

Annual Report 2019-2020

Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

Submitted to the Faculty Senate & Office of the Provost

22 April, 2020

Members

Carolyn Bonifield (Grossman School of Business)
Catherine (CC) Christenson (Larner College of Medicine)
Frances Delwiche (UVM Libraries)
Evan Eyster (Larner College of Medicine)
Michael F. Giangreco, Chair (College of Education and Social Services)
Hendrika (Rycki) Maltby (College of Nursing and Health Sciences)
William (Bill) Mierse (College of Arts & Sciences)
Mary Peabody (College of Agriculture & Life Sciences)
Alan Steinweis (College of Arts & Sciences)
Jason Stockwell (Rubenstein School of Environment & Natural Resources)
Tian Xia (College of Engineering & Mathematical Sciences)

Summary of Primary Activities

Sabbatical Reviews

During the 2019-2020 academic term the PSC reviewed a total of 57 sabbatical applications.

Number of Sabbatical Applications Reviewed by Academic Unit:

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS), n=4
College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), n=34
College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (CEMS), n=1
College of Education & Social Services (CESS), n=7
College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS), n=2
Grossman School of Business (GSB), n=2
Larner College of Medicine (LCOM), n=1
Rubenstein School of Environmental and Natural Resources (RSENr), n=4
UVM Libraries (LIB), n=2
Total Sabbaticals Reviewed, N=57

Reappointment, Tenure & Promotion Reviews (RPT)

During the 2019-2020 academic term the PSC conducted 94 RPT reviews: (a) 87 RPT full dossiers reviews, and (b) 7 *Expedited Tenure Reviews for Administrators* (pre-hire) to date.

College/ School & N of Dossiers*	2nd Reappoint- ment @ Assistant Professor Tenure Track	Promotion Senior Lecturer	Promotion Associate Professor Non- Tenure Track (e.g., <i>Research, Clinical, Libraries, Education, Extension</i>)	Promotion Associate Professor & Tenure (includes tenure only at rank)	Promotion Full Professor Non- Tenure Track (e.g., <i>Research, Clinical, Libraries, Extension</i>)	Promotion Full Professor Tenure Track (includes tenure only at rank and tenure with promotion to full)
CALS n=4		1	1 (Ext)	1		1
CAS n=19	2	3		7		7
CESS n=7	2	3		2		
CEMS n=4	1	1		1		1
CNHS n=7	1		3 (C)	3		
GSB n=2	1					1
LCOM n=39	1		23 (C) 1 (Ed) 1 (R)		9 (C) 1 (Ed) 1 (R)	2
LIB n=1			1 (L)			
RSENR n=4	3					1
Totals N= 87	11	8	30	14	11	13

*The data in this table reflect the highest action taken on the dossier; in some cases, the PSC voted on more than one of the tabled categories above on the same person (e.g., second reappointment and promotion to Associate Professor with tenure).

The Faculty Senate's *Expedited Tenure Review* (pre-hire) process was used to review 7 cases: CALS Dean Finalists (n=4); VP for Research Finalists (n=3); CNHS Dean (n= TBD, pending)

Review of PSC Operating Procedures

In April 2020 the PSC reviewed its operating procedures and made no changes. The most recent version submitted to the Faculty Senate remains posted on the PSC web page.

Summary of Persistent Issues Related to the Sabbatical and RPT Submissions

Given its role reviewing sabbatical and RPT (Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure) dossiers from across the university, the PSC is in a unique position to notice patterns, trends, and issues that may be helpful for faculty, Chairs, Deans, and the Provost to consider for future submissions. In this section of our report, we identify a series of issues we think would be helpful to address. Some of these issues are persistent and have been raised in previous annual reports.

Sabbatical Issues

1. Completeness of Submissions

- a. The PSC noted substantial variability in the completion of the cover page in Part A, item 2 (Indicate the time period for which you are applying for sabbatical leave). We found the Academic Year was left blank on several applications. Sometimes the Fall and/or Spring semester have a check mark and at other times it lists a year. The form itself is a bit ambiguous and we suggest it may need some minor adjustments to ensure it is consistently offering unambiguous prompts resulting in the necessary information.
- b. We encourage Colleges to double-check applications for technical accuracy and completeness (e.g., URL links, missing bookmarks, missing letters, missing votes) prior to submission. Each year, some applications are returned to units for correction, which can delay the review process. Other applications, not returned, are easier or more difficult for reviewers to navigate based on factors such as whether the dossier pdf file is bookmarked.
- c. Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) and Dean letters should all include dates -- several were undated. When presented out of context, or in varying sequences, it can be confusing to tell if they are current or past letters.
- d. If a sabbatical application includes collaboration with partner institutions or organizations, including letters of invitation is essential. The letters verify access and anticipated collaboration to confirm the proposed activities can be pursued and can reasonably be completed. Some sabbaticals continue to include plans for such collaboration without verifying letters or emails. If the plan includes travel to a foreign country, it is helpful for applicants to establish their language access (e.g., fluent in the dominant language, availability of translators), if required.
- e. Sabbaticals that include data collection, including from human subjects, should acknowledge the need for protections of human subjects/Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and report on the status of the IRB approval (e.g., plan/date for submission). An explicit IRB item may need to be added in the sabbatical form.

- f. Since sabbaticals are reviewed by people outside the applicant's own field or sub-field, it is helpful to limit excessive disciplinary-specific language and acronyms likely to be unknown by reviewers. When technical language is deemed essential, a short explanation in lay language is appreciated and the first occurrence of acronyms should be accompanied with the full corresponding text.

2. Specificity of Activities, Timelines, & Extension Beyond Standard Workload

- a. The PSC continues to note substantial variability among sabbatical submissions, especially pertaining to the level of specificity with which activities to be completed during the sabbatical are described. Some sabbatical applications include a strong rationale, yet sometimes lack the level of specificity that would allow the reader to clearly understand what the faculty member will actually be doing during the sabbatical period. With some regularity, we encounter the activity described in a broad way, such as, *"I plan to write a book"*. In order to assess the sabbatical plan, it is helpful to understand the entry point (i.e., work already been completed, table of contents), proposed activities (e.g., archival research, other data collection, document analysis, reading related sources, outlining chapters, number of draft chapters expected per month, editing, dissemination plan), and the corresponding timeline for reaching that ultimate goal (e.g., full or partial draft of a book). The PSC considers the timeline requirement inadequate when it states something like: *"Work described above will be completed by the end of the sabbatical leave"*. A timeline that lists activities to be completed during each month of the sabbatical period may be a reasonable time interval to describe activities. As outlined in the sabbatical elements listed in the CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement), the sabbatical application needs to include specific activities with projected timelines.
- b. The PSC encourages sabbatical applicants to be as explicit as possible about how their sabbatical plan extends beyond what they might typically be expected to complete on their standard workload devoted to scholarship and/or creative activity. For example, if someone indicates they plan to complete an article they have been working on and write one additional paper, one might reasonably wonder why these activities necessitate a sabbatical. It is most helpful when applicants explain how the sabbatical time allows them a unique opportunity to engage in activities that would otherwise not be available to them given a typical slate of duties (e.g., teaching, advising, committee work).

3. Relationship between Funding Cycles and Sabbatical Submissions

Due to the nature of funding cycles and notification dates, some faculty members who are pursuing external funding for sabbatical related activities (e.g., foreign or domestic travel) do not know the status of potential funding before submitting the sabbatical application. Since the plan may be dependent on the funding, faculty members often include a Plan A (a grand plan based on receipt of desired funding) and a Plan B (a scaled-back or completely different plan if funding is not forthcoming). This poses a challenge in the review process because the sabbatical applications almost universally are built around Plan A, with Plan B often offered as a brief afterthought (e.g., *"I have an extensive plan to travel overseas to do X, Y, Z, and if I don't get funded I plan to stay*

home and write a couple of articles."). We suggest that the Plans for A and B be reversed. By this we mean that the sabbatical applications primary **Plan A should be what the faculty member can commit to doing at the time of submission** and the Plan B should be considered value-added (e.g., "*... and if I receive the funding for which I applied or am applying, I will be able to do these additional or different activities...*"). If accurate, it can be helpful when an applicant states something like: "*work is not dependent on the external funding*". If presented this way the proposal can be evaluated on the known, rather than the unknown or aspirational.

4. **Mentoring**

It is unclear to the PSC whether some applicants are receiving sufficient mentoring, guidance, and feedback prior to submission, especially first-time applicants. When deficiencies are perceived during the review process, they are most frequently issues that could have been reasonably addressed had the applicant received feedback earlier, such as from the Chair. Sometimes faculty members get caught in Chair transitions that result in gaps in mentoring or support. Given the timing for faculty submissions of sabbaticals at the beginning of September, it seems desirable for substantive sabbatical planning to be well underway during the previous spring, since summer can be a challenging time for faculty and Chairs to connect given both off-contract times and mismatch in timing of summer plans.

Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure (RTP) Issues

1. **Overall Organization**

The PSC encourages all units to continue to self-assess and improve their consistent organization and bookmarking of dossiers to make them easier to navigate (e.g., all supporting materials after basic dossier entries; external reviewer CVs after all letters rather than after each letter, searchable pdf by using the OCR-optical character recognition feature in Adobe Acrobat; check all links to ensure they work).

2. **Common Definitions**

The PSC encourages the development of university-wide common definitions of workload categories (e.g., teaching/advising, scholarship, service, administration, clinical). Among the most common areas of confusion are the overlapping and different use of the terms: service, clinical, and administration.

The PSC also encourages the development of university-wide common definitions for recording RPT voting (i.e., Yes, No, Absent, Recuse, Abstain). A common inconsistency leading to potential confusion relates to the differences between terms: abstain, recuse and conflict". The PSC has offered proposed definitions of these terms in our operating procedures.

At all voting levels (i.e., department, FSC, PSC) it is essential for there to be a brief rationale for votes recorded as no, abstain, or recuse, so they are interpretable. Especially, pertaining to "No" votes, the PSC routinely puts little to no weight on such votes unless they are accompanied by some credible rationale.

3. **Work Load Distribution by Chair**

The PSC finds boiler plate language about workload from some Chairs (e.g., 40:40:20), without specifics about how many courses are actually taught along with other duties. The PSC recognizes workload distributions may differ from year to year during the review period. While we are not seeking excessive detail, it is helpful to have accurate estimates of an individual's workload distribution (e.g., the average number of courses taught per year) in order to assess aspects such as scholarship output. One might expect different output for someone who is teaching five courses per year rather than two, or how taking on significant administrative roles (e.g., Department Chair) might impact time for scholarship. The reason we request understanding the average number of courses taught with the estimates of workload percentages is because how courses are counted varies across the university. For example, in some colleges 40% for teaching equals five courses, in others it equals four courses -- this is further obscured when boiler plate language reflecting the default starting point is used because it doesn't offer information about releases or shifted roles. So, two faculty in the same department can be listed as having 40% devoted to teaching, where one person is teaching five classes a year and the other is teaching two classes a year. For the individual with fewer courses, understanding how that time has been redistributed is important to reviewing the dossier fairly (e.g., junior faculty releases with no additional responsibilities are different than a shift to externally-funded research activities or added administrative duties).

We request that LCOM departments consider putting workload percentages on the first page of all dossiers with estimates of percent of effort by category: (a) Clinical (e.g., serving patients), (b) Teaching and Advising, (c) Scholarship (e.g., publications, grants, presentations), (d) Service (e.g., committee work at various levels within the university, service to the profession), and (e) administration (e.g., Directing a Center or Clinic, Chairing a Department, Coordinating a Program).

4. **External Letters**

The PSC notes continued issues pertaining to "arm's length" external letters for tenure and promotion consideration. Too many are still coming through that are clearly not at arm's length or they flirt with the appearance of favorable bias.

Here is an actual example of what a submitted letter writer stated that would seem to establish the person as clearly not at arm's length: "I have co-authored seven scientific papers with Dr. XX, which were published in the period 2008 – 2018)". We are unclear on the process steps that would have led to a Chair soliciting such a letter, or if received, why it has not been acknowledged and shifted to a different part of the dossier as a supportive letter, but not one of the external review letters? Ensuring arm's length letters is a shared responsibility between the faculty member and the Chair. The PSC encourages departments to review their processes used to ensure arm's length external letters.

Some received letters, while they may technically be at arm's length, flirt with the appearance of favorable bias. Actual submissions have included statements such as, "I am a friend of his mentor", or "We are from the same academic lineage, but not

overlapping". Soliciting letter writers who are closely connected in such ways may present the appearance of selection for benefit based on the writer's loyalties to mentors or the faculty member's graduate program. Given the availability of potential reviewers, the PSC would discourage solicitation of letters from people with academic kinship relationships. We understand that there are small, highly specialized, fields of research in which it may be difficult to avoid soliciting letters from evaluators who have not previously intersected professionally with the candidate, or who do not belong to the same academic network.

There are other types of questionable selections. For example, an external reviewer wrote: "I am professionally acquainted with Dr. X. S/he/they invited me to give a talk in Vermont about a year and a half ago, for which I received an honorarium, as is common practice. I invited her/him/they to give a talk at my university in early 2019, and was able to provide him/her/they with an honorarium." Does this present the perceived or unspoken suggestion of a quid pro quo? Again, if other choices for reviewers are available, we would encourage pursuing those instead.

Credibility of arm's length letters are enhanced when the letters come from reviewers who: (a) work at an institution of higher education at least comparable to UVM (R1, R2) or other relevant organization, (b) have attained the rank or a higher rank as the promotion being sought, (c) have submitted a CV that reflects a substantial body of work that establishes them as an appropriate reviewer for a specific candidate, and (d) have no real or perceived bias related to the applicant.

5. **Early Tenure**

The PSC has reviewed some early tenure cases across pathways (e.g., tenure track, clinical), one or more years earlier than the standard timeline. The PSC requests that early tenure cases be specifically identified (e.g., with a notation on the first page of the dossier). We suggest the Chair's initial statement explicitly identify this as an early tenure and provide a brief rationale for why the person is going up early. When early tenure is more than one year earlier than the standard time frame, it has raised questions among PSC members about whether the productivity has been sufficiently sustained and under what conditions (e.g., substantially reduced course load). PSC has encountered what seem to be internal inconsistencies within colleges and equity issues when one faculty member is encouraged on an early tenure pathway, yet another is discouraged or denied because the record is not sufficiently sustained. We encourage more clarity and transparency on early tenure reviews. Years brought in that were accepted by UVM as counting toward tenure from the initial appointment letter may be part of an early or standard time frame review. We encourage Chairs to provide such information immediately in the first section of *I. Overall Expectations* (by Chair). The front page might be modified to include a distinct line to note early tenure and to clarify whether it is based exclusively on time at UVM or includes time credited from previous appointments at other comparable institutions of higher education.

6. **Nature of Contributions to Scholarship**

Many dossiers continue to omit the applicant's specific contribution to co-authored scholarship, especially when they are farther down the list of multiple authors. It is helpful to know the approximate percentage of contribution and the nature of the contribution. Given differences among disciplines, there needs to be clarity on the role as first author. When does the last author simply reflect the smallest contribution, and when does last author represent a prominent position (e.g., in LCOM sometimes the last author is the leader of the lab, the individual who conceptualized the study or it is their original line of research)? The PSC seeks to understand the approximate percent of contribution and nature of contribution. Namely, what did the faculty member actually do with regard to a particular publication (e.g., conceptualize the study, develop the research plan, collect data, analyze data, write all or part of the initial draft, edit)?

Gratitude for the Work

Being on the PSC involves a significant investment of time and effort. One of the most common sentiments expressed by PSC members to each other is that the time and effort are worthwhile. Individually and collectively we experience gratitude for the opportunity to review the breadth and depth of work being produced at UVM. Members of the PSC approach each dossier with great respect for the work of our UVM colleagues and take pride in carefully and independently reviewing each dossier. During March and April 2020 this meant meeting virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Being a PSC member offers a unique opportunity to glimpse into fields of study we would typically not encounter otherwise. It is a constant learning experience and contributes to our sense that UVM is a special place, with so many talented people doing so much amazing work!