

University of Vermont
Grossman School of Business
Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure Track Faculty
Reappointment and Promotion Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Approved by the Department Faculty 11/21/2025

Approved by the GSB Dean's Office 11/21/2025

Approved by Office of the Provost 12/19/2025

RPT actions and decisions pertain to the procedures, criteria and standards of performance for full-time¹ lecturers, tenure-track, and tenured faculty.

All academic units at the University of Vermont (UVM) must adhere to the parameters established by the University RPT Guidelines and Forms and the terms of the agreement between UVM and United Academics (AAUP/AFT). In addition, each academic unit establishes guidelines that elaborate on these criteria, standards, and procedures. This document elaborates on these guidelines for the Grossman School of Business (GSB), making clear what materials are expected from a candidate at the school level and what materials are sent forward to the university. Candidates applying for RPT decisions at GSB must familiarize themselves with this document and the websites mentioned above.

Reappointment actions refer to the review for continued appointment of a faculty member who is not eligible for tenure or has yet to be granted tenure. **Promotion** refers to a change in faculty rank. **Tenure** represents the commitment of the University to the continued appointment of a faculty member until retirement or resignation, termination for just cause, termination due to the inability to perform the essential requirements of the faculty member's appointment with reasonable accommodations for a physical or mental disability, or termination due to financial exigency or elimination of an institutional program.

Historically, the university procedures related to these actions were paper-based with type of action denoted by the color of the paper (Pink Sheet, Blue Sheet, Green Sheet). As faculty appointment type, action type, their combinations, and the previously referred to color are linked, this preamble describes the combinations by appointment type to reinforce the use of the action name (Reappointment, Reappointment with Formal Peer Review, Promotion and Tenure) and refers to color to ease the transition to use of language over paper color. We subsequently use the term "evaluation" to refer more broadly to the process and types of actions within the process and the term "Application Sheet" more broadly to refer to the document and supporting materials used to summarize the candidate's record for the purpose of an evaluation.

Individuals holding a tenure-track appointment typically receive an initial three-year appointment with **Reappointment with Formal Peer Review** in the second year and the possibility for two additional two-year reappointments through to the end of year seven; the latter two reviews require both Reappointment with Formal Peer Review and University-level review. **Promotion** reviews for tenure-track appointments include the following possible actions: changes in rank from Instructor to Assistant Professor (upon completion of the terminal degree, validated and

¹ Full-time faculty have appointments between 0.75 and 1.00 FTE in accordance with the UVM and United Academics collective bargaining agreement.

administered by Dean's office), Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (upon review for promotion and tenure), and from Associate Professor to Full Professor (upon review for promotion). **Tenure** review occurs within the Reappointment and Promotion sequence as well as the Appointment and Tenure sequence (tenure-track faculty member hired at rank of Associate without tenure and Tenure action to move from untenured to tenured status). Note that all Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure actions for tenure-track faculty involve Formal Peer Review and are handled with a Green Sheet.

For non-tenure track faculty, a distinction is made between a **Reappointment Review** (Pink Sheet) and a **Reappointment with Formal Peer Review** (Blue Sheet). Non-tenure track faculty may be reappointed without a formal peer review (Pink Sheet) but they must have at least one Formal Peer Review (Blue Sheet) every four years. After the second formal peer review, these formal peer reviews shall be required for Lecturers every six (6) years unless requested by the faculty member earlier. For non-tenure track faculty (lecturers), Promotion (change in rank from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer) requires **Formal Peer Review** (Green Sheet). For faculty who have achieved the rank of Senior Lecturer, formal peer reviews will be required only at the request of the faculty member or at the request of the Dean. Any such request for a formal peer review by the Dean shall be no more frequent than every six (6) years.

The processes and guidance described herein are organized in the following sections:

- I. [Preparation of Materials by the Candidate for RPT Review](#)
- II. [Criteria & Assessment](#)
 - A. Teaching & Advising Activities
 - B. Research Activities
 - C. Service Activities
 - D. Promotion to Full Professor
- III. [Responsibilities & Process](#)
 - A. Responsibilities
 - A.1 Responsibilities of the Candidate
 - A.2 Responsibilities within GSB & Committee of Three Composition
 - A.3 Responsibilities of the Provost
 - B. Process
 - B.1 Process for Input by Full-time Faculty
- IV. [Timelines for Particular Actions](#)
 - A. [Full Time, Tenure-Track Faculty](#)
 - A.1 Schedule for Review of First Reappointment at Assistant Professor Rank
 - A.2 Schedule for Review of Second Reappointment at Assistant Professor Rank
 - A.3 Schedule for Review of Promotion to Associate Professor Rank, Granting of Tenure, and Promotion from Associate to Professor
 - B. [Faculty Lecturers](#)
 - B.1 Schedule for Review for First Reappointment at Full-Time Lecturer Rank
 - B.2 Schedule for Review for Reappointment at Full-Time Lecturer Rank
 - B.3 Schedule for Review for Promotion to Senior Lecturer Rank

B.4 Schedule for Review for Reappointment at Senior Lecturer Rank

V. [Appeals](#)

I. Preparation of Materials by the Candidate for RPT Review

Candidates seeking RPT decisions must complete and submit materials to the Dean's Office by the established [deadlines](#) and a folder will be created by the GSB Dean's Office specifically for the purpose of RPT decisions. This shared folder contains subfolders for documents pertinent to the action including:

- An appropriate Application sheet as denoted on pp. 1-2 of these guidelines.
- Teaching, advising, research, and service materials outlined under the 'Criteria and Assessment' section of this document. A redacted version of the response provided by external evaluators should be included among this supporting material.

The full application package is reviewed by the relevant GSB parties involved in an action. As applicable, the following items, specified by the bargaining agreement and Provost's office, are combined by the Dean's office into a *single PDF file* labeled with the candidate's name (Lastname_Firstname.pdf), and sent to the Provost's office.

- Application Package completed and submitted by the Candidate
- Subsequent Review by the FSC and the Dean
- Candidate's CV
- External Evaluators Arm's Length Review
- GSBs RPT Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

It is the responsibility of the Candidate to ensure clarity, completeness, and accuracy of all documents in their shared folder. In addition, these documents should represent the Candidate's achievements in a thorough and compelling manner. As GSB is non-Departmentalized, the level of detail provided should be sufficient to allow a faculty member unfamiliar with the Candidate's background to make a reasoned evaluation.

Preparation of materials for RPT actions and decisions is a time-consuming process. Candidates must familiarize themselves with the timeline pertinent to particular actions and allocate adequate time for the preparation of these materials.

The process to create the materials that are deposited in the shared folder differs for Candidates already employed at GSB versus those being offered a position contingent on approval for rank and tenure.

- For current GSB employees, a preliminary Application Sheet can be populated by the Dean's office using data from [Digital Measures](#), GSB's activity tracking database. The Candidate should contact the Dean's Office as early as possible, typically in May, to request that a populated Application Sheet be created. The Candidate is responsible for reviewing, verifying, and correcting the data as appropriate. Ultimately, how the data and information is presented in the Sheet is the prerogative and responsibility of the Candidate who can edit and add pertinent content to the Sheet to make a compelling case that reflects their achievements as they pertain to a given RPT action. It is prudent for faculty members to regularly enter data

pertaining to their accomplishments in Digital Measures and familiarize themselves with how it appears in printed reports.

- Candidates completing Application sheets prior to start of employment at GSB must fill the Sheet directly. It is recommended to enter the data into Digital Measures and then request the generation of the Application Sheet for further editing.

II. Criteria & Assessment

RPT decisions are informed by an evaluation of a Candidate's performance across three areas of (A) Teaching & Advising, (B) Research, and (C) Service. The Dean determines the relative weighting of each area based on the nature of appointment and workload assignment of a faculty member. The Application sheets provide guidance related to each area. The guidance in this section of the document is in addition to what is asked for in the Sheet. The criteria shared below constitute a broad philosophical statement concerning the academic [mission](#) of GSB and does not limit nor specify minimum achievements needed for a specific RPT decision. The Candidate is encouraged to make a compelling case to reflect their achievements and align these with the School's mission.

Work environments differ and expectations regarding teaching, research, and service can vary dramatically across institutions. FSC members should only cast affirmative votes on RPT actions if they have reasonable confidence that a given candidate can meet or exceed GSB standards within the context of the GSB work environment. During all RPT deliberations, the FSC places the greatest weight on professional achievements during the most recent 6-year time period. This includes achievements in teaching, research, and service.

IIA. Teaching & Advising Activities

Effectiveness in teaching is an essential criterion for reappointment, promotion and tenure [Article 14.5 [UVM and United Academics \(AAUP/AFT\)](#)]. A Candidate's teaching performance is appraised based on the past and the prospective contributions to the School's mission of developing leaders of sustainable businesses that address complex economic, social, and environmental challenges in a dynamic global environment and entrepreneurially thinking graduates who are professional and technically competent. A faculty member must be proficient in communicating ideas in ways that facilitate student learning.

It is the Candidate's responsibility to provide the evidence of teaching effectiveness. Evidence of performance as an effective teacher at GSB must be provided in the primary areas reported in the Application Sheet within the word guidelines established by the Provost, some of which are elaborated upon below.

- i. Summary Statement: In addition to summary of the responsibilities, a Candidate may choose to describe his/her teaching philosophy within this section of the Application Sheet.
- ii. Courses: Classroom performance is evidenced by and evaluated through the following:
 - Student Evaluations: An on-line course evaluation questionnaire is sent to all students enrolled in classes taught by the GSB faculty. Results of the evaluation are available online to the faculty members in a shared folder. The Candidate should create a summary table of student course evaluations including a peer group comparison metric (e.g., all undergrad GSB weighted average mean). See example in Appendix

- A. When the Candidates' teaching experience at UVM is limited, similar evidence of instructional effectiveness at prior institutions should be provided.
- Faculty Evaluation of the Candidates' Teaching: A systematic program of classroom visits by faculty members is led by candidate's mentoring team.²
- iii. Curriculum/Course Development: Commitment to continuous instructional improvement shall be assessed through changes in established courses and design of new courses. As evidence of the preparation for and commitment to continuous instructional improvement, the Candidate shall make available materials including, but not be limited to, representative syllabi, and assignments/exams from courses taught. As with all other sections of the public folder, it is in the best interest of the Candidate to provide compelling and thorough evidence to demonstrate their curriculum and course development contributions.
- iv. Advising: GSB has created an on-line advising survey of students administered at the end of each semester. Results of this survey are available to faculty members in a shared folder. The Candidate should provide a statement of advising responsibilities and philosophy in the Application Sheet.
- v. Additional Accomplishments: Candidates are encouraged to refer to the [GSB Innovation, Engagement and Impact Grid \(Appendix B\)](#) to identify the nature of other significant teaching accomplishments valued by the GSB. The Candidate may include other evidence of performance and commitment to the School's educational and professional mission, such as the following:
- Evidence of the ability to work with other faculty members in designing and delivering a curriculum that fosters student learning. Development of the skills of practicing managers through executive education and in-company training programs.
 - Opportunities provided to students to interact with and learn from practicing managers and organizational leaders.
 - Letters from former students about teaching effectiveness.
 - Letters of support from industry practitioners involved with experiential learning courses.

IIB. Research Activities

Substantial and sustained scholarship/research/creative activity of high quality is an essential criterion for reappointment and promotion [Article 14.5 [UVM and United Academics \(AAUP/AFT\)](#)]. For promotion and/or tenure cases, evaluation by a minimum of five external arm's-length³ referees is required. The Dean consults with the Associate Dean, Candidate, and

² The FSC Chair (in consultation with the FSC) appoints a two-member mentoring team (MT), and meets with candidate and MT within the first semester of the first appointment of a candidate.

- MT serves as the liaison to the FSC and provides support and guidance to the candidate on research, teaching, and service.
- It is the responsibility of the candidate to set up a meeting with their MT at the start of each year to discuss the frequency of future classroom visits.
- The 'Peer Evaluation Form for Classroom Visits' is available for usage for these visits at http://www.uvm.edu/business/staff_faculty_resources. Completed evaluation forms are passed on to the FSC Chair for filing in public document folders.
- MT will provide feedback to the candidate after each peer evaluation visit.

³ The UVM full-time faculty collective bargaining agreement defines an "arm's length evaluator" in 14.5,

faculty members knowledgeable about the Candidate's research to identify these evaluators, as outlined in Article 14.5.e.ii ([UVM and United Academics \(AAUP/AFT\)](#)). Four or more referees are selected at the Dean's discretion, and at least four others are selected from a list of five or more names provided by the Candidate. Referees must hold tenured positions at or above the academic rank to which the Candidate is applying. They must be respected scholars in their fields and must have an ability to judge the Candidate's research. An example of the Dean's Letter to an External Reviewer is available through the [University RPT Guidelines and Forms](#).

In pursuit of the School's [mission](#), impactful scholarship includes basic, applied, and pedagogical research. Theoretical and empirical works using qualitative or quantitative methods and approaches are valued by GSB. Regardless of the research approach and disciplinary focus, it is in the Candidate's best interest to provide compelling evidence in the Application Sheet to enable those outside their discipline to make an informed evaluation of the national and international reputation for quality contributions to their field of study.

Evidence of research performance must be provided in the primary areas reported in the Application Sheet and the 'Research Statement.' A 'Research Statement' is a separate file to be sent to the external reviewers. This statement summarizes the research philosophy, past contributions and future research plans of the Candidate. While this document will likely be longer than the 'research summary statement' section in the Application Sheet, overlaps between these two parts of the public folder are expected. The aim of the 'Research Statement' should be to make a compelling case of the significance, impact and contributions of the Candidate.

A few items in the Application Sheet are elaborated upon below.

- i. Summary Statement: The Candidate should clearly communicate their area(s) of interest, how their work fits into their field, and the stature of their intellectual contributions.
- ii. Peer Reviewed Contributions: The Candidate shall create and include in the shared folder a table that lists their published peer reviewed publications along with GSB Tier ranking, in reverse chronological order, providing the order of authorship as it appears in the publication. Journal articles must be listed separately from other peer reviewed publications, and the latter must be classified by type. In areas where it is customary to list authors alphabetically, it is the Candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of the practice (e.g., letter from journal editor, the journal's author guidelines, etc.). For multi-authored publications, the Candidate should provide a description of his or her specific contribution. The Candidate should indicate up to five of their most important contributions with a double asterisk and briefly explain the rationale for these choices. Copies of or links to each article must be provided as supplementary documents.

point ii as "a person who is not compromised in his or her ability to provide an objective evaluation of the professional performance and reputation of the individual being evaluated." Following this definition are examples of "professional or personal relationships that are commonly perceived to put in question the objectivity of an external evaluator" (e.g., being a former thesis/dissertation advisor, or a colleague or fellow student at another institution; being a current or former co-investigator on a grant, or a co-author on a publication or other intellectual property; and having a financial, familial, or close personal relationship).

For listed journal articles, the Candidate shall provide evidence that indicates the stature of each article and journal by providing evidence of quality that shall include, but is not limited to, the following three indicators of research quality, except in cases when such information is unavailable:

- The quality ranking for each associated journal as determined by the School’s faculty-approved [Intellectual Contributions/Journal Ranking System](#). This system provides a ranking of hundreds of scholarly journals across business disciplines into four quality tiers. For purposes of evaluating faculty for RPT, the School’s ranking of journal quality is but one of multiple types of evidence for research quality that the Candidate can and should present in their shared folder.
- Citation counts for each contribution, specifying the date and source of that information.
- Impact Factor (IF) for the journal in which an article is published, specifying the time horizon and year of the IF (e.g., “2025 One-year IF”).

For other peer reviewed publications, the Candidate must provide similar evidence of the quality and significance of each contribution.

- iii. Non-Peer Reviewed Contributions: These may include but are not limited to books, book chapters, editorials, professional reports etc. As the quality metrics for such contributions are not standardized, the Candidate is encouraged to provide evidence of the quality and significance of each contribution.
- iv. Additional Accomplishments: Candidates are encouraged to refer to the [GSB Innovation, Engagement and Impact Grid \(Appendix B\)](#) to identify the nature of other significant accomplishments valued by the GSB. Reviewing and editorial-based activities, such as serving as an ad hoc reviewer, editorial board member, or journal / issue editor shall be considered service to the profession and presented only as part of a Candidate’s Service Activities (see IIC).

IIC. Service Activities

A Candidate’s service related performance is appraised based on contributions to the School, the University, the profession or discipline, and the community. A systematic account of contributions on each dimension must be provided in the Application Package. While the proportion of service expectations vary according to the workload of each faculty member at GSB, meaningful service contributions are expected from each faculty member.

- Service to the School includes, but is not limited to, active and meaningful contributions to support the mission of GSB, participation in committee assignments, and representing the School to various external constituencies. Some examples of basic opportunities for participation include: (1) attending and actively engaging in the deliberations of faculty meetings, (2) attending commencement and other GSB-wide ceremonies and events, (3) participating in faculty search activities, and (4) participating on an as-needed basis in enrollment activities (i.e., Open House, ASV).
- Service to the University may include participation and/or leadership in university level committees or governing bodies.
- Service to the profession or discipline may be evidenced through membership and leadership roles in academic and other professional organizations; serving on editorial

boards of refereed journals; reviewing and editing roles in journals; and organizing workshops or conferences.

- Service to the community may involve participation in a variety of activities such as professional advising or consulting, delivering speeches, seminars, or workshops (paid or pro bono). The Candidate must clarify the alignment of such service with their teaching and/or research. Care must be taken that such activities do not diminish a faculty member's basic obligations to teaching, research and service to the University and the School. University guidelines on extra compensation activities must be observed.
- Candidates are encouraged to refer to the [GSB Innovation, Engagement and Impact Grid \(Appendix B\)](#) to identify the nature of other significant service engagements valued by the GSB.

Assessment of service activities is based on the impact of contributions made rather than the number of activities. Members of the FSC may choose to offer accounts of their experiences working directly with the Candidate. An outstanding service performance normally cannot compensate for inadequate performance in either the teaching or research categories.

IID. Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of Full Professor (or, Professor) in GSB requires evidence of continuous maturation and impact in teaching, research, and service areas listed in IIA- IIC. An Associate Professor may apply for consideration to the rank of Full Professor at any time. The Candidate should provide compelling evidence of sustained contributions and leadership efforts in teaching, research, and service.

In addition to continuous high quality teaching, the Candidate should demonstrate maturity in teaching effectiveness. Maturation in teaching may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, the diversity of courses developed and taught at different levels, student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and other curricular development activities.

In addition to continuous high quality research, the expectation is for the Candidate to be acknowledged by the external evaluators as an expert who has had a significant impact in the development and progress of his/her discipline. Such impact may be demonstrated in a variety of ways including, but not limited to:

- Citation of works in books, journals, monographs, etc.
- Discussion of works in books, journals, monographs, etc.
- Reprints of works in books of readings or other publications.
- Invited contributions appearing in prestigious publications.
- Awards and honors for scholarly works/achievements.
- Solicitation of the person's opinion by recognized authorities through membership on journal editorial or review boards, through membership on advisory boards or commissions in the private and/or public sector, and through other such important roles.

Maturation in professional service should be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, moving from roles such as reviewing to editing; from presenting at to chairing sessions and/or organizing conferences; and from serving on GSB and UVM committees to chairing roles.

Candidates are encouraged to refer to the [GSB Innovation, Engagement and Impact Grid \(Appendix B\)](#) to identify the nature of accomplishments valued by the GSB.

III. Responsibilities & Process IIIA. Responsibilities

IIIA.1. Responsibilities of the Candidate: The Candidate is responsible for preparing and submitting the appropriate Application Sheet and supporting materials to the shared folder by the deadlines.

IIIA.2. Responsibilities within GSB: As there are no departments at GSB, the Dean's role is merged with that of a department chairperson for RPT decisions. The Dean manages the process of inviting input from faculty members within GSB and external evaluators as needed for each case. The Dean takes the FSC recommendations into consideration in preparing their recommendations for the Office of the Provost.

The 'FSC Chair' fields questions from the Candidate pertaining to the preparation of materials for the shared folder, and manages the process of convening the FSC meetings to review, discuss, and assess the Candidate's record (see sections IIIB and IV). If RPT actions involve promotion to Full Professor, the FSC Chair will also Chair the Sub-Committee of Full Professors if they holds the rank of Full Professor. If not, the body of Full Professors will elect the Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors. The FSC Chair (or the Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors) ensures the appointment of an 'Advisory Committee' (AC) for each case needing review in the academic year.

An Advisory Committee (AC) is appointed by the FSC Chair for each RPT action. The FSC chair cannot be on the AC. The AC will consist of a minimum of two (2) FSC members for non-tenure track actions and three (3) FSC members for tenure-track actions in which one member of the AC shall possess expertise pertaining to the Candidate's research whenever possible, and is expected to prepare an objective assessment of the Candidate's research record. The AC provides an administrative service for the FSC. Its role is not to make a case for or against an action, but rather to provide an objective assessment of the case based upon the material included in the shared folder, and where pertinent, a reading of the letters provided by external referees (the "arms-length" assessments). The AC is responsible for the following:

- i. Preparing the draft 'FSC Report' based on an in-depth analysis of the Candidate's record on teaching, research (as applicable) and service with a view to providing the FSC with an evaluation of the available evidence. This report is sent to the FSC members a week before its Candidate's review meeting. While this report is submitted without vote, in highlighting the central issues it is expected to indicate the strength and quality of the Candidate's case.
- ii. Presenting an objective summary of the Candidate's record on teaching, research and service (as applicable) at the beginning of the review meeting.
- iii. Working with the FSC Chair to finalize the FSC Report.

All full-time faculty members in GSB are encouraged to review the shared folder of the Candidate and provide input. However, only eligible faculty members of the same or higher rank who physically or virtually participate in the deliberations at the time of the discussion of the case can vote on a given RPT action. For tenure-track actions, tenured faculty members vote on all reappointments and tenure review decisions but only tenured full professors can vote on promotion from associate to full professor. For promotions of non-tenure track lecturers to senior lecturers, senior lecturers are permitted to participate in deliberations and vote on the

promotion action. Voting eligible faculty members on sabbatical or other approved leave have the option of participating or not participating in RPT process. Should multiple Candidates be under simultaneous consideration for the same RPT action, the FSC will evaluate the cases in the order determined by a random draw.

IIIA.3. Responsibilities of the Provost: The Provost shall automatically review any negative decision regarding the first reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member. For all second reappointment, promotion and tenure actions, the documentation, including the FSC Report and Dean's recommendation, is forwarded to the Office of the Provost. It is then sent to the Senate Professional Standards Committee for its recommendation before a final decision by the Provost.

IIIB. Process

RPT processes at GSB involve the following steps:

- i. Candidate contacts the Dean's Office to start the process and requests assistance with the appropriate Application Sheet and supporting reports from Digital Measures. Candidate reviews, edits, completes, revises, and submits the Application Sheet and the supporting materials to the Dean's Office by the appropriate deadlines.
- ii. FSC Chair (or the Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors) in consultation with the Associate Dean selects the AC for each case.
- iii. Dean's Office invites input by faculty and external evaluators following the parameters established by the [University RPT Guidelines and Forms](#) and the terms of the agreement between [UVM and United Academics \(AAUP/AFT\)](#).
- iv. The AC develops the initial summary of facts and draft FSC Report. This Report is sent to the FSC or deliberation committee members at least one week before its Candidate review meeting.
- v. FSC Chair (or the Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors) convenes a meeting of the eligible voters to review, discuss, and assess the Candidate's Application.
- vi. There shall be a discussion of each section of the Application (teaching, research, and service as applicable). After each section discussion, there shall be a private ballot containing the following voting options: (1) exceeds expectations, (2) meets expectations, (3) does not meet expectations, and (4) abstain. In accordance with GSB by-laws, only the members present (in person or over the telephone/videoconferencing) at the time when the vote is called can cast their vote. The vote will be counted and reported to the faculty present after each section discussion and the breakdown of each section vote shall be included in each relevant section of the FSC report. After all section discussions and votes have concluded, there shall be a discussion and an overall vote using private ballot on the candidates' record with regard to promotion and/or tenure using the following options: (1) yes, (2) no, and (3) abstain. The breakdown of this vote shall be reported to the faculty present and recorded in the FSC report. The FSC Chair submits the FSC Report with voting results and a summary of the comments and evaluations expressed in the deliberation meeting and/or contained in materials received from external sources to the Dean, as stated in the Grossman School of Business By-Laws Section 3.5. The entire FSC shall be copied when the FSC Chair sends this final report to the Dean.
- vii. FSC Chair verbally shares the vote with the Candidate as soon as possible.
- viii. Dean takes into account the FSC's Report and prepares their recommendation for the Provost.

IIIB.1. Process for Input by Full-time Faculty

As outlined in Article 14.5.f.ii ([UVM and United Academics \(AAUP/AFT\)](#)), all full-time tenure-track and non-tenure track GSB faculty members should have access to the Application materials. The Dean will invite full-time faculty to read and provide input on the Candidate's Application using an anonymous survey administered by the Dean's Office. Only voting eligible faculty members as outlined in section IIIA.2. above are permitted to vote on RPT actions.

Timelines for Particular Actions

The schedule for review is designed to provide adequate time for review and adherence to the Provost's calendar. The FSC Chair shall ensure at the start of each semester that the Provost's timeline of dates and deadlines has not changed. In instances when the Provost's timeline are revised, the dates and deadlines included in this document are to be adjusted accordingly and shall not require a vote of the FSC. In such instances, the FSC Chair shall amend the document solely to update the dates, noting the date of the Provost's timeline, and distribute the revised document to the Dean and all faculty.

Timelines incorporated in the document based on the [Provost's timeline of dates](#) last updated on: 9/2021

Updated by GSB on: November 21, 2025

IV.A. Timelines for Full Time, Tenure-Track Faculty

IV.A.1: Schedule for Formal Peer Review of First Reappointment at Assistant

Professor Rank For an Assistant Professor the maximum probationary period is 7 years. No RPT action occurs in year 1. RPT action is required by May 1 of year 2 for reappointment for years 4 and 5 at College/School level using the Application for Promotion (Green) Sheet as the evaluation form.

Dates	Activity
December or January (Year 2)	Dean advises Candidate of process and timeline. Candidate contacts Dean's Office to obtain the appropriate Application Sheet and supporting materials from Digital Measures. FSC identifies Advisory Committee for each eligible Candidate.
Mid-February	Candidate submits complete documentation to the public folder.
Late February	Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments
March 1	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from Grossman School full-time faculty members.
March 2-15	FSC evaluates the Candidate.
Mid-March	FSC Chair submits the FSC Report and summary of meeting to the Dean. FSC Chair informs Candidate of FSC vote.
May 1	Dean informs Candidate of the decision.

IV.A.2: Schedule for Formal Peer Review of Second Reappointment at Assistant Professor Rank

No RPT action occurs in year 3. The required notice date is May 1 of year 4 for reappointment for years 6 and 7 at University level using the Application for Promotion (Green) Sheet as the evaluation form.

Dates	Activity
May (end of Year 3)	<p>Dean advises Candidate of process and timeline.</p> <p>Communication to Candidate on key dates, their responsibilities. FSC identifies Advisory Committee for each eligible Candidate.</p> <p>Candidate contacts Dean's Office to obtain the appropriate Application Sheet and supporting materials from Digital Measures.</p>
June 1	(Optional) Candidate can elect to use external reviewers as an optional source of information to the FSC. Candidate and Dean determine if external letters will be requested. If so, Candidate provides Dean with list of external reviewers and packet of materials (including research statement, sample publications, and current CV), and Dean requests letters from external reviewers.
August - early September (start of Year 4)	<p>FSC Chair communicates to all GSB faculty regarding schedule and reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p> <p>(Optional) Dean requests letters from external reviewers. Faculty encouraged to visit Candidate's classes.</p>
October 1	Candidate submits complete documentation to the public folder.
Mid-October	(Optional) If requested, external reviewer letters due.
Mid-October to November 1	<p>Shared folder available for review by tenure-track and non-tenure track GSB faculty members.</p> <p>Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments</p>
October 30	The Grossman School provides Provost's Office with names of faculty who will be reviewed in the current academic year.
Early November	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from all full-time Grossman School faculty members.
End of November/Early December	<p>FSC evaluates and arrives at recommendations on second reappointment at Assistant Professor rank.</p> <p>FSC Chair informs Candidate of vote.</p> <p>FSC Chair submits the FSC Report and summary of meeting to the Dean.</p>
Mid December	Dean provides copy of FSC Report and Dean's written assessment to the Candidate who has 7 days to add written rebuttal.
January 15	Dean submits recommendations and documentation to Office of the Provost.
March 15	Review of Candidate's Dossier by Senate Professional Standards Committee is completed.
Last Week of April	Provost's decision communicated to Dean.
May 1	Dean informs Candidate of decision received from Provost's office.

IV.A.3: Schedule for Formal Peer Review of Promotion to Associate Professor Rank, Granting of Tenure, and Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Required notice date is May 1 of year 6 for tenure and promotion at University level using Green Sheet as Application form. There is no minimum or maximum probationary period for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

Dates	Activity
May (end of Year 5)	<p>Dean advises Candidate of process and timeline. Communication to Candidate on key dates, and their responsibilities.</p> <p>Candidate contacts Dean’s Office to obtain the appropriate Application Sheet and supporting materials from Digital Measures.</p> <p>FSC identifies Advisory Committee for each eligible Candidate.</p>
June 1	Candidate provides to the Dean’s Office list of external reviewers and packet of materials (research statement, sample articles, and CV).
–Mid to Late September (start of Year 6)	FSC Chair communicates to faculty reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.
	Dean requests letters from external reviewers. Faculty encouraged to visit Candidate’s classes.
October 1	Candidate submits complete Application and supporting material in shared folder.
Mid October	<p>Evaluation letters due to be received from external reviewers.</p> <p>Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments</p>
Mid October to November 1	Shared folder available for review by tenured and untenured Business faculty members.

October 30	The Grossman School provides Provost's Office with names of faculty who will be reviewed in the current academic year.
Early November	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from all full-time Grossman School faculty members.
End of November/Early December	<p>FSC evaluates and arrives at a recommendation on promotion and granting of tenure at the Associate Professor rank. FSC Chair informs Candidate of FSC vote. FSC Chair submits the FSC Report and summary of meeting to the Dean.</p> <p>The Sub-committee of Full Professors evaluates and arrives at recommendation on promotion to Full Professor. A representative from this sub-committee informs the Candidate of the vote. The Sub-committee of Full Professors submits their report and recommendation to the Dean.</p>
Mid December	Dean provides copy of FSC Report and dean's written assessment to Candidate who has 7 days to add written rebuttal.

By January 15	Dean submits recommendation and documentation to Office of the Provost.
March 15	Review of Candidate's Dossier by Senate Professional Standards Committee.
Last Week of April	Provost's decision communicated to Dean.
May 1	Dean informs Candidate of decision received from Provost's Office.

Timelines for Faculty Lecturers

IV.B.1. Schedule for Formal Peer Review of First Reappointment at Full-Time Lecturer Rank (year 2 of first 2-year contract)

Dates	Activity
Fall of year before 2-year contract expires	<p>Process is explained to Candidate by Dean or his/her designee.</p> <p>FSC identifies Advisory Committee for each eligible Candidate.</p>
Fall of year before 2-year contract expires	<p>Candidate compiles teaching and other pertinent data entering data into Digital Measures.</p> <p>Candidate requests Dean's Office populate the Application Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Mid January	<p>Candidate submits documentation to the public folder. Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments</p> <p>FSC Chair communicates to faculty reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p>
Mid January - Mid February	Materials available for review by all Grossman School faculty.
Mid February	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from all full-time Grossman School faculty members.
Third Week of February	Evaluation of the Candidate by the FSC.
February 20-24	FSC submits the FSC Report and their recommendations to the Dean. FSC Chair informs Candidate of FSC vote.
March 1	Dean informs Candidate of decision.

IV.B.2 Schedule for Formal Peer Review for Subsequent Reappointment at Full- Time Lecturer Rank (year 4 and every six years after unless requested by the faculty member earlier)

Dates	Activity
Fall of year before 2-year contract expires	<p>Process is explained to candidate by Dean or his/her designee.</p> <p>FSC identifies Advisory Committee for each eligible Candidate.</p>
Fall of year before 2-year contract expires	<p>Candidate compiles teaching and other pertinent data entering data into Digital Measures.</p> <p>Candidate requests Dean’s Office populate the Application Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Mid January	<p>Candidate submits documentation. Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments</p> <p>FSC Chair communicates to faculty reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p>
Mid January - Mid February	<p>Materials available for review by all GSB faculty.</p>
Mid February	<p>Confidential written comments on Candidate due from all full-time Grossman School faculty members.</p>
Third Week of February	<p>Evaluation of candidacy by FSC.</p>
February 20-24	<p>FSC submits reports and recommendations to Dean. FSC chair informs candidate of FSC.</p>
March 1	<p>Dean informs candidate of decision.</p>

IV.B.3. Schedule for Formal Peer Review for Promotion to Senior Lecturer Rank

Dates	Activity
Candidate requests consideration for promotion	Process is explained to Candidate by Dean or his/her designee - see Article 14.2 and Article 15.4.i. of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Candidate requests Dean's Office populate the Application Sheet from Digital Measures.
Late August to early September	FSC Chair communicates to faculty reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy. FSC identifies Advisory Committee for each eligible Candidate. Communication to Candidate on key dates/responsibilities.
October 1	Candidate submits complete documentation to public folder.
Mid October	Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments
Last Two Weeks of October	Shared folder available for review by tenured and untenured Business faculty members.
November 5	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from all full-time Grossman School faculty members.
End of November/Early December	FSC and eligible Senior Lecturers evaluate and arrive at recommendation on Promotion to Senior Lecturer rank. FSC Chair informs Candidate of vote. FSC Report due to Dean.
Mid December	Dean provides copy of FSC Report and Dean's written assessment to Candidate who has 7 days to add written rebuttal.

By January 15	Dean submits recommendations and documentation to Provost's office.
Mid March	Review of Candidate's Dossier by UVM Professional Standards Committee.
March 1	Provost's decision communicated to Dean. Dean informs Candidate of decision received from Provost's Office.

IV.B.4. Schedule for Review for Formal Peer Review for Reappointment at Senior Lecturer Rank – required at request of faculty member or Dean. Such requests cannot be more frequent than every six (6) years.

Dates	Activity
May of year before last year of appointment	Process is explained to Candidate by Dean or his/her designee. Candidate requests Dean’s Office populate the Application Sheet from Digital Measures.
Summer and Fall of eligible year:	Candidate compiles public folder including Application Sheet.
Late August to early September:	Communication to faculty re: schedule and reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy. Communication to Candidate on key dates/responsibilities.
October 1	Candidate submits complete documentation to the public folder.
Mid October	Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to review material and submit comments.
Last Two Weeks of October	Shared folder available for review by full-time faculty members.
November 5	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from full-time Grossman School faculty members.
End of November/Early December	FSC and eligible Senior Lecturers evaluate and arrive at recommendations on reappointment to Senior Lecturer rank. FSC Chair informs Candidate of vote. FSC Report due to Dean.
December 15	Dean informs Candidate of decision.

There is no probationary period at Professor level—initial appointment made with tenure.

IV. Appeals: Go to the Provost's Office website for [specific contract language](#).

This document shall be reviewed by the Chairperson of the FSC each time the AAUP/AFT agreement is modified. The Chairperson of the FSC shall apprise the FSC of that review and convene an ad hoc subcommittee of the FSC as the FSC deems necessary.

ⁱ The UVM full-time faculty collective bargaining agreement defines an "arm's length evaluator" in 14.5, point ii as "a person who is not compromised in his or her ability to provide an objective evaluation of the professional performance and reputation of the individual being evaluated." Following this definition are examples of "professional or personal relationships that are commonly perceived to put in question the objectivity of an external evaluator" (e.g., being a former thesis/dissertation advisor, or a colleague or fellow student at another institution; being a current or former co-investigator on a grant, or a co-author on a publication or other intellectual property; and having a financial, familial, or close personal relationship).

ⁱⁱ The FSC Chair (in consultation with the FSC) appoints a two-member mentoring team (MT), and meets with candidate and MT within the first semester of the first appointment of a candidate.

- MT serves as the liaison to the FSC and provides support and guidance to the candidate on research, teaching, and service.
- It is the responsibility of the candidate to set up a meeting with their MT at the start of each year to discuss the frequency of future classroom visits.
- The 'Peer Evaluation Form for Classroom Visits' is available for usage for these visits at http://www.uvm.edu/business/staff_faculty_resources. Completed evaluation forms are passed on to the FSC Chair for filing in public document folders.
- MT will provide feedback to the candidate after each peer evaluation visit.

Appendix A: Example of Teaching Evaluation Table

Summary of Student Teaching Evaluations

	Fall 20xx		Spring 20xx		
	BUSxxxx Sec. A xx, 3 cr.	FA23 All GSB Faculty	BUSxxxx Sec. A xx, 3 cr.	MBAxxxx Sec. A02 xx, 1.5 cr.	S23 All GSB Faculty
# of Students Enrolled / # of Credits					
Number of Students Evaluations	xx		xx	xx	
1. The course materials (e.g. readings, lecture notes, exercises, assignments, videos, etc.) were informative	4.20	4.30 ¹	4.13	4.12	4.39
2. Course assignments require application of lecture and text material	4.51	4.39	4.68	4.45	4.47
3. Course materials stimulate thought about the subject matter	3.98	4.29	4.26	4.12	4.36
4. Illustrates concepts with real life examples	4.00	4.57	4.95	4.31	4.58
5. Presents material clearly, logically and in an organized manner	4.25	4.17	4.61	4.51	4.21
6. Respects students, avoids denigration	4.16	4.62	4.02	4.15	4.62
7. Identifies main points covered in class	4.78	4.42	4.35	4.62	4.47
8. Clearly specifies student responsibilities	4.95	4.38	4.82	4.05	4.39
9. Provides useful feedback on assignments	4.21	3.97	4.61	4.03	3.96
10. Provides timely feedback on assignments	3.99	4.26	4.02	4.80	4.21
11. Fair in evaluating students	4.50	4.37	4.20	4.62	4.45
12. Instructor was effective as a teacher overall	4.26	4.27	4.82	4.67	4.35
13. This course overall was a good learning experience	4.36	4.21	4.40	4.33	4.29

1 – Weighted average for all GSB results.

Appendix B: GSB Innovation, Engagement and Impact Grid

		Research				
		<u>Basic</u>	<u>Applied</u>	<u>Pedagogical</u>	<u>Outreach & Practice</u>	<u>Instruction</u>
Input						
		Working Papers	Working Papers	Working Papers	Relationship Building	Mentoring Colleagues
		Submissions	Submissions	Submissions	Client Development	Curriculum Development
		R&Rs	R&Rs	R&Rs		Course Development
		Conference Papers	Conference Papers	Conference Papers		Honor's Thesis Advisor
		Grant Proposals	Grant Proposals	Grant Proposals		Independent Study Advisor
				Case Development		Master's Committee
						Doctoral Committee
						Executive Education
						Student Advising
Output						
		Academic Journal Articles	Practioner Journal Articles	Education Journal Articles	Repeat Engagements	Classes Taught
		Proceedings	Proceedings	Education Journal Cases	Company Projects	Student Credit Hours Taught
		Funded Work	Funded Work	Education Panel	Data Access	Guest Lectures
		Book Chapters	Book Chapters	Book Chapters	Consulting/Professional Reports	Experiential Learning Supervision
		Books	Books	Books	Professional Certifications	Curricular Materials
		Conference Presentations	Conference Presentations	Conference Presentations	Consulting	Completed Independent Studies
		Grant Funded Monographs	Grant Funded Monographs	Textbooks	Onsite Seminars/Presentations	Completed Honor's Theses
		Patents	Patents		Professional Memberships	Completed Master's Theses
					Executive Education	Completed Doctoral Theses
					Faculty in Residence	Student Evaluations
					Videos/Podcasts/Webinars	Faculty Evaluations
					Blogs	Curriculum Materials
Impact						
		Editorial Boards	Editorial Boards	Editorial Boards	Invited Boards	Case Competition Awards
		Citations	Citations	Citations	Keynotes	Job Placement
		Editor	Editor	Editor	Recruiters	Internships
		Journal Reviewer	Journal Reviewer	Journal Reviewer	Career Fairs	Alumni Engagement
		Book Reviewer	Book Reviewer	Book Reviewer	Donations	Donations
		Invited Talks	Invited Talks	Invited Talks	Exec. Ed. Enrollments	Teaching Awards
		Journal Quality	Journal Quality	Journal Quality	Major Events	Student Exit Surveys
		Host Conferences	Host Conferences	Host Conferences	Media Coverage	Media Rankings

	Visiting Scholar/Fellow	Visiting Scholar/Fellow	Visiting Scholar/Fellow	Media Features	Recruiters
	Scholarly Awards	Scholarly Awards	Scholarly Awards	Media Mention	Applications
	Prof. Assoc. Leadership	Sales	Sales	Editorials	Yield
	Media Rankings	Adoption	Adoption	Society Presentations	Placement
	Downloads/Hits	Downloads/Hits	Downloads/Hits	Downloads/Hits	Commissioned Course Development
			Media Cites	Community Awards	Writing National Exam Questions
				Service Learning	Service Learning