# Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering of the University of Vermont Reappointment and Promotion (RP) Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty

Approved by CEE faculty on December 20, 2017 Approved by Dean's Office on December 21, 2017 Approved by Provost's Office on January 9, 2018

#### 1. Introduction

In accordance with the Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) dated 12/12/2014 (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document provides reappointment and promotion (RP) guidelines for Research Faculty in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering (hereinafter referred to as the Department).

Research faculty are reviewed only relative to the quality of performance in scholarship/research work and other duties as expressly assigned and commensurate with assignment distributions as recorded in the annual workload plan. The Department applies the quality criteria listed in Article 14 Section 10 in the Union Contract, Appointments & Evaluation: Non-Tenure Track Faculty and has the following additional specifications.

A research faculty may progress through the following ranks: Research Associate, Research Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. At the discretion of the Chair in consultation with the Dean's Office, deviations from this progression are possible if the candidate previously held a similar position at a peer institution.

# 2. Faculty Input and Eligible Voters for RP Reviews

### 2.1 RP Committee and Meeting

The RP committee shall consist of all full-time tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty (i.e. the Committee of the Whole) of the Department, excluding the candidate.

At the RP committee meeting: (i) all full-time Department faculty members discuss the material in the candidate's dossier, and (ii) all eligible voters (as defined in Section 2.3) discuss the material in the dossier in closed session and then vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend the candidate's application during the meeting. The vote will be considered complete when votes cast at the meeting are provided to the Department Chair (hereafter "Chair") at the end of the meeting.

# 2.2 Duties of the Chair

For pink sheet reviews the Chair will inform the Department faculty via email that a case is being considered six (6) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. If any faculty requests a full department review and vote in writing to the Chair within a week of Chair's notification, a full department review and vote will be conducted. Otherwise, the Chair will review these cases.

The Chair will set an appropriate schedule for a review, such that the complete dossier will be ready for faculty review at least two (2) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the dossier for faculty review prior to the RP meeting for that candidate. Once the dossier is ready for review, all full-time faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate at the RP committee meeting called by the Chair at least one (1) week before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will (i) attend the meeting but not vote, (ii) provide factual information as requested, and (iii) record all of the comments and an anonymous tally of the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted prior to the adjournment of the meeting. The comments and vote will be included in the Chair's Evaluation. The Chair will summarize the discussion and share the document with the voting members of the RPT committee via email within three (3) business days of the committee meeting to ensure that the discussion is accurately summarized.

After considering the feedback from the RP committee and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application, and will prepare a summary statement of his/her assessment and include a tally of the vote. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement will also be made available to those voting members of the committee (Section 2.1) who request it in writing.

## 2.3 Eligible Voters for Research Faculty Reviews

- 1. Only full-time Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty members and Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty members who have successfully passed the stage for which the candidate is applying are eligible voters.
- 2. Full-time faculty on academic leave and on sabbatical are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document.
- 3. Only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.
- 4. The Chair is not an eligible voter.
- 5. As the College's by-laws require that one of the Department's faculty must serve on the College's Faculty Standard's Committee, that elected member must recuse themselves from voting in the RP process at either the Department or College level.

## 2. Guidelines for Evaluating Research and Scholarship and Departmental Contributions

#### 2.1 Evaluation Criteria

Research faculty are reviewed only relative to the quality of performance in both (1) scholarship/research work and (2) other duties expressly assigned. These other duties expressly assigned cannot be taken as a substitute for the candidate's scholarship/research work. Metrics for research and scholarship productivity may include refereed articles in archival journals and conferences, book chapters, patents, invited technical presentations, extramural support for research and contracts and research awards; some examples include:

- Publications of original research articles in peer-reviewed journals in the field of expertise of the candidate. Professional publications also include authorship of books or book chapters. Other evidence of scholarly activities may include peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Websites, blogs are not equivalent to publications.
- 2. Patents and Disclosures successful translation of research products into commercial or public applications is evidence of innovative research, although it is not expected that all research programs will yield patentable discoveries.
- 3. Acquisition of or participation in competitive grants and research work.
- 4. Present talks at scientific meetings, invitations to present seminars at other universities or within UVM.
- 5. Any research awards or other special recognition of scholarship.
- 6. Service as a reviewer for research manuscripts and extramural research grants, and participation and service in professional societies.

Research faculty are expected to contribute to the Department in ways such as:

- 1. Training graduate students
- 2. Training undergraduate students
- 3. Offering courses
- 4. Attendance at seminars and department meetings
- 5. Presentation of research to the Department

# 2.2 Annual Evaluation and Reappointment

Evidence of research activity can take the form of the following. These are examples, and not all are required, except publications, in a single year. However, there should be substantial evidence of research activity.

- 1. Annual description of research progress
- 2. Attendance at professional meetings or workshops
- 3. Submission of conference abstracts as author, co-author
- 4. Submission of grant applications as PI, co-PI, co-I or Key Personnel
- 5. Submission of patents and/or disclosures or other intellectual products
- 6. Publication of manuscripts (at least one per year)
- 7. Sponsor gives positive evaluation of work and assurance of continued funding for the position

## 2.3 Appointment to Research Associate

Generally, a Postdoctoral Associate can be promoted to Research Associate if the Research Associate is:

- 1. productive in research as evidenced by the items listed in Section 2.1
- 2. has a commitment from the sponsoring tenure-track faculty member for space (desk, access to phone and Internet connection, and research space)
- 3. intends to submit grant applications
- 4. intends to remain at UVM with the faculty sponsor for at least 2 years
- 5. faculty sponsor gives positive evaluation of work
- 6. there is assurance of continued funding for the position

The Research Faculty track, from the ranks of Research Assistant Professor through Research Professor, is meant to provide a research-intensive path for career advancement. Although each individual is different, the timeline for promotions from one rank to the next is expected to roughly mirror that of tenure-track faculty.

## 2.4 Promotion to Research Assistant Professor

Generally, a Research Associate is promoted to Research Assistant Professor if the Research Associate:

- 1. is productive in research as evidenced by the items under Section 2.3
- 2. demonstrates assurance of continued self-funding
- 3. contributes to the Department in significant ways such as:
  - training graduate students
  - training undergraduate students
  - offering colloquia and/or courses
  - attendance at seminars and department meetings
  - presentation of research to the Department

# 2.5 Promotion to Research Associate Professor:

Generally, a Research Assistant Professor is promoted to Research Associate Professor if the candidate:

- 1. is able to demonstrate research and scholarship activities that are viewed as productive and significant by the Department faculty members
- 2. demonstrates assurance of continued self-funding
- 3. produces high-quality publications on a regular basis (on average at least one per year)
- 4. mentors graduate student research
- 5. participates in the Department in a sustained and significant way (Section 2.1)

# 2.6 Promotion to Research Professor

Generally, a Research Associate Professor is promoted to Research Professor if the candidate:

- 1. is able to demonstrate research and scholarship activities since the last promotion that are viewed as productive and significant by the Department faculty members
- 2. demonstrates assurance of continued self-funding
- 3. there are high-quality publications on a regular basis (on average at least one per year) for at least six years following promotion to Research Associate Professor
- 4. mentors graduate student research
- 5. participation in the Department is sustained and significant (Section 2.1)