

## **Grossman School of Business Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT)**

This document was officially updated and unanimously approved by Grossman School of Business Faculty on December 12, 2018 and approved by the Office of the Provost on June 13, 2017. Received OP 01/01/2019; Reviewed OP 01/23/2019, Re-approved with friendly amendments by GSB Faculty 02/20/2019, resubmitted to OP 02/20/2019, approved by the Office of the Provost on February 26, 2019.

RPT actions and decisions pertain to the procedures, criteria and standards of performance for full-time 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 "review" to refer more broadly to the process and types of actions within the process and the term "Review Sheet" more broadly to refer to the document used to summarize the candidate's record for the purpose of a review.

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 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. For non-tenure track faculty (lecturers), Promotion (change in rank from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer) requires **Formal Peer Review** (Green Sheet).

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 by the established [deadlines](#) into a public folder on the school's intranet created by the GSB Dean's Office specifically for the purpose of RPT decisions. This public folder contains subfolders for documents pertinent to the action including:

- An appropriate review sheet as denoted on pp. 1-2 of these guidelines.
- Collateral teaching, advising, research, and service materials outlined under the 'Criteria and Assessment' section of this document. The personal statement provided to external evaluators should be included among this collateral material.

This full set of materials are reviewed by the relevant GSB parties (faculty, Dean) 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.

- Review Sheet completed 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 his/her public 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 public 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 Review Sheet is populated by the Dean's office using data from [Digital Measures](#), the University's activity tracking database. The Candidate should contact the Dean's Office as early as possible, typically in May, to request that a populated Review 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 his/her 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 Review 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 Review 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 review 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 professional, technically competent, and entrepreneurial graduates with an ability to create and manage sustainable businesses that address ethical, social, and environmental challenges and opportunities in the complex and dynamic global environment. A faculty member must be proficient in communicating ideas in ways that facilitate student learning.

It is in the Candidate's best interest to ensure the evidence in the public folder is sufficiently thorough for an affirmative vote. Evidence of performance as an effective teacher at GSB must be provided in the primary areas reported in the Review Sheet, 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 Review 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 through the report function in Digital Measures. In addition to the summary table or chart of student course evaluations, the Candidate should show appropriate peer group comparison statistics: e.g., required courses vs. elective courses and/or by course level (0xx, 1xx, 2xx, 3xx). The Candidate should justify the rationale for the chosen comparison group. 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 (details in endnote ii).
- 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: The 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 through Digital Measures. The Candidate must provide a summary table of advising evaluations in a format deemed acceptable by the FSC Chair.
- v. Additional Accomplishments: Candidates are encouraged to refer to the [AACSB Intellectual Contributions Impact Grid](#) 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:
- Cooperation provided to other colleagues in course or curriculum development and dissemination.
  - 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 alumni about teaching effectiveness.

## **II.B. 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 three or more external arm's-length<sup>i</sup> referees is required. The Dean consults with the Chair of the 'Committee of Three' (as described in Section IIIA.2), Candidate, and faculty members knowledgeable about the Candidate's research to identify these evaluators, as outlined in Article 14.5.e.ii [UVM and United Academics \(AAUP/AFT\)](#). At least four qualified referees are invited to submit their evaluations. Two or more referees are selected at the Dean's discretion, and at least two others are selected from a list of five or more names provided by the Candidate and deemed acceptable by the Committee of Three Chair or the Dean. 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 public folder 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 Green 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 Green 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 Review 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 public folder a table that lists his/her published peer reviewed publications, 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 his/her 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.

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. At GSB, the primary purpose of the Journal Ranking System is to provide a consistent, externally-validated, internally-accepted, and predictable process to inform [teaching-related workload assignments](#). In addition, it provides clarity to faculty about which journals are valued most as outlets for their intellectual contributions. 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 public folder. Faculty members whose published research falls outside of the listed journals are encouraged to use the [Journal Ranking Challenge and Evaluation Process](#) to initiate the ranking of an unranked journal. It is the Candidate's responsibility to initiate this process well in advance of the RPT timeline.
- 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., "2016 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 [AACSB Intellectual Contribution Impact Grid](#) 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 Review Sheet. 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 faculty area responsibilities, participation in committee assignments, representing the School to various external constituencies.
- 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; 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 [AACSB Intellectual Contribution Impact Grid](#) 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 a lack of distinction 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, 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 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 [AACSB Intellectual Contribution Impact Grid](#) 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 Review Sheet and collateral materials to the public 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 his/her recommendations for the Office of the Provost.

The 'FSC Chair' fields questions from the Candidate pertaining to the preparation of materials for the public 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 he/she 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 a 'Committee of Three' (CT) for each case needing review in the academic year.

A Committee of Three (CT) is appointed by the FSC Chair for each RPT action. The Chair of the CT must neither be a member of the Candidate's Mentoring Team<sup>ii</sup> nor be the FSC Chair (or Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors), and must be an "arms-length" objective evaluator as described in endnote i with the exception of being the Candidate's colleague at the same institution. One member of the CT shall possess expertise pertaining to the Candidate's research whenever possible, and is expected to assist the CT Chair in preparing an objective assessment of the Candidate's research record. The CT 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 public folder, and where pertinent, a reading of the letters provided by external referees (the "arms-length" assessments). The CT 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 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 letter 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. Assisting the FSC Chair to finalize the FSC Report to the Dean.

All full-time faculty members in GSB are encouraged to review the public folder of the Candidate and provide input. However, only tenured 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. Tenured 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:** For all second reappointment, promotion and tenure actions, the documentation, including FSC recommendation 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 requests population of the appropriate Review Sheet as a Word document from Digital Measures. Candidate reviews, edits, completes, revises, and submits the Review Sheet and the collateral materials to the public folder by the appropriate deadlines.
- ii. FSC Chair (or the Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors) convenes a meeting to elect the CT for each case.
- iii. Dean 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 CT develops the initial summary of facts and draft FSC Report. This Report is sent to the FSC 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 public folder. At the beginning of the review meeting, the Chair of the CT presents an objective summary of the CT's draft FSC Report of the Candidate's record on teaching, research and service (as applicable).
- vi. There shall be a discussion of each section of the record (teaching, research, and service as applicable). After each section discussion, there shall be a private ballot containing the following voting options: (1) exceeds expectation, (2) meets expectations, (3) does not meet expectations, and (4) abstain. The vote will be counted and reported to the FSC members 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 FSC members present and recorded in the FSC report. In some instances, the draft report might be adopted as presented, with the simple addition of a summary evaluative paragraph. In other instances, where there are substantial disagreements within the FSC, the FSC Chair amends the Committee of Three draft report making sure the majority and minority opinions with supporting evidence are clear in the report. The FSC Chair submits the FSC Report with recommendation and voting results 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 memo and prepares his/her recommendation for the Provost.

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

All full-time faculty members are invited by the Dean to provide input on the Candidate's record on dimensions elaborated in section II. Not all dimensions will be applicable for all Candidates. Input provided must be based on the providers' experience and expertise. Evaluations of a Candidate's contributions to the improvement of organizational conditions for faculty development and productivity within GSB and the University should

be based on direct interaction with the Candidate.

Each faculty member is asked to submit comments in an *unmarked* envelope, place the unmarked envelope in a larger envelope, put their name on this larger envelope and send the package to the assigned staff assistant. This assistant ensures anonymity of the respondent and that each faculty member can only provide one response envelope per

Candidate. All received responses are forwarded as a batch of unmarked envelopes to the FSC Chair (or Chair of the Sub-Committee of Full Professors).

#### IV. 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: 12/2018  
 Updated by GSB FSC on: March 31, 2016

#### 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 Promotion (Green) Sheet as the evaluation form.

Dates	Activity
December or January (Year 2)	Dean advises Candidate of process and timeline.  Candidate requests Dean’s Office populate the public folder using the Review Sheet from Digital Measures.  FSC identifies Committee of Three for each eligible Candidate.
Mid February	Candidate submits complete documentation to the public folder.
Late February	Dean invites all untenured and tenured Grossman School faculty to participate in the anonymous input process on the Candidate's record. Materials available for review by untenured and tenured faculty members.
March 1	Deadline for receipt of written comments from tenured and untenured Grossman School faculty members.

March 2- March 15	FSC evaluates the Candidate.
Mid March	FSC submits the FSC Report and their recommendations 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 Promotion (Green) Sheet as the evaluation form.

Dates	Activity
May (end of Year 3)	<p>Dean advises Candidate of process and timeline. Communication to Candidate on key dates, their responsibilities.</p> <p>FSC identifies Committee of Three for each eligible Candidate.</p> <p>Candidate requests Dean’s Office populates the Review Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Mid July	<p>(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.</p>
August - early September (start of Year 4)	<p>Dean communicates to faculty regarding schedule and reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p>

	<p>(Optional) Dean requests letters from external reviewers.</p> <p>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>Public folder available for review by tenured and untenured Business faculty members.</p> <p>Dean invites all untenured and tenured faculty to submit the anonymous input on the Candidate's record.</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 tenured and untenured Business 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 submits FSC Report to the Dean.</p>
Mid December	Dean provides copy of FSC Report and Dean's written assessment to the Candidate who has 10 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.
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 evaluation 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 requests Dean's Office populate the Public Folder using the Review Sheet from Digital Measures.</p> <p>FSC identifies Committee of Three for each eligible Candidate.</p>
Mid July	Candidate provides to the Dean's Office list of external reviewers and packet of materials (research statement, sample articles, and CV).
Late August - early September (start of Year 6)	Dean communicates to faculty reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.



	<p>Dean requests letters from external reviewers.</p> <p>Faculty encouraged to visit Candidate's classes.</p>
October 1	Candidate submits complete public folder.
Mid October	<p>Evaluation letters due to be received from external reviewers.</p> <p>Dean invites all untenured and tenured faculty to submit the anonymous input on the Candidate's record.</p>
Mid October to November 1	Public 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 tenured and untenured Business 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 submits the FSC Report and recommendation 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 10 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.

## IV.B Timelines for Faculty Lecturers

### IV.B.1. Schedule for Formal Peer Review of **First** Reappointment at Full-Time Lecturer Rank

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 Committee of Three 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 Review Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Mid January	<p>Candidate submits documentation to the public folder. Dean invites all Grossman School faculty to participate in double blind process.</p> <p>Dean communicates to faculty re: schedule &amp; reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p>
Mid January - Mid February	Materials available for review by all Grossman School faculty.
Mid February	Deadline for receipt of written comments from all Grossman School faculty.
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**

<b>Dates</b>	<b>Activity</b>
Fall of year before 2-year contract expires	<p>Process is explained to candidate by Dean or his/her designee.</p> <p>FSC identifies Committee of Three 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 Review Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Mid January	<p>Candidate submits documentation. Dean invites all BSAD faculty to participate in double blind process. Communication to faculty re: schedule &amp; 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>Deadline for receipt of written comments from all, GSB faculty.</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	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidate requests Dean's Office populate the Review Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Late August to early September	<p>Dean communicates to faculty reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p> <p>FSC identifies Committee of Three for each eligible Candidate.</p> <p>Communication to Candidate on key dates/responsibilities.</p>
October 1	Candidate submits complete documentation to public folder.
Mid October	Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to submit double blind input on Candidate's record.
Last Two Weeks of October	Public folder available for review by tenured and untenured Business faculty members.
November 5	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from Grossman School faculty members.
End of November/Early December	FSC evaluates and arrives 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 10 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**

<b>Dates</b>	<b>Activity</b>
May of year before last year of appointment	<p>Process is explained to Candidate by Dean or his/her designee.</p> <p>Candidate requests Dean's Office populate the Review Sheet from Digital Measures.</p>
Summer and Fall of eligible year:	Candidate compiles public folder including Review Sheet.
Late August to early September:	<p>Communication to faculty re: schedule and reminder of open classroom/peer visitation policy.</p> <p>Communication to Candidate on key dates/responsibilities.</p>
October 1	Candidate submits complete documentation to the public folder.
Mid October	Dean invites all tenured and untenured faculty to submit double blind input on Candidate's record.

Last Two Weeks of October	Public folder available for review by tenured & untenured Business faculty members.
November 5	Confidential written comments on Candidate due from Grossman School faculty members.
End of November/Early December	FSC evaluates and arrives 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.

**V. 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.

---

<sup>i</sup> The current UVM full-time faculty contract (expiring June 30, 2020) defines an "arm's length evaluator" in 14.5, point ii (p. 38) 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).

<sup>ii</sup> 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 his/her 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](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.