School of Engineering at the University of Vermont
Reappointment and Promotion Guidelines for Officers of Research

1. Introduction

In accordance with the Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document provides reappointment guidelines for Officers of Research (or Research Faculty) in the School of Engineering (SoE). The SoE applies these quality criteria for research and scholarship, as documented under Scholarship, Research and Creative Activities in the Evaluation of Faculty and Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures in the Union Contract (Articles 14 & 15), and has the following additional specifications.

2. Scholarship, Research and Creative Activities

Officers of Research with more than one year contracts shall have a reappointment review in the academic year preceding the expiration of their contract if the faculty member is seeking reappointment. Such reviews shall be formal peer review (or green sheet reviews) but shall take place at the college/school level. Notwithstanding the above, an officer of research must have at least one formal peer review up to and including the Dean’s level every four years. Such officers shall be reviewed only relative to the quality of performance in both (1) scholarship/research work and (2) other duties expressly assigned. These other duties expressly assigned cannot be taken as a substitute for the candidate’s scholarship/research work.

3. Faculty Input and Eligible Voters for RPT Reviews

3.1. Faculty Input and Schedule for RPT Reviews

The SoE Director will set an appropriate schedule for each review so that the complete dossier will be ready for review at least 2 weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean’s Office. The Director will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the greensheets.

Once the candidate’s dossier is ready for faculty review, all faculty members, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lectures) will be invited to review the dossier.
As per Section 14.5 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Director shall summarize anonymous individual comments from the faculty of the candidate’s Program. This will be shared with the School RPT committee.

At the beginning of the second week after the candidate’s review dossier is complete, the Chair of the SoE Faculty RPT Committee will convene and chair a two-part meeting of the faculty to discuss the candidate’s performance with respect to scholarship and research work as well as to other duties expressly assigned and clearly defined by the SoE Director. The first part of this meeting is for all faculty where non-eligible voters may share their comments. This is followed by the second part with only the eligible faculty voters who will vote by Australian ballot on the candidate’s reappointment or promotion. The RPT Committee Chair will record the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted prior to the adjournment of the meeting and will send a brief written report containing the vote and a summary of the faculty discussion to the SoE Director. That vote and report will be recorded on the Director’s Evaluation.

After the above faculty feedback and eligible voters’ vote, the SoE Director will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate’s application, and will inform the candidate of this recommendation and will provide them with a copy of the Director’s Evaluation.

3.2. Eligible Voters for Officers of Research Reviews

- Only Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty members are eligible voters.
- The SoE Director is not an eligible voter.
- Only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.
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