



### Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Preparatory and Procedural Guidance for Faculty Candidates

July 2025

In consultation with the CEMS Leadership the below guidelines are provided to faculty candidates who are preparing their reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) dossiers to ensure consistent and equitable evaluations as required by the Agreement between the University of Vermont and United Academics. Appendix I provides guidance specific to Pink Sheets, and Appendix II provides some example templates for reporting teaching, advising, and scholarship products.

#### **COMMON GUIDANCE (Applicable for all types of review – green, blue, and pink)**

Per the Collective Bargaining Agreement between University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) all faculty are responsible for the preparation of a self-evaluation and for providing a curriculum vitae. Candidates are strongly encouraged to follow the below guidance while preparing their dossiers.

Review the Office of the Provost's Division of Faculty Affairs (DOFA) recommendations on RPT actions [available here](#) as well as their instruction on the preparations of Formal Peer Reviews (Blue Sheets) and University Level Reviews (Green Sheets) [available here](#). Have a peer or mentor review the dossier prior to submission and provide the dossier to the department chair for informal review and comment two weeks before the required submission deadline. Submission deadlines in the College are set as October 1<sup>st</sup> in the Fall (per the Provost's Office and the Dean) and January 1<sup>st</sup> in the Spring (per the Dean).

- The onus of presenting accomplishments in a user-friendly manner that could be easily understood by the various sets of reviewers (peers, chair, FSC, dean, PSC, provost, arms-length reviewers) is on the candidate. Consider including commentaries in a way that helps reviewers in writing their assessments.
- Even when previous green/blue sheets are available for modification or using a colleague's sheets as guidance, make sure to use the latest versions of green/blue sheets available on the [provost's website](#).
- Read the section descriptions in the blue/green sheets carefully and ensure that all required information is included in the responses.
- Adhere to the word limits included in various sections of the blue/green sheets.
- The RPT documents are read by peers, FSC, dean, PSC, and provost. Make sure the text is free from grammatical and spelling errors.
- Report information in an accessible and user-friendly way. Tables are useful in providing information related to courses taught, student course evaluation scores, research students advised, thesis committees served, etc. Example templates are provided in Appendix II; many are very similar to those in the CEMS annual faculty review form.
- Formatting of the curriculum vitae should generally cover the guidance provided by DOFA, which is [available here](#).



### Reporting on Teaching, Mentoring and Advising:

- For the documentation on courses taught and student course evaluations tabular format is most useful. Sample tables are provided in Appendix II. Include important information such as required/elective, number of credits, number of students enrolled, response rate for student evaluations, etc. Other forms of data presentation (e.g. plots) can also be included. Courses taught and their evaluations should be reported at least for the review period.
- If relevant, include a table on research mentees summarizing their degree, discipline, candidate's role (primary or secondary advisor, provide name of the co-advisor when relevant), start date and graduation date, research topic title, and funding source. A template is provided in Appendix II.
- If relevant, include a table of thesis committees served summarizing student name, degree, thesis title, graduation date, etc. A template is provided in Appendix II.

### Reporting on Research and Scholarship:

- If engaged in research, while providing a list of publications, it is essential to address why particular venues were selected, contributions toward co-authored scholarly products, and which are the top five scholarly contributions in terms of impact and recognition. The specific ask in the blue/green sheets is "*In the case of multi-authored, original contributions, provide a brief description (1-2 sentences) of the role/contribution of the candidate..... 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).*" Some opt to provide a table of all available venues in their field with their impact factors/selectivity and provide a commentary on why they chose the specific venues. At a minimum, include impact factor/selectivity. In addition to the required 1-2 sentence description, some departments expect percentages to quantify the candidate's contribution to multi-authored products; the latter is certainly acceptable, but optional if not expected by the department.
- If there are discipline-specific nuances, provide a brief commentary on those. For example, in some fields, certain conference publications are highly selective and play an important role in promoting research impact, in addition to journal publications. In such fields, evidence of conference impact should be provided, such as paper acceptance rate, archival access to conference proceedings, etc. In some fields, authors are listed alphabetically irrespective of their level of contribution or the senior author is listed last. The candidate cannot expect the reviewers (e.g. members of FSC and PSC, dean, provost) to be aware of such discipline-specific nuances.
- Clearly identify scholarship products from work conducted after joining UVM versus elsewhere, and since last RPT action, if relevant. It is customary to report scholarship products over the candidate's career, while clearly separating activities from the last review.
- List grants/grant applications including title, funding agency, role (PI, co-PI, senior personnel, etc.), names of all other PI/co-PI/SP, start and end dates, total \$ amount, the candidate's personal estimated share of the grant (student/postdoc support, supplies, summer salaries, etc. that is specifically for the candidate's activities/responsibilities; include applicable F&A).



- In situations where there are several grants and grant applications to report, separating them under subheadings (e.g. external [federal, state, private], internal) is very useful. It is customary to report grants over the candidate's career, while clearly separating activities from the last review.

## Reporting on Service:

- Summarize institutional service under different subheadings: Department, College, and University. It is useful to include information on what work was done for each service assignment and time dedicated to the effort.
- Organize external service in a logical manner. Provide quantitative information whenever possible. For example, for a proposal review panel, include the number of proposals reviewed. For manuscript reviews for a journal, include the number of manuscripts reviewed.
- For professional committees/societies work, include some details on the specific service provided and associated time commitment.
- It is useful to report main service performed over the candidate's career at UVM, while separating activities from the last review as appropriate. At a minimum, include all service performed during the review period.

## UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW GUIDANCE (GREEN SHEETS)

University level reviews or Green Sheets are all promotion actions and tenure track, second reappointments. They undergo all levels of review including departmental faculty, department chair, College Faculty Standards Committee review, Decanal review, University Professional Standards Committee review, and review by the Provost. They are the most robust of any review and the Provost's Office provides specific [guidance here](#). Faculty are encouraged to thoroughly review these guidance documents and their departmental guidelines prior to beginning the preparation of their green sheets. Curriculum vitae formatting is required for Green Sheets for ease of review at every level and very specifically as an arm's length external evaluation is a common feature in Green Sheets.

## FORMAL PEER REVIEW GUIDANCE (BLUE SHEETS)

Formal Peer Reviews or Blue Sheets are reviewed at every level in the College and are an important opportunity for faculty to receive feedback from their departmental peers and departmental leadership. Curriculum vitae is not required for Blue Sheets but it is encouraged for ease of review.

## REAPPOINTMENT REVIEWS (PINK SHEETS)

As non-tenure track Reappointment Reviews or Pink Sheets take place more frequently than other reviews and with fewer rounds of review (being only reviewed by the department chair and dean), there is less guidance in the CBA regarding their preparation when compared to Green Sheets and Blue Sheets. To facilitate their preparation the College provides guidance on the minimum expected documents for pink sheets separately in Appendix I.



## **Appendix I**

### **Minimum Requested Documents for College Pink Sheet Evaluations**

The candidates are strongly encouraged to include the below information along with their completed Pink Sheet.

#### **Guidance for Lecturer Pink Sheet Evaluations:**

1. A brief teaching statement (typically up to 2 pages that include information around new courses, innovative teaching approaches, inclusive teaching practices, etc.).
2. Tabular summary of courses taught (at least during the review period) – see Appendix II for example template.
3. Tabular summary of students' teaching evaluations (at least during the review period) – see Appendix II for example template.
4. One peer teaching review letter obtained during the review period (arranged by department chair).
5. A brief statement (typically half a page) on advising during the review period as applicable (include information on the number of academic advisees, advising approach, number of recommendation letters written, etc.).
6. Any professional development around teaching, advising, and/or service completed during the review period.
7. A brief description of service during the review period as applicable (include information on department, college and UVM committees served with time commitments, professional service, etc.).
8. Student teaching evaluation forms (at least during the review period). These could be provided by the dean's office.
9. The candidate's most updated curriculum vitae.

#### **Guidance for Research Faculty Pink Sheet Evaluations:**

1. A research statement highlighting research and scholarship contributions since the last RPT action (typically up to 2 pages).
2. As relevant, include a list of scholarly outputs (e.g. journal papers, conference papers, reports, presentations, patents, etc.) during the review period.
3. As relevant, include a tabular summary of undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral students mentored. See Appendix II for example template.
4. As relevant, include a list of continued grants, new grants obtained, and proposals submitted during the review period. See Appendix II for example template.
5. The applicant's most updated curriculum vitae.

For further details on the criteria by which Non-Tenure Track faculty are evaluated during their Reappointment and Promotion reviews, please review your Departmental RPT Guidelines.



## **Appendix II – Suggested Templates**

### **Courses Taught**

Semester & Year	Course Number and Name	Credits	Enrollments	Additional Information
Fall 2024	XXX ##### Design of .....	2	51	Required, Project-based, Recitation + 3 lab sections (New preparation)
Spring 2024				
Fall 2023				

### **Student Teaching Evaluations (out of 5.0)**

Semester	Course Number and Name (for each section taught)	Response Rate	Average of Instructor Effectiveness	Average of Course Challenge
Fall 2024	XXX ##### Programming .....	43/51		
Spring 2024				
Fall 2023				



### Research Mentoring

Note: Instead of a single table like the one below, multiple tables separating student levels (e.g. PhD, MS, Honors, etc., similar to the CEMS annual faculty review form) could also work.

No	Student Name	Capacity	Degree	Start Date	End/Graduation Date	Research Topic	Funding
1		Secondary advisor (Primary advisor – A. Bcde)	Post-Doctoral		Sept 2024 - current		NASA
2		Advisor	Post-Doctoral		Sept 2023 – August 2024		Start-up
1		Advisor	Ph.D. CEE	Sept 2022	Expected Summer 2026		Start-up, Space Grant
2		Secondary Advisor (Primary advisor – F. Ghij)	Ph.D. EE	Sept 2023	Expected Summer 2027		GTA
1			M.S. thesis				
2			M.S. thesis				
3			M.S. Project (AMP)				Self
1		Advisor	Honors Thesis Student				
2		Advisor	Honors Thesis Student				
1		REU	BS ME				CEMS-REU
2		REU					CEMS-REU
3		REU					CEMS-REU
4		REU					NSF



### Thesis Committee Membership

No	Name	Degree	Thesis Title	Graduation
1	Abc Def	Ph.D. ME		Ongoing
2	Hij Klm	M.S. ME	(MS Project)	March 2025
3	Nop Qrs	Ph.D. ME (UNH)		Ongoing
4	Nop Qrs	Ph.D. CSDS		Ongoing

### Example for Publications:

Below are some examples that help highlight scholarly work with students, which many CEMS departments expect. The specific citation style could change based on the discipline/department expectations.

In the following list of publications, if **Smith, J. J.** is highlighted, it indicates that I was either a corresponding author and/or Principal Investigator on the grant that supported the work.

Underline indicates work with a graduate student, \* indicates that I advised or co-advised the graduate student.

Double underline indicates work with an undergraduate student that I advised or co-advised.

Dashed underline indicates work with a post-doc that I advised or co-advised.

Uuwxy, X. Y., Smith. J.J., \*Lmnopqr, S. T., and Efghi, J. (2025), “Shrinking fibers for curing-initiated stressing for improving concrete durability,” *Concrete* (IF 3.4), 18(7), 1574-89.

Contribution: I helped in designing the study and analysis of laboratory results; edited manuscript multiple times.

\*Lmnopqr, S. T., Qrs, T., and **Smith, J. J.** (2024), “Efficient ..... programming,” *Conf. Proc. of \_\_\_\_\_*, p.14 (acceptance rate: 20%).

Contribution: I envisioned and designed the study as the sole PI on the grant that funded this work and mentored my graduate student and undergraduate researcher through all stages of this study and manuscript writing (contribution ~50%).



Below is an example of reporting publications in a field where authors are listed alphabetically:

In my field, it is very customary that authors are listed alphabetically irrespective of their contributions.

Abcd, E.F., Efghi, J., Lmnopqr, S. T., Smith, J. J., Uuwxy, X. Y., and Xyz, T., (2025), “Nonlinear ..... symmetric systems,” *Mathematical* \_\_\_\_\_ (IF 3.4), 18(7), 1574-89.

Contribution: This was a collaborative study across three institutions. I helped develop the theory and performed some validation (contribution ~20%).

Lmnopqr, S. T. and **Smith, J.J.** (2023) “Nonlinear ..... symmetric systems,” *Mathematical* \_\_\_\_\_ (IF 3.4), 18(7), 1574-89.

Contribution: My collaborator and I worked very closely on all aspects of this publication (contribution 50%).

### Example Grants and Contracts:

#### External Federal Grants:

Title: Xyz.....  
Agency: National Science Foundation (Smart & Connected Communities)  
Contribution: co-PI (PI – Abd Def, co-PIs – Ghi Jkl, Mno Pqr [U. of Hawaii])  
Amount: \$1,499,999 (\$980,390 direct + \$519,610 indirect)  
My Share: ~\$685,000 (1 GRA, 1 post-doc, and 2 weeks salary per year)  
Award Period: 2023 - 2026

#### Internal Grants:

Title: Xyz.....  
Agency: NASA Space Grant  
Contribution: PI  
Amount: \$23,900 (all direct)  
My Share: \$23,900  
Award Period: 2025 - 2026