

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

June 1, 2009

Updated from 9/24/06 version

INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the guidelines for review of faculty performance in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (hereafter *CALS* or the *college*) for the purpose of reappointment, promotion and tenure, recognizing the heterogeneous skills, backgrounds and goals of faculty members in the various departments in the College. This document is updated from the previous CALS RPT Guidelines dated September 24, 2004. The changes reflect University policies as stated in the third Collective Bargaining Agreement (hereafter the CBA) between the University of Vermont and United Academics ratified September 25, 2008, with clarification of procedures and established expectations in CALS.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement includes specific, detailed, high-quality information regarding the contractual relationship between faculty in the bargaining unit (hereafter *faculty*) and the college, which the faculty candidate (hereafter *candidate*) will find essential in planning for successful RPT actions. Article 14 contains the relevant language for reappointments, evaluations and promotions. Non-bargaining-unit CALS faculty continue to be governed by the language of the faculty handbook as well as the specific expectations contained in the present document.

The goal of the present document is to extend the Agreement language by defining expectations of faculty performance expectations in CALS. This document addresses expectations for all faculty in the college, including:

- I. Tenure-track faculty (begins on page 2)
- II. Lecturers (begins on page 8)
- III. Extension faculty (begins on page 12)
- IV. Research-track faculty (begins on page 18)

Faculty Lecturers in CALS whose salary line is partially supported by multiple sources (for example, General Funds, the Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension, or extramural research grants—Appendix A) must fulfill all obligations and expectations of those funding sources commensurate with the level of FTE support provided and the specific expectations associated with these assignments as defined by the department chair in the annual faculty workload form. Please refer to “general rules of thumb for CALS workload assignments” appended at the end of this document (Appendix B).

I. Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment and Reappointments of Assistant and Associate Professors During the Probationary Period (pre-tenure)

Tenure-track Assistant Professors are typically appointed to an initial three-year term. The faculty member undergoes review in the spring semester of their second year, and pending favorable progress, is appointed for a second two-year term (years 4 and 5). The faculty member undergoes a comprehensive university-wide review in the fall of their fourth year, with external peer-input. Pending favorable review, the faculty member is appointed for a third two-year term (years 6 and 7). The faculty member must undergo review for tenure in the fall of their 6th year, which includes extensive external peer-evaluation of scholarship and a comprehensive university-wide review of the faculty member's dossier of accomplishments. The result of the sixth year review is either promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure effective September 1 of the 7th year, or dismissal after expiration of the second reappointment (at the end of the 7th year). Faculty members may request to be considered for promotion and tenure prior to the 6th year if warranted by their dossier of accomplishments. The probationary period and the mandatory 6th year review can only be extended by Provost approval and in the case of exceptional extenuating circumstances as described in the CBA Article 14 section 5.d.

New faculty who are hired at the rank of Associate Professor are appointed to an initial two-year term. The faculty member's dossier is reviewed in the spring of year 1 for reappointment for a second two-year term (years 3 and 4). The faculty member must undergo review for tenure in the fall semester of their third year, which includes extensive external peer-evaluation of scholarship and comprehensive university-wide review of their dossier of accomplishments.

New faculty who are hired at the rank of Professor must undergo tenure review as described above, prior to commencing employment at the University of Vermont, as specified in the CBA Article 14 section 5.a.v.

A. Expectations of Tenure-Track Faculty During the Probationary Period

Initial Appointment Period (review conducted in the spring semester of 2nd Year)

Assistant Professors under review for first reappointment must demonstrate *progress* towards tenure. Progress includes:

- establishment of an active program of scholarly activity,
- becoming an effective teacher, and
- participating in departmental affairs,
- fulfillment of annual faculty workload assignments

Specifically these expectations include:

- formulation of a plan for productive scholarly activity
- indications of progress in scholarly activity
- attempts to obtain external competitive support for scholarly activity
- attendance at scientific meetings or exhibitions relevant to the scholarly activity
- participation in undergraduate teaching and/or graduate teaching
- participation in undergraduate advising and/or graduate advising
- efforts to improve effectiveness in teaching and advising
- participation in departmental faculty meetings

- attendance at departmental seminars

New faculty are encouraged to establish a productive relationship with a faculty mentor. External letters of evaluation are not required for the first reappointment, and they are not recommended for inclusion by either the college or university review committees.

Second Appointment Period (review conducted in the fall semester of 4th Year)

Assistant Professors under review for second reappointment, and Associate Professors hired without tenure under review for reappointment must demonstrate *continued* progress towards tenure that includes:

- evidence of a fully functional scholarly endeavor, for example, a productive laboratory, a productive research program, or a productive studio
- recruitment of graduate or undergraduate students to participate in scholarly activity
- peer-reviewed publications or exhibitions, as appropriate to the scholarly field
- success at attracting external funding appropriate to support the scholarly activity
- attendance and presentation or results at scientific meetings or professional exhibitions, as appropriate to the field
- success in teaching as evidenced by favorable student evaluations and peer observation
- success in advising as evidenced by favorable student evaluations
- success in undergraduate and/or graduate course development and improvement
- consistent efforts to improve effectiveness in teaching and advising
- participation in departmental issues
- participation in service to the department, college or the university
- participation in service to the profession, or to the community in a professional capacity
- fulfillment of all annual faculty workload assignments

B. Consideration for Tenure

Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty members considered for tenure are required to meet the standards of **teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity and service** in the *Agreement* as defined in Article 14.5.e.

The essential expectation for tenure is expressed in the CBA Article 14 section 5.e.:

"Each candidate is expected to be engaged in a program of work that is sound and productive and that can be expected to continue to develop throughout his or her professional career consistent with the needs and mission of the University. In all instances, excellent intellectual attainment...is the standard for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure."

The CBA provides an explicit list of evaluation criteria in Article 14 section 5.e. CALS faculty are required to also meet the following expectations, as well as any specific scholarship or performance expectations stated in the initial Letter of Hire.

CALS faculty must demonstrate:

- An established reputation in the scholarly field, as supported by external peer-evaluations by persons at arms-length to the candidate
- Evidence of a fully-functional and sustained scholarly endeavor
- Recruitment of graduate students, and possibly also undergraduate students to participate in scholarly activity

- Peer-reviewed publications or juried-exhibitions, as appropriate to the scholarly field
- Success in attracting consistent external funding appropriate to support the scholarly activity
- Attendance and presentation of results at professional meetings or exhibitions
- Success in undergraduate teaching and/or graduate teaching, as evidenced by student and peer evaluations
- Success in undergraduate advising and/or graduate advising, as evidenced by student evaluations and comments
- Success in undergraduate and/or graduate course development and improvement
- Consistent efforts to improve effectiveness in teaching and advising
- Engagement in departmental issues
- Consistent service to the department, college and the university community
- service to the profession, or to the community in a professional capacity
- fulfillment of all annual faculty workload assignments

Schedule for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

A full-time Assistant Professor must be informed no later than the end of the sixth year of service whether tenure will be granted; an Associate Professor without tenure must be informed no later than the end of the third year of service whether tenure will be granted. Hence the promotion dossier is due in the fall of the candidate's sixth year as assistant professor, or third year of service as Associate Professor. Extension of the probationary period for other than University-approved leave or care-giving associated with childbirth is possible in extraordinary circumstances, but must be approved by the Provost as described in Article 14.5.d.

The candidate's scholarship must be appraised by external peer-reviewers; these external peer-reviewers must be *arms length* and may not be previous advisors, advisees or collaborators on projects or manuscripts, family members, or have a personal history with the candidate in any way. The candidate's dossier must also be reviewed by the candidate's department peers, any secondary units (the candidate may hold appointments in, or may receive partial funding for the appointment from), the candidate's department chair, the candidate's college faculty standards committee, the candidate's college Dean, the University Faculty Standards Committee and the Provost. The disposition of the dossier is determined by the Provost, with all indicated levels of review advisory to the Provost.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in less than the usual probationary period requires unusual circumstances or exceptional performance in teaching, research, and service (*exceptional performance* is defined as that beyond what is usually seen for individuals at this point in their careers).

C. Documentation Required in the Candidate's Dossier

The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides an extensive list of evaluation criteria in Article 14.5.e. For clarity, the essential elements required for CALS faculty are summarized below.

Teaching Effectiveness

The candidate must present a variety of documented materials establishing their participation and effectiveness in undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and advising. The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides a list of criteria for teaching effectiveness in Article 14.5.e.i. The essential elements include:

- a **narrative** describing the teaching activity, efforts, and abilities. Consistent with the CBA, the candidate should use this narrative to assert their
 - intellectual competence, integrity and independence
 - knowledge of the field
 - willingness to improve teaching effectiveness through input of peers
 - ability to work with other faculty to deliver a curriculum that fosters student learning
 - capacity to structure course materials and lectures clearly and effectively in a ways that promote student learning
 - ability to employ strategies to assess student learning, and to adjust their teaching efforts in accord with those assessments to maximally promote student learning
 - ability to stimulate student intellectual interest and enthusiasm
- a **listing** of all courses assigned as part of the faculty member's workload, that includes class size, format (lecture, laboratory or seminar), and audience (undergraduate, undergraduate/graduates or graduate students). The candidate's role in each course in which they were not the sole instructor should be defined.
- a **summary table** of student course evaluations, which clearly indicates the quantitative results of the teaching evaluation instruments employed each semester. An **addendum** that includes a short representative sample of written comments from students may be included in the "**Miscellaneous**" section of the dossier.
- Letters of **peer evaluation** of the candidate's teaching based on classroom observation by colleagues; these peer-evaluations must be organized by the candidate's department Chair.
- A **table** summarizing the number of students advised, programs the candidate advises in, students' evaluation of the candidate's advising (the CALS instrument)

In addition, certain kinds of evidence are so powerful in supporting the candidate's effectiveness that they are desirable if available (that is, these strengthen the case but are not required). These include:

- Recognitions and awards
- Development by the candidate of new and effective techniques of instruction and instructional materials such as textbooks or lab manuals
- Publication on teaching in the discipline in peer-reviewed journals
- A selected sample solicited and unsolicited letters reviewing the candidate's teaching and/or advising, either from students or faculty, is a valuable addition to the dossier.
- External funding for innovations in teaching

Scholarship

The candidate must present a variety of documented materials establishing their effectiveness in scholarly activity and exhibit clear potential for sustained productivity in scholarship throughout their career. Scholarship is expected of all tenure-track faculty regardless of the distribution of their appointment between General Fund and Agricultural Experiment Station Funds. Faculty whose salary line is supported from multiple sources (for example, General Fund, Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension, Extramural Research Grants) must meet the expectations of each of those sources. The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides a list of criteria for scholarship in Article 14.5.e.ii. The essential elements of the dossier are:

- a **narrative** describing the:
 - nature and scope of the scholarly activity,
 - key contributions to the field, and evidence of impact of these contributions, the novelty/originality/significance of the work

- quality of the work,
- the candidate's vision for future activities and opportunities, potential funding sources to enable the work, and outlets to disseminate the results
- a **list** of all **peer-reviewed publications**, separated categorically into journal articles, book chapters, books, juried exhibitions, and peer-reviewed published abstracts.
- a separate **list of non-peer reviewed publications** and abstracts, if applicable
- a **list** of professional **presentations** of scholarly activity, separated categorically into invited presentations and seminars, oral presentations at professional meetings, poster presentations, and public presentations.
- a **description** of the **impact** or prestige of each scholarly outlet; that is, an indication to the evaluator regarding the tier significance of the journal, professional meeting, readership scope of the book or book chapter, or impact factor. A short summary of the impact provided by the candidate's most significant scholarly outputs may be included.
- a **list** of patents and **intellectual property** disclosures, if applicable.
- a **list** of all **external funding received**, indicating funding source, duration, amount of support, and title of the project.
- a list of any awards or professional recognition, if applicable

The Department Chair will provide:

- a narrative that makes clear any specific scholarly assignments or expectations, or any unique situational factors in, or special characteristics of, the faculty member's field of specialization to be taken into account in the review process.
- Solicited letters from peers at other institutions who have achieved the desired rank that attest that the candidate has become an effective researcher in their discipline and is recognized to have made valuable contributions advancing their field. These letters cannot be from the candidate's advisors, advisees or collaborators on projects or publications.
- the Chair's assessment of the faculty member's publication, exhibition, or presentation productivity, a commentary on the reputation of the cited journals or other media

The college defines scholarship in relation to the candidate's department and area of expertise into two areas: Scientific Research and Artistic Endeavors. Dossiers of candidates combining activities from the two cultures need a customized approach drawing from both sets of criteria.

Special notes on solicited external letters on scholarship: a copy of the letter sent by the chair should be included in the dossier as well as the qualifications of the individuals asked to contribute to the faculty member's review. The written solicitation by the chairperson should clearly articulate the university's evaluation criteria for the applicable personnel action (i.e., this document should outline guidelines for reappointment, promotion or tenure). These letters must be entirely arms-length and cannot be from major professors, post-doctoral supervisors, or research collaborators or any individual that shares a personal history with the candidate.

Service

The candidate must present evidence of investment in service to the department, institution, and professional community. However, it is critical for the candidate and chair to define an appropriate service commitment. This level of commitment is articulated in the annual faculty workload assignments, and generally, should not constitute more than 5-to-10% of the faculty member's effort except in highly unusual circumstances.

In the dossier, the candidate must include:

- a **narrative** describing the candidate's contribution to the University, the public and to the profession on a national or international level.
- a **list** of service activities, separated categorically into departmental, college and university activities. A separate listing should be provided for service to the profession and service in a professional capacity to the community. The lists should include dates of service, and note whether the candidate's service was solicited or volunteered.
- In documenting service, it is useful to provide some measure establishing the candidate's investment into the activity.

Examples of service include:

Administrative or committee assignments in the individual's department, college or the University. Professional service at the community, state, regional or national level (including membership on a grant review panel, program review panel, service as an exhibition judges, membership on a state professional advisory committee, service as an elected officer of a national society or member of an ongoing committee, service with public entities such as national laboratories, government agencies and private foundations).

D. Promotion to Full Professor

The rank of full professor in CALS is reached by those faculty who present documentation of the sustained professional activity of high quality and national or international impact. There is no specific requirement for the period of time that a faculty member must hold the rank of Associate Professor. However, the candidate must demonstrate clear evidence of significant advancement, sustained, high impact scholarly work, and a national or international reputation which has progressed demonstrably since their promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In addition to the criteria listed above for "Consideration of Tenure", the candidate must demonstrate:

- An established and highly respected reputation in the scholarly field, as evidenced by peers who have achieved the rank of full professor
- Evidence of a substantial, sustained, productive body of scholarly work with a national or international reputation, which has attracted consistent extramural funding to accomplish the work.
- That the candidate is truly outstanding in the student instruction as well as the scholarly field
- An indication that the candidate is engaged in University issues and shared governance
- Demonstration of engaged participation and leadership in professional service on a local, national or international level

Documentation must be presented during the fall RPT cycle in the form of a "Candidate's Dossier" ("green sheet" dossier) as described in section C above: "*Documentation Required in the Candidate's Dossier*". The candidate's scholarship must be appraised by external peer-reviewers who have achieved the rank of full Professor at their institutions; these external peer-reviewers must be *arms length* and may not be previous advisors, advisees or collaborators on projects or manuscripts, family members, or have a personal history with the candidate in any way. The candidate's dossier must also be reviewed by the candidate's department peers, any secondary units the candidate may hold appointments in or receives partial funding for the appointment from, the candidate's department chair, the candidate's college faculty standards committee, the candidate's college Dean, the University Faculty Standards Committee and the Provost. The disposition of the dossier is determined by the Provost, with all indicated levels of review advisory to the Provost.

II. Lecturers

Lecturers in CALS are governed by Article 14 of the CBA, specifically sections 10.a and 11. Expectations for teaching effectiveness are the same as those defined in section 5.e of Article 14 for tenure-track faculty.

A. Appointment and Reappointments of Lecturers

A Lecturer is initially appointed for a one-year term. The University may reappoint the Lecturer for a second one-year term. If the University is to make a reappointment to that faculty member in years consecutive to the first two appointments, the subsequent reappointments are for two-year terms. Lecturers must be informed, no later than March 1 of the terminal year of their appointment, whether reappointment will be offered. For this reason, Lecturers undergo reappointment review in the spring semester (January) of their terminal year.

Lecturers must undergo an internal review (the pink sheet) by the Department Chair and Dean prior to each reappointment which assesses:

- the Lecturer's performance,
- the availability of funding within the department to continue the position,
- the continued need for the position based on departmental workload and staffing.

All non-tenure-track faculty must undergo a comprehensive "Periodic Performance Review", generally every four years or at terms directed by the Dean.

Lecturers may request to be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer after completion of six years of full time service (defined as 0.75 FTE or greater) as a lecturer within an eight year period. Faculty who have achieved the rank of Senior Lecturer may be appointed for three-year, four-year, or five-year terms, depending on the needs of the department and taking into account budgetary limitations, and programmatic or enrollment considerations. Senior Lecturers must be informed, no later than December 15 of the terminal year of their appointment, whether reappointment will be offered. For this reason, Senior Lecturers undergo reappointment review in the Fall semester (October) of their terminal year.

B. Expectations of Lecturers for Reappointment

Lecturers in CALS are governed by Article 14 of the CBA, and are expected to devote the majority of their time and effort to teaching and advising, commensurate with their FTE supported by General Fund, and in accord with the instructional expectations defined by the department Chair in the annual workload assignment form. Lecturers are also expected to serve on Departmental, College or University committees. Assignments to scholarly activity should be minimal and approved on a case-by-case basis, although some assignment by chairs to scholarly activity in pedagogy is appropriate and Lecturers are expected to have some portion of their time assigned to broadening the curricular experience.

Lecturers in CALS whose salary line is partially-supported by sources other than General Funds (for example, the Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension, or extramural research grants) must fulfill all obligations and expectations of those funding sources commensurate with the level of FTE support provided, as well as specific expectations associated with these assignments as defined by the department chair in the annual faculty workload form.

C. Reappointment Review (conducted in the terminal year of the appointment)

Pink Sheet Review:

The faculty member under consideration for reappointment must provide the department chair with the following information for review:

- a **list of teaching activities** during the period of appointment, including courses taught, and enrollment of courses
- a **brief narrative** (one paragraph) of efforts to gauge teaching effectiveness and efforts to improve update, revise, restructure or develop undergraduate courses
- a **summary** of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluation and departmental evaluation, and peer-evaluation of teaching if arranged by the chair
- a **summary** of advising activities, including the number of students advised and the programs for which advising was conducted
- a **summary** of advising effectiveness that includes advisee evaluations
- **list** of service activities, including department, college or university committee participation, community service, or service to the profession.
- An updated **curriculum vitae**

The department chair will provide brief statements regarding:

- the Lecturer's performance,
- the availability of funding within the department to continue the position,
- the continued need for the position based on departmental workload.

Documentation Required for the Periodic Performance Review (to coincide, where possible, with the pink sheet review):

A more comprehensive evaluation, the "Periodic Performance Review" is required of all non-tenure-track faculty, generally every four years or at intervals directed by the Dean. The faculty member being evaluated in the Periodic Performance Review must provide the department chair with a dossier which contains the following information for review of teaching effectiveness. Article 14.5.e. evaluation criteria, which are used to assess teaching effectiveness of all UVM faculty. The dossier must include, at minimum:

- a **narrative** describing the teaching activity, efforts, and abilities. Consistent with the CBA, the candidate should use this narrative to assert their
 - intellectual competence, integrity and independence
 - knowledge of the field
 - willingness to improve teaching effectiveness through input of peers
 - ability to work with other faculty to deliver a curriculum that fosters student learning
 - capacity to structure course materials and lectures clearly and effectively in a ways that promote student learning
 - ability to employ strategies to assess student learning, and to adjust their teaching efforts in accord with those assessments to maximally promote student learning
 - ability to stimulate student intellectual interest and enthusiasm
- a **listing** of all courses assigned as part of the faculty member's workload, that includes class size, format (lecture, laboratory or seminar), and audience (undergraduate, undergraduate/graduates or graduate students). The candidate's role in each course in which they were not the sole instructor should be defined.
- a **summary table** of student course evaluations, which clearly indicates the quantitative results of the teaching evaluation instruments employed each semester. An **addendum** that

includes a short representative sample of written comments from students may be included in the "**Miscellaneous**" section of the dossier.

- Letters of **peer evaluation** of the candidate's teaching based on classroom observation by colleagues; these peer-evaluations must be organized by the candidate's department Chair.
- A **table** summarizing the number of students advised, programs the candidate advises in, students' evaluation of the candidate's advising (the CALS instrument)

In addition, certain kinds of evidence are so powerful in supporting the candidate's effectiveness that they are desirable if available (that is, these strengthen the case but are not required). These include:

- Recognitions and awards
- Development by the candidate of new and effective techniques of instruction and instructional materials such as textbooks or lab manuals
- Publication on teaching in the discipline in peer-reviewed journals
- A selected sample solicited and unsolicited letters reviewing the candidate's teaching and/or advising, either from students or faculty, is a valuable addition to the dossier.
- External funding for innovations in teaching

The candidate must present evidence of investment in departmental or professional activities. However, it is critical for the candidate and chair to define an appropriate service commitment. This level of commitment is articulated in the annual faculty workload assignments, and generally, should not constitute more than 5-to-10% of the faculty member's effort except in highly unusual circumstances.

The dossier should also include **service** to the department, institution, and the professional community:

- a **narrative** describing the candidate's contribution to the University, the public and to the profession on a national or international level.
- a **list** of service activities, separated categorically into departmental, college and university activities. A separate listing should be provided for service to the profession and service in a professional capacity to the community. The lists should include dates of service, and note whether the candidate's service was solicited or volunteered.
- In documenting service, it is useful to provide some measure establishing the candidate's investment into the activity.

Examples of service include:

Administrative or committee assignments in the individual's department, college or the University. Professional service at the community, state, regional or national level (including membership on a grant review panel, program review panel, service as an exhibition judges, membership on a state professional advisory committee, service as an elected officer of a national society or member of an ongoing committee, service with public entities such as national laboratories, government agencies and private foundations).

The Periodic Performance Review Dossier of Lecturers whose appointment is supported in part by sources other than General Funds (AES, Extension, or Extramural Grants), must also include a narrative of work conducted to meet the expectations of the other sources providing partial-salary support.

D. Expectations for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Candidates who wish to be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer must submit a dossier for in accord with the fall semester RPT cycle, due October 1. The dossier must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching and advising.

The candidate must present a variety of documented materials establishing their participation and effectiveness in undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and advising. The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides a list of criteria for teaching effectiveness in Article 14.5.e.i. The essential elements include:

- a **narrative** describing the teaching activity, efforts, and abilities. Consistent with the CBA, the candidate should use this narrative to assert their
 - intellectual competence, integrity and independence
 - knowledge of the field
 - willingness to improve teaching effectiveness through input of peers
 - ability to work with other faculty to deliver a curriculum that fosters student learning
 - capacity to structure course materials and lectures clearly and effectively in a ways that promote student learning
 - ability to employ strategies to assess student learning, and to adjust their teaching efforts in accord with those assessments to maximally promote student learning
 - ability to stimulate student intellectual interest and enthusiasm
- a **listing** of all courses assigned as part of the faculty member's workload, that includes class size, format (lecture, laboratory or seminar), and audience (undergraduate, undergraduate/graduates or graduate students). The candidate's role in each course in which they were not the sole instructor should be defined.
- a **summary table** of student course evaluations, which clearly indicates the quantitative results of the teaching evaluation instruments employed each semester. An **addendum** that includes a short representative sample of written comments from students may be included in the "Miscellaneous" section of the dossier.
- Letters of **peer evaluation** of the candidate's teaching based on classroom observation by colleagues; these peer-evaluations must be organized by the candidate's department Chair.
- A **table** summarizing the number of students advised, programs the candidate advises in, students' evaluation of the candidate's advising (the CALS instrument)

The dossier must evidence that the candidate has contributed to the mission of the home department, college, and university through **service activities**. This should include

- a brief **narrative** describing the candidate's contribution to the University, the public and to the profession on a national or international level.
- a **list** of service activities, separated categorically into departmental, college and university activities. A separate listing should be provided for service to the profession and service in a professional capacity to the community. The lists should include dates of service, and note whether the candidate's service was solicited or volunteered.
- In documenting service, it is useful to provide some measure establishing the candidate's investment into the activity.

In addition, certain kinds of evidence are so powerful in supporting the candidate's effectiveness that they are desirable if available (that is, these strengthen the case but are not required). These include:

- Recognitions and awards

- Development by the candidate of new and effective techniques of instruction and instructional materials such as textbooks or lab manuals
- Publication on teaching in the discipline in peer-reviewed journals
- A selected sample solicited and unsolicited letters reviewing the candidate's teaching and/or advising, either from students or faculty, are a valuable addition to the dossier.
- External funding for innovations in teaching

The candidate may also include a list of teaching awards received, pedagogically related research publications, particularly in peer-reviewed journals, to provide evidence of a candidate's extra investment in education. Grants for teaching-related research are especially effective in demonstrating commitment to improving the educational process and the candidate's case for promotion.

The candidate's **teaching effectiveness must be appraised by three peers** at UVM, chosen by the department chair, who have achieved the rank of Senior Lecturer. The dossier, along with letters from these three peers will then be reviewed by the candidate's department peers, any secondary units the candidate may hold appointments in or receives partial funding for the appointment from, the candidate's department chair, the candidate's college faculty standards committee, the candidate's college Dean, the University Faculty Standards Committee and the Provost. The disposition of the dossier is determined by the Provost, with all indicated levels of review advisory to the Provost.

III. Extension Faculty

Extension faculty in CALS are governed by Article 14 of the CBA, specifically sections 10.d and 11. Extension faculty in CALS whose salary line is partially-supported by sources other than Extension funds (for example, the Agricultural Experiment Station, General Funds, or extramural research grants) must fulfill all obligations and expectations of those funding sources commensurate with the level of FTE support provided, as well as specific expectations associated with these assignments as defined by the department chair in the annual faculty workload form.

A. Schedule for Reappointment of Extension Faculty

Faculty with the title of Extension Instructor and Extension Assistant Professor are appointed for a one-year term and may be reappointed for subsequent one-year terms subject to favorable performance review and availability of funding. Faculty who have achieved the rank of Extension Associate Professor are eligible for term appointments of up to two-years, and Extension Professors are eligible for term appointments of up to three-years. The appointment term of all Extension faculty is at the discretion of the Dean of CALS in consultation with the Dean of Extension, and requires favorable performance review and availability of funding. Extension faculty must be provided with notification of non-reappointment at least twelve (12) months before the expiration of an appointment after two (2) or more years in the institution (Article 14. 11.b. iii).

Extension faculty must undergo an internal review (the pink sheet) by the Department Chair and CALS Dean prior to each reappointment. This review will include:

- an assessment of performance
- compliance with reporting requirements
- availability of funds
- need for the program area

All non-tenure-track faculty must undergo a comprehensive "Periodic Performance Review", generally every four years or at terms directed by the CALS Dean. Faculty may request a full-dossier "Period Performance Review" at intervals more frequently than scheduled by the Dean, even for each reappointment action if so desired by the faculty member.

B. Expectations for Reappointment of Extension Faculty

Extension faculty members are required to meet standards of performance, as defined in the CBA, in the areas of Extension teaching (Article 14.10.d.ii.(a).(i)), scholarship, research and creative activity (Article 14.10.d.(a).(ii), and community/university service (Article 14.10.d.(a).(iii). General responsibilities of Extension faculty are the development and delivery of non-credit educational extension programming to various audiences, as well as research/scholarship to enable high quality service to Extension stakeholders, and to enable delivery of up-to-date relevant Extension programming. Typical duties include, but are not limited to: preparation of program materials, publications, newsletters, articles, radio, computer and television programs; facilitation of groups and workshops; addressing requests of individuals for advice and information; communicating, publication of peer-reviewed articles appropriate to the field, acquisition of extramural funds to conduct expected scholarly/research activities, and articulation with other professional groups and advisors.

Extension faculty in CALS whose salary line is partially-supported by sources other than Extension funds (for example, the Agricultural Experiment Station, General Funds, or extramural research grants) must fulfill all obligations and expectations of those funding sources commensurate with the level of FTE support provided by those sources, provided, as well as specific expectations associated with these assignments as defined by the department chair in the annual faculty workload form.

C. Reappointment Review (conducted in spring semester at least 12 months prior to expiration of the current appointment)

Pink Sheet Review:

The faculty member under consideration for reappointment must provide the department chair with, at minimum, the following information for review:

- a **list of Extension Programming activities** during the period of appointment, including programs taught, and enrollment of programs
- a **brief narrative** (one paragraph) of efforts to gauge learning by the target audiences, teaching effectiveness, and efforts to improve update, revise, restructure or develop extension programming
- a **summary** of indicator instruments used to evaluate instructional and program effectiveness, including participant evaluation instruments, departmental evaluation, and peer-evaluation of extension programming, if arranged by the chair
- a **list of Extension research projects** engaged in the period of appointment, including sources of support, start and end dates of the funding
- a **list of Extension publications** accepted and submitted during the most recent appointment period
- a **list** of Extension-related grant proposals submitted during the most recent appointment period, with a **list** of personnel involved in, or supported by, the faculty member's extramurally-funded Extension-related projects
- a **list** of all available **salary support** to continue the position

- a **list** of service activities, including department, Extension, college or university committee participation, community service, or service to the profession
- An updated **curriculum vitae**.

The department chair will provide brief statements regarding:

- the faculty member's performance,
- the availability of funding from all sources to continue the position,
- the strategic advantage to the department and the University to continue the position.

Documentation Required for the Periodic Performance Review (to coincide, where possible, with the pink sheet review):

A more comprehensive evaluation, the "Periodic Performance Review" is required of all non-tenure-track faculty, generally every four years, or at intervals directed by the CALS Dean. The dossier for the Periodic Performance Review must include the three integral components of the Extension appointment: Extension Instructional Programming, Extension Scholarship, and Extension Service, (as described in CBA Article 14.10.d.ii.a). The essential elements of the dossier are:

(i)Extension Programming/Instruction

- a **narrative** describing Extension instructional programming activities, efforts, and abilities. Consistent with the CBA, the candidate should use this narrative to assert their
 - intellectual competence, integrity and independence
 - knowledge of the field
 - willingness to improve instructional effectiveness through input of peers
 - ability to work with other faculty to deliver Extension programming that fosters participant learning
 - capacity to structure program materials and presentations clearly and effectively in ways that promote participant learning
 - ability to employ strategies to assess participant learning, and to adjust their instructional efforts in accord with those assessments to maximally promote participant learning
 - ability to stimulate participants interest and enthusiasm to put learned material into practice
- a **listing** of all program activities assigned as part of the faculty member's workload, that includes program event attendance and participation in instructional programming, program format, and target audience. The candidate's role in each program activity should be defined.
- a **summary table** of participant evaluations of instructional programming, which clearly indicates the quantitative results of the evaluation instruments employed. An **addendum** that includes a short representative sample of written comments from participants may be included in the "**Miscellaneous**" section of the dossier.
- **Peer evaluation** of the candidate's programming based on first-hand observation by **UVM colleagues**; these peer-evaluations must be organized by the candidate's department Chair.

In addition, certain kinds of evidence are so powerful in supporting the faculty member's effectiveness that they are desirable if available (that is, these strengthen the case but are not required). These include:

- Recognitions and awards
- Development by the candidate of new and effective techniques of instruction and program materials such as brochures, instructional manuals, or web-based program information
- Publication of Extension program materials in peer-reviewed journals, or contributions to Extension.
- A selected sample solicited and unsolicited letters reviewing the candidate's teaching and/or advising, either from students or faculty, are a valuable addition to the dossier.
- External funding for Extension instructional programming activities

(ii) Extension Scholarship

This portion of the dossier for the Periodic Performance Review should be prepared in consideration of evaluation criteria described in CBA Article 14.10.d.ii.a (ii), and must include, at minimum, the following essential elements:

- a **narrative** describing the:
 - nature and scope of their Extension-based scholarly activity ,
 - key contributions to the scholarly field, evidence of impact of these contributions, and the novelty/originality/significance of the work
 - quality of the Extension-related scholarly work,
 - the faculty member's vision for future activities and opportunities, potential funding sources to enable the Extension scholarship, and outlets to disseminate the results
- a **list** of all **peer-reviewed publications resulting from Extension scholarship**, separated categorically into journal articles, manuals, pamphlets, book chapters, books, and peer-reviewed published abstracts.
- a separate **list of non-peer reviewed Extension publications**, manuals, abstracts, brochures, proceedings and other similar materials,
- a **list** of professional **presentations** of Extension scholarly activity, separated categorically into invited presentations and seminars, oral presentations at professional meetings, poster presentations, and public presentations.
- a **description** of the **impact** or prestige of each scholarly outlet; that is, an indication to the evaluator regarding the tier significance of the journal, professional meeting, readership scope of the book or book chapter, or impact factor. A short summary of the impact provided by the candidate's most significant scholarly outputs may be included.
- a **list** of patents and **intellectual property** disclosures, if applicable.
- a **list** of all **external funding received to enable Extension scholarship activities**, indicating funding source, duration, amount of support, and title of the project.
- a list of any awards or professional recognition, if applicable

(iii) Extension-assigned Service

The dossier should also include a section on **service** to the department, institution, and the professional community, as assigned under the Extension FTE portion of their annual workload assignment:

- a **narrative** describing the faculty member's contribution to the University, the public and to the profession on a national or international level.
- a **list** of service activities, separated categorically into departmental, college and university activities. A separate listing should be provided for service to the profession and service in a professional capacity to the community. The lists should include dates of service, and note whether the candidate's service was solicited or volunteered.

- In documenting service, it is useful to provide some measure establishing the candidate's investment into the activity.

Examples of service include:

Administrative or committee assignments in the individual's department, college or the University. Professional service at the community, state, regional or national level (including membership Extension boards, review panels for extramural funding proposals, program review panel, service as an exhibition judges, membership on a state professional advisory committee, service as an elected officer of a national society or member of an ongoing committee, service with public entities such as national laboratories, government agencies and private foundations).

The Periodic Performance Review Dossier of Extension faculty whose appointment is supported in part by sources other than UVM Extension funds (AES, General Fund, or Extramural Grants), must also include a narrative of work conducted to meet the expectations of the other sources providing partial-salary support.

D. Expectations for Promotion of Extension Faculty

Extension faculty may be considered for promotion to Extension Associate Professor or Extension Professor whenever the candidate believes they have met the standards for the proposed rank. Candidates who wish to be considered for promotion must submit their dossier (green sheets) for consideration in the fall RPT cycle (due September 1). This dossier should be the same format as that for the Periodic Performance Review described immediately above, taking into consideration the expectations to achieve rank, described below.

The faculty member will prepare his or her dossier for promotion consisting of a self-evaluation and a most recent curriculum vitae, which shall address his or her work in the performance areas of Extension teaching, scholarship/research/creative achievement and service. The dossier will be evaluated by external peers (no less than three for Associate Professor, no less than five for Professor), the department Chair, department faculty, the College Faculty Standards Committee, the CALS Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the Provost. The Provost's decision shall constitute the final action of the University regarding promotion.

Expectations to Achieve Extension Ranks

Extension Instructor: Appointment or reappointment as Extension Instructor requires a judgment that the person being appointed possesses the potential to develop and to meet substantially the following criteria:

- demonstrates cooperativeness, initiative and ability as an educator
- demonstrates an ability to plan and conduct Extension programs
- demonstrates competence in the subject-matter area
- demonstrates ability in public relations skills and interpersonal and mass communication

Extension Assistant Professor: Appointment or promotion to Extension Assistant Professor requires an earned doctorate degree or highest terminal degree expected for the position held. All requirements of the Instructor's rank are to be met with the additional qualifications that demonstrate:

- evidence of professional growth
- evidence of continued development of communication skills
- increasing levels of leadership in areas of responsibility

- excellence in the work appropriate to their work assignments, to include extension teaching, scholarship and service

Extension Associate Professor: Appointment, reappointment or promotion to Extension Associate Professor requires both evidence that the person exhibits satisfactory indications that his or her work is sound and productive and that professional development will continue to develop throughout their career. All the requirements of Extension Assistant Professor must be met with the additional qualifications:

- sustained effectiveness in teaching and other assigned duties as determined by clientele, peer, administrative and external evaluations
- achievement in scholarship and creative activity that establishes the individual as a state, regional and national contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction
- ability to objectively evaluate, strengthen, and improve existing programs and a basis for launching new ones
- quality in published results and/or creative works
- active involvement in service by participation within regional and national professional or industry organizations
- leadership in program enhancement and development
- consistency and growth in their work and a likelihood of continuing excellence, demonstration of an emerging reputation, and the clear promise of sustained contributions in the future.

Extension Professor: Appointment, reappointment or promotion to Extension Professor requires demonstrated evidence that the person exhibits a high degree of professional accomplishment and reasonable assurance that this level of achievement will be sustained. Generally, a high degree of professional accomplishment is evidenced most clearly by forms of scholarly presentations made, and service rendered, to accomplished professional groups in a region extending beyond Vermont or in the national or international arena. Evaluation of this accomplishment should come from highly accomplished peer professionals at institutions in these broader arenas as well as from UVM Extension.

All requirements for the rank of Associate Professor must be met on a continued basis with the addition requirements of:

- Demonstration of a substantial command of the whole subject matter field in the assigned area of responsibility, and a well marked, sound and significant scholarly view
- Demonstrated reputation as a leader in regional, national and/or international arenas in the field of work
- Demonstrated distinction in teaching or other assigned duties as evident in continuing development and sustained effectiveness in these areas
- Demonstrated distinction in scholarship, as evidenced by recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession.

The faculty member shall present a record of continuing sustained excellence which demonstrates that the candidate is recognized for contributions to knowledge in the discipline; is recognized by peers and students as an excellent teacher and contributes to the overall effort and reputation of the University through appropriate extension of knowledge and discipline-related service.

IV. Research-track Faculty

Research-track faculty in CALS are governed by Article 14 of the CBA, specifically sections 10.c and 11.

A. Schedule for Appointment and Reappointment of Research-track Faculty

All Research-track faculty are initially appointed for a period of one-year. Research-track faculty must undergo an annual internal review (the pink sheet) by the Department Chair and Dean prior to each reappointment which assesses:

- the Research-track faculty member's performance,
- the availability of funding to continue the position,
- the strategic advantage to the department and the University to continue the position.

All non-tenure-track faculty must undergo a comprehensive "Periodic Performance Review", generally every four years, or at intervals directed by the Dean.

All research-track appointments are subject to continued availability of funding. In most cases, research-track faculty are primarily or entirely dependent upon funding from extramural sources. If funding is no longer available, research-track faculty must be given, at minimum, **30 days notice** prior to the termination of their appointment with UVM.

Research Associates and Research Assistant Professors may only be appointed a term of up to one-year, which may be renewed for additional one-year terms, subject to favorable performance review and demonstrated availability of funding. Research Associate Professors may be appointed for terms up to two years in length, and Research Professors are eligible for appointments of up to three years in length, provided they have secured grant funding that enables salary support for their appointment for that period. The length of appointment terms for Research Associate Professors and Research professors are at the discretion of the Chair and Dean.

B. Expectations for Reappointment of Research-track Faculty

Research-track faculty are expected to devote the majority of their time and effort to basic or applied research. The same privileges and the same scholarly standards for reappointment and promotion apply as for the "**Scholarship**" expectations outlined under "Article 14.5.e.ii" which describes scholarship expectations of tenure-track appointments. The scholarship expectations of Research-track faculty should be specific, intimately related to the objectives of the funding sources providing salary support for the position, and specifically documented by the department chair in the annual faculty workload form assignment. Instruction and advising of students is only appropriate if the students are working directly on the faculty member's extramural projects providing salary support, or if the faculty member's scholarship is supported in part by general funds, the Agricultural Experiment Station, or instructional extramural grants. Research-track faculty supported by extramural grant funds may serve on Departmental, College or University committees if they desire, but are neither expected nor obliged to fulfill the service role required of faculty supported through general funds, the Agricultural Experiment Station, or Extension. All reappointment actions and promotion decisions will be based on the individual's research/scholarship as specifically defined in the annual workloads assigned by the department chair.

Research-track faculty in CALS whose salary line is partially-supported by sources other than extramural funds (for example, the Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension, or General Funds) must fulfill all obligations and expectations of those funding sources commensurate with the level of FTE support provided, as well as specific expectations associated with these assignments as defined by the department chair in the annual faculty workload form.

Pink Sheet Review (conducted in the terminal year of the appointment):

The central criteria for continued reappointment or Research-track faculty are:

- External funding
- Relevance of research program to the department and college mission
- Published articles in peer-review journals
- Participation in national and international meetings, especially as a presenter and ideally as an invited presenter
- Reviewing for reputable journals and national funding agencies
- Citation of work in other publications
- Presenting invited seminars at other institutions

Accordingly, the faculty member under consideration for reappointment must provide the department chair with the following information for review:

- a **list of research projects** engaged in the period of appointment, including sources of support, start and end dates of the funding
- a **list of research publications** accepted and submitted during the most recent appointment period
- a **list** of grant proposals submitted during the most recent appointment period
- a **list** of all available **salary support** to continue the position
- a **list** of personnel involved in or supported by in the faculty member's research projects,
- an updated **curriculum vitae**

The department chair will provide brief statements regarding:

- the faculty member's performance,
- the availability of funding from all sources to continue the position,
- the strategic advantage to the department and the University to continue the position.

Documentation Required for the Periodic Performance Review (to coincide, where possible, with the pink sheet review):

A more comprehensive evaluation, the "Periodic Performance Review" is required of all non-tenure-track faculty, generally every four years, or at intervals directed by the Dean. The dossier for the Periodic Performance Review should resemble the "Scholarship" section of dossiers prepared by tenure-track faculty (described in CBA Article 14.5.e.ii). The essential elements of the dossier are:

- a **narrative** describing the:
 - nature and scope of the scholarly activity,
 - key contributions to the field, and evidence of impact of these contributions, the novelty/originality/significance of the work
 - quality of the work,
 - the candidate's vision for future activities and opportunities, potential funding sources to enable the work, and outlets to disseminate the results

- a **list** of all **peer-reviewed publications**, separated categorically into journal articles, book chapters, books, juried exhibitions, and peer-reviewed published abstracts.
- a separate **list of non-peer reviewed publications** and abstracts, if applicable
- a **list** of professional **presentations** of scholarly activity, separated categorically into invited presentations and seminars, oral presentations at professional meetings, poster presentations, and public presentations.
- a **description** of the **impact** or prestige of each scholarly outlet; that is, an indication to the evaluator regarding the tier significance of the journal, professional meeting, readership scope of the book or book chapter, or impact factor. A short summary of the impact provided by the candidate's most significant scholarly outputs may be included.
- a **list** of patents and **intellectual property** disclosures, if applicable.
- a **list** of all **external funding received**, indicating funding source, duration, amount of support, and title of the project.
- a list of any awards or professional recognition, if applicable

The Department Chair will provide:

- a narrative that makes clear any specific scholarly assignments or expectations, or any unique situational factors in, or special characteristics of, the faculty member's field of specialization to be taken into account in the review process,
- an assessment of the faculty member's publication, exhibition, or presentation productivity, a commentary on the reputation of the cited journals or other media, relative to peer expectations in the scholarly area,
- an assessment of the availability of funding from all sources to continue the position,
- the strategic advantage to the department and the University to continue the position.

Although **service** is not required of Research-track faculty, the dossier should include any service provided to the profession, which are typical expectations of funding agencies, such as:

- the candidate's contribution to the profession on a national or international level.
- membership on a grant review panel, program review panel, service as an exhibition judges, membership on a state professional advisory committee, service as an elected officer of a national society or member of an ongoing committee, service with public entities such as national laboratories, government agencies and private foundations. The list should include dates of service, and note whether the candidate's service was solicited or volunteered.

The Periodic Performance Review Dossier of Research-track faculty whose appointment is supported in part by sources other than external grants (AES, General Fund, or Extension), must also include a narrative of work conducted to meet the expectations of the other sources providing partial-salary support.

Expectations for Promotion of Research-track Faculty

Research-track faculty who wish to be considered for promotion in rank must present documentation during the fall RPT cycle in the form of a "Candidate's Dossier" ("green sheet" dossier) as described in "Scholarship" portion of section I (page 6) of this document). The candidate's scholarship must be appraised by external peer-reviewers who have achieved the rank sought by promotion; these external peer-reviewers must be *arms length* and may not be previous advisors, advisees or collaborators on projects or manuscripts, family members, or have a personal history with the candidate in any way. The candidate's dossier must also be reviewed by the candidate's department peers, any secondary units the candidate may hold appointments in or

receives partial funding for the appointment from, the candidate's department chair, the candidate's college faculty standards committee, the candidate's college Dean, the University Faculty Standards Committee and the Provost. The disposition of the dossier is determined by the Provost, with all indicated levels of review advisory to the Provost.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

The candidate must present a variety of documented materials establishing their effectiveness in scholarly activity and exhibit clear potential for sustained productivity in scholarship. The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides a list of criteria for scholarship in Article 14.5.e.ii. The essential elements of the dossier are:

- a **narrative** describing the:
 - nature and scope of the scholarly activity,
 - key contributions to the field, and evidence of impact of these contributions, the novelty/originality/significance of the work
 - quality of the work,
 - the candidate's vision for future activities and opportunities, potential funding sources to enable the work, and outlets to disseminate the results
- a **list** of all **peer-reviewed publications**, separated categorically into journal articles, book chapters, books, juried exhibitions, and peer-reviewed published abstracts.
- a separate **list of non-peer reviewed publications** and abstracts, if applicable
- a **list** of professional **presentations** of scholarly activity, separated categorically into invited presentations and seminars, oral presentations at professional meetings, poster presentations, and public presentations.
- a **description** of the **impact** or prestige of each scholarly outlet; that is, an indication to the evaluator regarding the tier significance of the journal, professional meeting, readership scope of the book or book chapter, or impact factor. A short summary of the impact provided by the candidate's most significant scholarly outputs may be included.
- a **list** of patents and **intellectual property** disclosures, if applicable.
- a **list** of all **external funding received**, indicating funding source, duration, amount of support, and title of the project.
- a list of any awards or professional recognition, if applicable

The Department Chair will provide:

- a narrative that makes clear any specific scholarly assignments or expectations, or any unique situational factors in, or special characteristics of, the faculty member's field of specialization to be taken into account in the review process.
- Solicited letters from peers at other institutions who have achieved the desired rank that attest that the candidate has become an effective researcher in their discipline and is recognized to have made valuable contributions advancing their field. These letters cannot be from the candidate's advisors, advisees or collaborators on projects or publications.
- the Chair's assessment of the faculty member's publication, exhibition, or presentation productivity, a commentary on the reputation of the cited journals or other media

Special notes on solicited external letters on scholarship: a copy of the letter sent by the chair should be included in the dossier as well as the qualifications of the individuals asked to contribute to the faculty member's review. The written solicitation by the chairperson should clearly articulate the university's evaluation criteria for the applicable personnel action (i.e., this document should outline guidelines for reappointment, promotion or tenure). These letters must be entirely arms-

length and cannot be from major professors, post-doctoral supervisors, or research collaborators. or any individual that shares a personal history with the candidate.

Promotion to Research Professor

The rank of full professor in CALS is reached by those faculty who present documentation of the sustained professional activity of high quality and national or international impact. There is no specific requirement for the period of time that a faculty member must hold the rank of Research Associate Professor. However, the candidate must demonstrate clear evidence of significant advancement, sustained, high impact scholarly work, and a national or international reputation which has progressed demonstrably since their promotion to Research Associate Professor. The candidate must demonstrate:

- An established and highly respected reputation in the scholarly field, as evidenced by peers who have achieved the rank of full professor
- Evidence of a substantial, sustained, productive body of scholarly work with a national or international reputation, which has attracted consistent extramural funding to accomplish the work.
- That the candidate is truly outstanding in the student scholarly field

APPENDIX A: Additional Criteria for Faculty whose salary line is supported by more than one funding source.

Partial Appointments in the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES)

The expectations for maintaining a partial FTE appointment supported by funds associated with the Agricultural Experiment Station include maintaining an active Hatch project which is approved by both the AES Director and the USDA. Faculty who have not had an approved Hatch project for more than one year may have their AES appointment revoked at the discretion of the AES Director. The procedure and expectation for maintaining an active Hatch project can be found at the following site, which is modified from time to time:

<http://www.uvm.edu/vtaes/?Page=instr09.htm>.

In addition, the department chair must provide a list of specific expectations for the AES portion of the faculty member's appointment in each annual faculty workload assignment; these AES expectations should be listed using a separate annual workload form designated "AES appointment portion".

Partial Appointments funded by UVM Extension (EXT)

The expectations for maintaining a partial FTE appointment supported by funds associated with UVM Extension include working in a defined Extension priority program area, demonstration of Extension programming and scholarship relevant to, and valued by, Vermont citizens, and completion of all reporting, planning, and public outreach activities requested by the Dean of Extension. The specific expectations for the annual EXT appointment must be specified in the faculty member's Personal Performance Plan (PPP) which must be entered annually in the ALBERT system, and updated quarterly with activity reports. The PPP must be approved by the department Chair and the Dean of Extension (or his/her designee), and must be presented as a separate form of the faculty member's annual workload assignment; the "EXT appointment portion" of the annual workload assignment must detail the specific expectations for EXT-programming, EXT-scholarship, and EXT-service as reported in the PPP.

Partial FTE Appointments for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Supported by Extramural Grants

The expectations for maintaining a partial FTE appointment supported by extramural grants are fulfillment of the objectives, intent, and basis of the external grant, as well as successfully maintaining adequate extramural funds to support the appointment. Thus, the expectations are defined on a case-by-case basis as specified by the extramurally funded project and the funding sponsor. These expectations must be specifically described in the faculty member's annual workload assignment, and should be listed on a separate form entitled "Extramural Funds appointment portion". Accordingly, the partial FTE appointment made by the CALS Dean is in proportion to the availability of extramural funds and in accord with the specific expectations of each extramural funding source.

Partial General Fund Appointments for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The expectations for maintaining a partial FTE appointment supported by the General Fund are defined on a case-by-case basis by the Dean of CALS in association with the faculty member's department Chair. These expectations must be specifically described in the faculty member's annual workload assignment, and should be listed on a separate form entitled "General Fund appointment portion". Activities and duties assigned under General Fund support can include formal course instruction, non-credit course instruction and programming, student advising, scholarship and research, professional or community service, or specific administrative assignments (such as program oversight or coordination). General Fund support is dependent on satisfactory

performance, but is also only for the current appointment period. General Fund support beyond the appointment period is at the discretion of the CALS Dean and the department Chair, in accord with balancing the strategic needs of the department and the College.

APPENDIX B
2009 Guidelines for CALS Workload Assignments

(dated 2/27/09)

The RULES OF THUMB for workload assignments in CALS are as follows, as understood by our Chairs and reviewed for consistency by Associate Dean Vayda before workload assignments are sent to the Provost's Office each spring.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

A "typical" 3 credit course in CALS is weighted 0.10 FTE

A large 3 credit class over ~100 students is 0.15 FTE

A 4 credit class (usually includes a lab section) is 0.15 FTE

Courses taught for the first time are afforded an additional 0.05 FTE for preparation; this can be assigned either in the semester the course is taught, or the preceding semester if the course is anticipated to be taught on the next annual workload. However, the faculty member does not get the "extra" 0.05 FTE twice (i.e., prepared one year and delivered for the first time the next).

A course that is "team taught" has the effort split proportional to the effort of each instructor. For example, if two professors share a typical 3 credit course, they each are assigned 0.05 FTE; if unequal contributions by faculty participants, it could be split 0.075 FTE to one and 0.025 FTE to the other.

A 1 or 2 credit course is 0.05 FTE or 0.075 FTE depending on the number of students. Same with "variable credit" courses and independent studies (usually considered under advising, several students lumped together).

"Additional Sections". If a faculty member teaches more than one section of the same course, they are assigned 0.10 FTE for the course and 0.05 FTE for the second section. We discourage two sections of the same course (as opposed to one larger section) as our faculty generally indicate this is a disruption of their time for scholarship.

ADVISING

The typical advising load in CALS varies from 15-to-35 undergraduate advisees. Most faculty have a 0.10 FTE advising assignment in CALS, although this varies between departments. Typically, faculty do not have greater than an 0.15 FTE advising load except in specific, unusual situations.

Faculty who serve as primary thesis advisor for active graduate students are assigned 0.05 FTE to 0.10 FTE depending on the number of students they have in the lab. The typical by far is 0.05 FTE.

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The "typical" load for tenure-track faculty is roughly:

0.40 FTE course instruction

0.40 FTE scholarship/research in their area of expertise

0.10 FTE student advising

0.10 FTE professional service (this is either state/national service to the profession in accord with their professional expertise; or service to the university through departmental, college or university committees).

It is understood that some departments have higher course assignments than others, but this is the general rule of thumb.

Faculty whose scholarship has waned are assigned higher teaching loads and lighter scholarship assignments to maintain a fair balance among the faculty. Conversely, chairs have the discretion to assign faculty with considerable extramural funding heavier scholarship responsibilities and lighter teaching loads. Chairs often assign a "light" teaching load to new faculty in their first year of service to enable them to establish their scholarly enterprise effectively. Some scholarship is expected of ALL tenure-track faculty members. Assignments of greater than 0.15 FTE to "professional service" are unusual (with exceptions reserved for special cases such as directing the Master's in Dietetics program).

Faculty on sabbatical leave have their time assigned solely to scholarship FTE, unless they maintain some advising or committee service responsibilities while on sabbatic (unusual)

LECTURERS

Lecturers in CALS are appointed to address instructional needs in specific areas, often "gap" areas not covered by the expertise of the tenure-track faculty.

The "typical" CALS Lecturer assignment is:

0.75 FTE course assignments (typically 5 to 6 courses per year)

0.15 FTE undergraduate advising

0.10 FTE professional service (national/state service in their professional capacity; or service to university departmental, college or university committees)

Again this is a rule of thumb; CALS has several lecturers who are assigned by their chair to conduct appropriate scholarly activity; this is usually pedagogical in nature but sometimes includes participation in extramurally funded research projects in their professional expertise area. The expectation is that this work will lead to peer-reviewed dissemination of their findings.

SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty are assigned time for scholarship with the expectation that they will conduct research that will lead to peer-reviewed publications, books or book chapters within a timeframe that is reasonable for their discipline, to make professional presentations among their peers in national/state forums or at other academic institutions, and to actively compete for/secure extramural funding (i.e., at least submit grant proposals). In general, it is difficult to conduct meaningful scholarship in the disciplines represented within CALS without extramural funding sources. However, our chairs are well aware of the exceptions; for example: juried design competitions or pedagogical research consistent with the expectations of particular position descriptions.

DIRECTORSHIPS

Most directorships in CALS (such as the cross-college program directors) are assigned as additional duties above the 1.0 FTE workload assignment. Typically, these carry 12 month responsibilities appointed by the Dean and are compensated by a stipend (although we have one exception in which the directorship carries an FTE within the workload assignment; this individual does not receive a stipend for this assigned work).

CONTINUING EDUCATION and INTERNATIONAL COURSES TAUGHT ABROAD

These courses are generally taught "off-load", with the workload in addition to their 1.0 FTE

assignment, and with additional compensation from CE or the source for international instruction. The exception to this is CE courses taught "during day class periods". These are generally taught as part of the base workload assignment with an MOU between the department and CE to provide the appropriate compensation for the faculty member's time "bought out" from tuition funds generated through CE.