In considering the qualities and merits of a faculty member's work, CESS subscribes to UVM’s *Our Common Ground* that recognizes that respect, integrity, innovation, openness, justice, and responsibility are critical components of the CESS community and upon which the criteria for faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure are established. The granting of reappointment, promotion, and tenure ensures academic freedom, which is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the College. The granting of reappointment, promotion, and tenure to faculty members will proceed most effectively in an environment that includes the following features:

- Faculty members have ready access to clear information regarding the type, quality and quantity of work that is expected for reappointment, promotion and tenure.
- Faculty members demonstrate that they meet institutional needs and expectations by providing documentation of excellent teaching and advising, research, and service.
- Faculty members meet the professional obligations of their workload by providing effective teaching and advising, substantial and sustained scholarship of high quality, and quality service.
- CESS provides clear, accurate, and timely information regarding criteria and processes for successful reappointment, promotion, and tenure review.
- CESS provides faculty members with the necessary personnel, technical, and financial resources to support faculty during the reappointment, promotion and tenure process.

The work of the CESS in the 21st century will exemplify high quality teaching, scholarship, and service while honoring and building upon the historic work of practitioners and scholars in education and human services. The criteria against which our work will be judged are those enumerated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. In applying these criteria, the College recognizes Boyer’s (1997) notion that scholarship can have different purposes and goals including: the *scholarship of discovery*, the generation of knowledge through which we confront the unknown and seek understanding for its own sake; the *scholarship of integration*, which seeks connections between and among disciplines, interprets knowledge from a variety of perspectives, and brings new insight by altering contexts; the *scholarship of engagement*, or the dynamic use of knowledge to help solve individual and societal problems; and the *scholarship of teaching*, which transforms and extends knowledge as well as transmitting it. The College recognizes the value of each of these areas of scholarly contribution (pure research, applied research/scholarship, cross-disciplinary research/scholarship, community-based research/scholarship, and research/scholarship on teaching).
The unique scholarly focus of each department is acknowledged in this document. Materials reviewed for reappointment, and promotion are to be evaluated in keeping with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT). This document provides supplementary guidelines to the CBA and are intended to clarify expectations and describe processes and criteria for faculty success. This document is also intended to inspire advancements in the scholarship of teaching, research, and service.

I. Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching and Advising, Scholarship/Research, and Service
The following criteria guide the process for reappointment, promotion, and tenure by expressing how CESS faculty members are expected to meet University criteria in the context of their work within the College. The specific document criteria are adapted from the 2004 RPT document and the Senior Lecturer, and Professor Promotion criteria developed by the College Faculty Affairs Committee and subsequently reviewed by each department. In many cases, the criteria serve as clarifications of the CBA. In other cases, the CBA criteria are expanded and built upon through the CESS-based guidelines.

A. Teaching and Advising (including supervision) Criteria
As reflected in the CBA, “effectiveness in teaching” is an essential criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Additionally, the skill and interest in the general guidance and academic advising of students is also considered an important criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Further, independent study, thesis, and dissertation advising requires sustained intellectual out-of-classroom effort with students (e.g., theses, dissertations, comprehensive exams, qualifying papers, portfolios, independent studies, and students’ research articles and chapters) requiring purposeful, individual effort.

As noted in the CBA indicators of effective teaching include documented evidence for:

- intellectual competence, integrity and independence
- evidence of knowledge of the field
- evidence of willingness to consider suggestions from peer reviews of one’s teaching
- evidence of ability to work with other faculty in designing and delivering a curriculum that fosters student learning
- evidence of the ability to present course materials clearly and effectively
- evidence of the capacity to structure courses in ways that promote student learning
- evidence of the employment of strategies to assess students’ learning and adjust to one’s teaching in light of the findings of those assessments
- evidence of an ability to stimulate students’ intellectual interest and enthusiasm
- evidence for supervision that includes effective oversight and guidance of practica, field placement, internships, and student teaching, which lead to the attainment of professional standards

1) Teaching Evidence
The key evidence used to highlight effective teaching (undergraduate and graduate) includes but is not limited to:
• faculty peer observations (these should be conducted each academic year for probationary faculty)
• evaluations of teaching by students
• department chair evaluation

Additional evidence may include but is not limited to:
• creative collaborations with professional colleagues (in academia or in the field)
• professional awards
• creativity and innovation in syllabi, readings, materials, and teaching methods, as well as university, state, regional, and/or national recognition
• development of new courses, teaching materials, and other activities related to instruction

(2) Academic Advising Evidence
Academic advising must model professional ethics and documented standards of the discipline. Evidence of effective advising includes but is not limited to:
• evaluation of advising by students

Additional evidence may include but is not limited to:
• narrative of the advising process

(3) Independent Study, Thesis, and Dissertation Advising Evidence
Documentation of sustained intellectual out-of-classroom effort with students (e.g., theses, dissertations, comprehensive exams, qualifying papers, portfolios, independent studies, and students' research articles and chapters) requiring purposeful, individual effort is required. Evidence of effective advising includes but is not limited to:
• documented commitment and effort of support for thesis or dissertation
• documented commitment and effort for independent study credits
• documented productive dissertation committee membership
• documented commitment to support students in their independent research, projects, or other scholarly work

B. Scholarship Criteria
Boyer’s (1997) notion of scholarship frames the assessment of scholarship within the college. As noted in the CBA, “Substantial and sustained scholarship/research/creative activity of high quality is an essential criterion for reappointment, promotion and tenure.”

In CESS, evidence of high quality scholarship is primarily evidenced by the publication of refereed scholarly research and other articles in high quality journals, books published by highly regarded presses, and competitive national, international or state grants which advance, integrate, apply, and/or transform knowledge.

Additional examples of scholarship (listed below) can bolster a faculty member's scholarship record, but do not replace the primary forms of evidence listed above. In other words the forms of additional evidence of scholarship listed below are not sufficient in the absence of the primary forms of evidence.
Additional evidence includes but is not limited to:

- articles, essays, chapters, and theoretical treatises written for scholarly books, monographs and scholarly meeting proceedings
- published pieces, articles, columns, and notes in magazines, trade journals, newsletters, websites for popular or general audiences
- field-based or policy studies resulting in changed policy and/or practice as evidenced by national, state, or local adoption and publication by funders
- published book reviews in refereed journals
- refereed/reviewed or invited presentations (e.g. papers, roundtables, poster presentations, lectures) at international, national, regional, and state conferences
- production and distribution of unpublished scholarly research reports or external evaluation reports
- published scholarly educational computer software, psychological and educational tests, films, media, and/or videotapes
- funded university or local grants
- objective criteria of high quality research such as Google Scholar Citations, acceptance rates, journal impact factors, journal circulation, and grant selectivity

C. Service Criteria

As noted in the CBA, “Service to the University, and in their capacity as scholars, to the community and the profession is an essential part of the University’s mission and faculty performance expectations…the quality of the service must be addressed through evaluations from those served.” Service includes service to the University, college and department, profession, and community.

In CESS, service includes but is not limited to professional activities which:

- contribute to one's profession at the local, state, national, and international levels
- contribute to the institution (program, department, college, university) and to the mission of the University as a land grant institution
- contribute to issues of contemporary concern within the community at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g. human rights work, development, school reform)
- support inter-professional collaborations in field and college-based settings, and provide leadership in improving public policies at the local, state, national, and international levels
- contribute to the recruitment and support of students, staff and faculty who are from traditionally underrepresented groups

(1) **Service To University, College, and Department includes but is not limited to:**

- membership on or serving as chair for college and university committees.
- coordinating an academic program
- administrative appointments elected or assigned in the department, college, or university (for example, program coordination, directing a center, institute, program, or grant, and chairing a department). The candidate should clarify the nature of the service as being compensated or not compensated as well as assigned or elected.
• sustained mentoring or coaching of other faculty in their teaching, research, or service

(2) Service to the Profession includes but is not limited to:
• editorships and membership on editorial boards of professional journals
• leadership positions (e.g. committee chair, executive offices, appointments) held in professional associations in the candidate's discipline
• membership on regional or national review panels, councils, boards, and committees
• organization of scholarly meetings and conferences
• national and regional public service or uncompensated discipline-related consultation and expert testimony on public policy in candidate's area of expertise
• speeches and consultation with local, regional, state, national, and international bodies
• reviewing conference presentations, book proposals, and other materials and activities in the area of candidate's expertise

(3) Service to the Community includes but is not limited to:
• leadership in professional education development for practitioners in the field
• on-site visits for evaluation and program review
• membership on regional or national review panels, councils, board, and committees

II. Performance Criteria
The following criteria recognize that it is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement for reappointment, tenure and promotion. Each case must be examined in detail by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context must be the criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on reappointment, tenure or promotion.

Reappointment as Lecturer
A sustained standard of effective teaching in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for reappointment as a Lecturer in CESS. Teaching effectiveness is central to all reappointment and promotion decisions for lecturers and senior lecturers.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Reappointment as Senior Lecturer
A sustained standard of effective teaching in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for promotion to Senior Lecturer, and reappointment to Senior Lecturer in CESS. For promotion and reappointment to Senior Lecturer, it is expected that the faculty member contributes to increasing the effectiveness of teaching in the individual's program, department, or to the college.

Reappointment as Instructor or Assistant Professor
Effective teaching in the context of a research university, and demonstrated likelihood this will continue is required for reappointment, promotion and tenure in CESS. Additionally, progressing towards substantial and sustained quality scholarship and the promise of continued effective service contributions towards the work of the individual's department or school and the intellectual life of the University must be evident. For reappointment, the central assessment question is, “Is the candidate demonstrating substantial and sustained high quality scholarship, moving towards the goal of becoming an effective teacher, and providing
quality service?” The successful candidate must be able to substantiate these objectives. Once these prerequisites are met, substantial and sustained scholarship is the requirement for tenure.

**Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at UVM, a candidate must work in the pre-tenure years on developing a record of substantial and sustained, high quality achievement and recognition in scholarship. In continuing from the reappointment criteria above the focal question becomes: “Has the candidate demonstrated substantial and sustained high quality scholarship, effective teaching and quality service? In terms of scholarship, ‘sustained’ scholarship requires productivity across the tenure track rather than a compressed effort in the last few years of the probationary period. The process of evaluating a candidate for promotion and tenure involves a comprehensive review of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, the quality of service rendered, and whether their scholarly agenda indicates sustained and high quality achievement in scholarship. Documentation will be required from within UVM as well as an external review of scholarship outlined in section III of this document.

**Promotion to Professor**

The inquiry for promotion to full professor is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: “Has the candidate for promotion demonstrated their ability to produce substantial and sustained high quality scholarship that is recognized by their peers either nationally or internationally?” In addition, the candidate must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. An example of this could be a trajectory of high quality research as evidenced by a set of peer reviewed journal articles and/or books published by highly regarded presses. The normal expectation will be that the new work marks demonstrate a degree of impact or recognition in the author’s field since the conferring of tenure. The promotion papers must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion. Further evidence includes but is not limited to:

1. Citation of works in books, journals, monographs, etc
2. Discussion of works in books, journals, monographs, etc
3. Reprints of works in books of readings or other publications
4. Invited contributions appearing in high quality publications
5. Awards and honors for scholarly works/achievements
6. 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

Documentation will be required from within UVM as well as an external review of scholarship outlined in section III of this document.

**Reappointment as Research Associate**

Critical to reappointment decisions for Research Associates are whether they are fulfilling the requirements of their position in support of funded research and outreach conducted on behalf of the CESS mission.
Reappointment as Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research (Full) Professor

Substantial and sustained scholarship is the requirement for reappointment and promotion of research faculty. The process of evaluating a candidate for reappointment involves a comprehensive review of whether the candidate’s funded work indicates sustained and high quality achievement in scholarship. For reappointment, the central assessment question is, “Is the candidate meeting the scholarly expectations of their funded work and/or completing the objectives of the funded project?”

Promotion to Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research (Full) Professor

For promotion to Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Professor, the central assessment question is “Has the candidate demonstrated substantial and sustained high quality scholarship as demonstrated by external review?” In addition, the candidate for promotion to Research Professor must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding appointment as an Research Associate Professor such as a trajectory of high quality research as evidenced by a set of peer reviewed journal articles, books published by highly regarded presses, and/or research grants. The normal expectation will be that the new work marks significant new scholarship since the conferring of the rank of Associate Research Professor. The promotion papers must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.

III. The Evaluation Process

Current university processes and procedures for faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) require that faculty complete electronic Green Sheets or Blue Sheets. These forms require: (1) a background information (name, current rank and date attained, department, College, proposed action), (2) description of assigned responsibilities, and (3) evidence of effectiveness and quality. These forms can be found on the Provost’s website.

A. Department Chair's Role

The department chair is responsible for overseeing the department’s review of the candidate’s work and conducting the chair’s evaluation. The Department Chair in the RPT process must provide effective, fair, consistent, and timely information to faculty. Department Chairs also must provide timely formative and summative evaluations of faculty during the annual review process each year and the annual review process should inform the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure process. Each faculty member must be provided with a verbal and written summary of progress in providing effective teaching and advising, scholarship, and quality service during the annual review process each year. The faculty member's strengths as well as areas in need of improvement must be clearly documented in the annual review, reappointment, promotion, and tenure materials.

B. Evaluating Teaching

In evaluating teaching, departmental expectations apply for every reappointment and promotion decision and are in consort with the CBA’s emphasis on “effectiveness in teaching” as an essential criterion for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.” Department chairs working with the CESS Dean’s office must maintain end-of-course student evaluations
for each faculty candidate. It is also expected that probationary faculty members and those seeking reappointment and promotion will have their teaching reviewed by peers, so that decisions about the quality of their teaching will be based on several sources of information rather than on just one observation. For example, colleagues from the same or different department, college or profession, personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning, as well as chairs may be requested by the candidate to observe and provide evaluative feedback. At least two colleagues should observe and discuss a candidates teaching with the candidate prior to each reappointment or promotion decision. Letters from these observations, signed by the candidate and the observer(s), shall be included in the reappointment or promotion materials.

C. Evaluating Advising
Advising is a priority in the College of Education and Social Services. In evaluating advising, the CBA notes, “Interest and skill in the general guidance and academic advising of students will be an important consideration for reappointment, promotion and tenure.” Candidates shall submit quantitative data about number of advisees, and whether advisement includes primary or secondary responsibility (e.g. primary advisor to doctoral candidate vs. serving on dissertation committee). Each department will administer advising evaluations each year and develop a process for documenting and evaluating the quality of advisement.

D. Evaluating the Scholarly Agenda
While scholarly work will vary among faculty, each faculty member with scholarship as part of designated workload must define her/his primary area(s) of scholarship in terms of a scholarly agenda. The scholarly agenda delineates those serious intellectual pursuits that have engaged the faculty member; it states the manner in which the scholar’s research activities relate to his or her field of knowledge, and to the departmental mission and programmatic goals; and it summarizes the individual’s accomplishments and contributions to knowledge, as well as long-term goals and purposes. These primary areas are discussed with Department Chairs on an annual basis and articulated in mutual agreements. Whether for reappointment or promotion, it is the faculty member's responsibility to present their primary areas of scholarship so that they can be evaluated against the performance criteria for scholarship. It is, therefore, critical for candidates to focus on the quality and significance of the work, in addition to quantifying or categorizing the work.

E. Evaluating Scholarship Externally
In cases of reappointment, external review is not required. The areas of scholarship identified are evaluated internally using the performance criteria for scholarship. For promotion to the rank of Associate or Full Professor and Research Associate Professor or Research (Full) Professor, faculty scholarship will be reviewed by external reviewers as well as internally through the RPT process in those primary areas of scholarship so identified by the faculty member. In the case of research, faculty submit a sampling of scholarly work (preferably 3-5 refereed scholarly publications), current Curriculum Vitae (CV), and a 1-2 page articulation of their research agenda to the Department Chair who sends this material out to external reviewers. The faculty member should provide the department chair with a list of 6 potential external reviewers before the end of the spring semester of the year the faculty member intends to submit papers for promotion and/or tenure (or as negotiated with the chair). The chair will also identify 6 reviewers with the appropriate scholarly expertise. Both the chair
and faculty member will review the full list of 12 possible external reviewers to ensure they are “arm’s length” as defined in the CBA and that there are no potential issues of “cause, meaning actual bias or prejudice toward the candidate or lack of qualifications to review the candidate’s record”. According to the CBA, the external reviewers “will have an academic rank equal to or above the rank of the promotion sought”. The selection of the final reviewers remains anonymous to the candidate. The chair should seek to recruit 6 external reviewers (ideally 3 from the candidates list and 3 from the chair’s list) using the template letter on the Provost’s website. The packet sent to the external reviewers should include: 1) the Provost’s Template External Reviewer Letter, 2) the section of the CBA pertaining to evaluation of scholarship/research/creative activity”, 3) the CESS RPT Guidelines, and 4) the candidate’s CV, Scholarly Research Agenda Overview, and 3-5 refereed scholarly publications. It is critical that the external reviewers note in their review letter that they are arm’s length and can provide and objective assessment of the candidate.

F. Evaluating Service
Departmental expectations apply for every reappointment and promotion decision. If service is part of a faculty member’s workload, it is expected that the candidate maintain service to the university and to the wider community. The candidate must summarize service work. Sample letters from committee chairs or service colleagues that can attest to the quality of the candidate's contributions should be included.

IV. Mentoring in the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Process (RPT)
Faculty members may request mentoring support through the Faculty Senate Mentoring program or from faculty colleagues. Mentors can often serve as helpful role models and provide feedback and advice regarding the faculty member’s contributions in scholarship, teaching, advising and service. Still, as candidates for RPT, faculty bear the ultimate responsibility for asking questions, reviewing RPT processes and criteria and ensuring that their professional responsibilities have a high probability of leading to successful reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

References


CBA http://www.uvm.edu/~facrsrscs/?Page=OfficersPage.html

Our Common Ground
http://www.uvm.edu/~presdent/?Page=miscellaneous/commonground.html

NOTE: Approved by departmental and college-wide vote 5/14/14