLUE SHEETS**

**Provost Review Only in Unsuccessful Cases*

Department
Chair (or
Equivalents in
Schools within
Colleges or
Standalone
Schools

Faculty
Standards
Committee
(FSC) /Dean

2nd Reappointment & Tenure/Promotion: Unit, University & Provost's level of review: **GREEN SHEETS**

Department
Chair(or
Equivalents)

College Level:
**Faculty
Standards
Committee
(FSC)**
(Advisory to
the Dean)

Dean Level
Review

*Faculty
Senate's
Professional
Standards
Committee
(PSC)
(Advisory to
Provost)

*Provost (Chief
Academic
Officer of the
University)

Tips & Reflections: *Green Sheets Preparation*

Nicole Conroy

Associate Professor

Human Development & Family Science

My Journey

First-generation student/faculty

Lecturer (2016-2018)

Assistant Professor (2018-2024)

Tenured Associate Professor (2024-Present)

2 Parental Leaves

4 Dept. Chairs (5 transitions!) & 3 Deans

Telling Your Story

Your Narrative & Evidence: Part 2

“Candidate’s Summary of Accomplishments”

Tips

- Use subheadings
- Build on your Blue Sheet narrative
- Clearly state new accomplishments
- Hyperlink to additional evidence

Since my initial appointment at UVM,* I have successfully executed my responsibilities in teaching, advising, research, and service. My work reflects my commitment as a teacher-scholar to bridge research and practice and build community-university partnerships, in and out of the classroom, and in alignment with the [CESS Mission](#).

Since my last review (spring 2020), my accomplishments resulted in “meritorious” (level 5 of 5) annual review ratings of my work ([AY19-20](#) & [AY20-21](#)).

Teaching & Academic Advising

At UVM, I have taught over 1,500 students in 20 courses, mentored students in 27 credit hours of Undergraduate Research, and instructed two independent studies. Student evaluation scores of my teaching average 4.51 (out of 5). I also regularly advise 21-33 undergraduate majors, with advising evaluations averaging 4.85 (out of 5).

I have also contributed to the HDFS program curriculum by creating 4 new courses, revising 2 core courses, and leading and/or collaborating with HDFS colleagues on developing program curriculum and assessments.

Since my last review, I was appointed to the graduate faculty and advise one PhD student in Educational Leadership & Policy Studies and serve on two doctoral dissertation committees. I also successfully adapted my teaching and advising in response to the pandemic, as described below.

“Candidate’s Summary of Accomplishments”

Tips

- Use subheadings
- Build on your Blue Sheet narrative
- Clearly state new accomplishments
- Hyperlink to additional evidence

Additional information is available in: My [curriculum vitae](#), my [Google Scholar](#) page, and letters from [Dean Scott Thomas](#) and the [Faculty Standards Committee](#).

Show Your Development in Teaching & Advising

E.g.:

- # of courses, # of students, # of new preps
- Increases in evaluation scores
- New mentor activities, grad committee memberships
- New graduate students

Since my last review (spring 2020), I instructed over 365 students in 4 courses (5 course equivalents), almost exclusively in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Modifications to my pedagogy were successful, evidenced in part by the increase in my overall average student course evaluation score to 4.51 (out of 5), as well as my highest ever average evaluation score across courses during the 2020-2021 academic year (4.65 out of 5).

Show Your Development in Scholarship

E.g.:

- # of articles (published, under review)
- New funding sources
- Grant submissions/awards

Since my last review (spring 2020), I have published 3 peer-reviewed articles with 1 article in press, totaling 10 articles being published/in-press at UVM. I also have 2 articles under review, including an invited submission to the *Journal of Family Violence*'s special issue "25 Years Since Johnson's Typology." I have also published one book chapter in a peer-reviewed text, one research report, and one sexual violence prevention toolkit at UVM. I am also Co-PI on a Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women Grant (\$436,804) currently under review, to support a multi-site project, "Intersectional Trauma-Informed Violence Prevention and Response Policies and Practices: Defining and Measuring Success for Colleges."

Show Your Development in Scholarship

As a scholar, in your own right

- Bring closure to in-progress works
- Show increase in lead authorship
- Articulate clear research agenda
- Carefully select publications to highlight

i. Peer Reviewed Contributions

List all works reviewed prior to publication by peers / editorial boards in the field, such as journal articles in refereed journals, juried presentations, books, etc. Indicate up to five of the most important contributions with a double asterisk and briefly explain why these choices have been made. Include a description of the stature of journals and other scholarly venues and how this is known (e.g., impact factors, percentage of submitted work that is accepted, together with an explanation of the interpretation of these measures).

Show Your Development as a University Citizen (Service)

- Increase breadth of service
 - Program/department → College → University
- ***But protect your time!***
- Seek advice re:
 - Time commitment
 - Whether to accept/decline

Show Your Development: Respond to Feedback

Since my last review, I also attended to feedback provided by the DLDS Chair and/or Faculty Standards Committee as follows:

Peer Teaching Evaluations: Colleagues from other programs/departments observed and reviewed my teaching, including Dr. Katharine Shepherd, former Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and Dr. Susan Munkres, CELO Director.

HDFS 005 Technologies (i.e., Top Hat) & Supplemental Learning Sessions (SLS): I significantly revised the SLS and technologies used in HDFS 005, as they were identified by a number of students as the least effective aspect of the course. Upon implementation of the Top Hat platform, it was

Since my last review, I have continued to attend to student feedback as well as that provided by the DLDS Chair regarding balancing HDFS content with research skills emphasis, which students both appreciated and struggled with, as follows:

“Ungrading”: I implemented the practice of “ungrading,” providing detailed feedback on many low-stakes, scaffolded assignments in order to build writing and critical reflection skills prior to submitting graded assignments. Students also complete ongoing metacognitive exercises, including but not limited to a final self-assessment that informs their grade in their course.

Civic Learning & HDFS Content: Prompted by the pandemic-related loss of our community partners, and following consultation with CELO Director, Susan Munkres regarding the benefits of “scaling” high impact practices, the course designation was modified from *service-learning* to *civic*

Show Your Development: Respond to Feedback

I also attended to feedback provided by the DLDS Chair to encourage advisees to complete advising surveys:
The average response rate increased to 53% (from 28%) since my last review.

Since my last review (spring 2020), I also attended to feedback provided by the DLDS Chair as follows:

Bring Closure to In-Progress Manuscripts: At the time of my last review, I had one manuscript under review and one in development. Both of these manuscripts have been published, in addition to two other papers.

Lead Authorship: As detailed above, publications since my last review include two papers for which I was PI/co-PI and lead author, and one paper where I was second of two authors with equal contributions. Moreover, I am the lead author on two manuscripts currently under review as well as two manuscripts in development.

Conference Participation/Visibility: I presented at the international 2020 National Council on Family

Thinking Ahead: Reappointment/Promotion

Continue to:

- Document feedback
- Pursue appropriate professional development opportunities
- Monitor your research pipeline

External Review

- Professional service
- Network strategically

RPT Submissions – PSC's Role & Review

- The PSC is a University standing committee comprised of 11 representatives (one from each unit; two from CAS & LCOM)
- The PSC reviews RPT dossiers during the spring semester
- Description of PSC-level review process
 - *Documents (Dept., FSC, Dean)*
- The PSC is advisory to the Provost

Second Reappointment-Organization

Organization of Dossier:

1. Order of materials, bookmarking of dossier (e.g., all supporting materials after basic dossier entries)
2. Do not include scanned documents.
3. Once assembled, dossier should be combined into one pdf with bookmarks, rather than separate pdf files.
4. Adhere to word limits – make strongest case in a concise manner. **Focus on showing that you are making appropriate progress toward promotion and tenure.**
5. Limit excessive discipline-specific language and acronyms.

Workload distribution:

- Assure that the workload distribution is consistent throughout the dossier
- Include information on number of courses taught with the estimates of workload percentages
 - How courses are counted varies (e.g., in some units, 40% of teaching equals five course, and in others, it equals four courses).

Second Reappointment-Progress

Focus on showing that you are making appropriate progress toward promotion and tenure.

Scholarship/Research/Creative Activities

- Introduce your research area(s)
 - How have you built your research program thus far, your focus, funding (if applicable)
 - How do you view your research moving forward
 - It is helpful to know the approximate nature and percentage of the applicant's contribution to co-authored scholarship
- Contributions
 - Clearly label and organize peer-reviewed publications (e.g., accepted in press, published, under review)
 - List any non-peer-reviewed publications separately
 - Conference presentations
 - Grants/contracts (if applicable): indicate your role (e.g., PI, co-PI), funding agency, amount, and status (e.g., under review, awarded)
 - Indicate the nature and percentage of your contribution to co-authored scholarship

Second Reappointment-Workload

Teaching & Advising:

- Teaching philosophy/approach
- Teaching load – percentage of workload, number and variety of courses
- Evals, peer assessments, teaching honors, awards
- Identify areas of improvement and specific efforts made to improve (e.g., CTL seminars) – highlight these efforts

Service

- University, college/unit, department, professional discipline-related
- Identify the impact of your service

Rebuttals & Grievances

The CBA provides information regarding letters of rebuttal and supporting documentation, including timelines that must be adhered to by the candidate

Rebuttals are useful tools for correcting misrepresentation of faculty records or inaccurate interpretations, including to external reviewers

Ask for feedback if you choose to write a rebuttal either from a trusted colleague or from UA's Contract Administrative Committee (contract@unitedacademics.org).

You cannot file a grievance until the Provost has issued a decision.

Chair-Submitted within 7 days and may respond to external reviewers as well.
Dean & FSC-Submitted within 10 days

See Article 14.9 of the CBA for more information about the grounds on which the Provost's decision could be grieved.

Discussion