

Annual Report 2025-2026
Professional Standards Committee (PSC)
Submitted to the Faculty Senate & Office of the Provost
April 27, 2026

Members:

- Mark Canella (College of Agriculture & Life Sciences - CALS)
- Rory Waterman (College of Arts & Sciences - CAS)
- Louis deRosset (College of Arts & Sciences - CAS)
- Greg Rowangould (College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences - CEMS)
- Rebecca Callahan (College of Education & Social Services - CESS)
- Tara Burnham (College of Nursing & Health Sciences - CNHS)
- Kevin Chiang (Grossman School of Business - GSB)
- Daisy Benson (UVM Libraries - LIBS) – Chair
- Charlotte Teneback (Larner College of Medicine - LCOM)
- Matt Siket (Larner College of Medicine - COM)
- Jason Stockwell (Rubenstein School of Environment & Natural Resources - RSENR)

Summary of Primary Activities

Sabbatical Reviews

Number of Sabbatical Applications Reviewed by Academic Unit:

- College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS), n=7
- College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), n=31
- College of Education & Social Services (CESS), n=6
- College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (CEMS), n=9
- College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS), n=5
- Grossman School of Business (GSB), n=3
- Larner College of Medicine (LCOM), n=2
- Rubenstein School of Environmental and Natural Resources (RSENR), n=3
- UVM Libraries (LIB), n=2

The Professional Standards Committee reviewed 68 Sabbatical Applications during the Fall semester.

Issues relating to sabbatical applications:

Many sabbaticals include work with or at external institutions. We ask that a letter of invitation be included in such cases so that we can see that support for that work is in place.

We recommend that faculty who may need a backup plan have that in place when making their application.

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews

College/ School & # of Dossiers*	2nd Reappoint - ment @ Assistant Professor Tenure Track	Promotion Senior Lecturer	Promotion Associate Professor Non- Tenure Track (e.g., Clinical Research, Education, Libraries, Extension)	Promotion Associate Professor & Tenure (Includes tenure only at rank)	Promotion Full Professor Non- Tenure Track (e.g., Clinical Research, Education, Libraries, Extension)	Promotion Full Professor Tenure Track (Includes tenure only at rank and tenure with promotion to Full)
CALS - 8	1	1		2	1 (E)	3
CAS - 15	3	4	1 (C)	4		3
CESS - 9	1	6				2
CEMS - 6	1	1		3		1
CNHS - 7	3		1 (C)		2 (C)	1
GSB - 1			1			
LCOM - 60	3		29 (C) 4 (R) 3 (E)	6	13 (C)	2
LIB - 2					2 (L)	
RSENR - 5		2	1	1	1 (R)	
TOTAL - 113						

The Faculty Senate Professional Affairs Committee reviewed 113 dossiers for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure during the Spring 2026 semester.

Ongoing issues and observations include:

We remind candidates and chairs that our committee is drawn from members across campus who are unfamiliar with many of the disciplines on our campus. Please try to avoid acronyms and use “lay” terminology as much as possible or explain specific disciplinary terminology and practices.

We would like to see clearer and more explicit distinctions made between External Reviewers” and Letters of Support. Both play an important role but those roles are different

and want to stress the importance of “arms length” reviewers in the RPT process. Many units use standard forms asking external reviewers to declare their answers to different levels of contact they may have had with a candidate and we recommend that all units adopt similar strategies. We recommend more training on this for chairs and other engaged in processing RTP paperwork.

Many dossiers included “no” votes that did not explain why they were cast as “no.” We request that Department chairs, and FSC Chairs, explain why “no” votes were cast or indicate that no explanation was provided. No votes cast with no stated justification carry no weight.

Chairs need to ensure that in the time leading into an RPT review a candidate’s workload includes all required elements of their job. For example, if the candidate is expected to be evaluated on their work with advisees, they should have advisees assigned to them.

RPT dossiers are often very long we remind those preparing the documents to move forward to PSC that “short CV – 4pgs” for External Reviewers are recommend and that manuscripts for the candidate and other non-evaluative supplementary materials should not be included.

Lastly, we would also like to recommend more formalized Professional Development (and perhaps a manual) for PSC Members.