

**Department of Mechanical Engineering
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

Approved by ME faculty on Tuesday, December 05, 2017

In accordance with the “Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT)”, dated 12/12/2014 (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document is developed to provide reappointment, promotion and tenure (RPT) guidelines for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. This document incorporates the position appointment titles for tenure-track and tenured as described in Article 14, Section 1 of the Union Contract.

1. Department Considerations

The Department of Mechanical Engineering is a research-oriented academic unit. The Department supports and strengthens the mission of the University of Vermont towards the provision of innovation in research and scholarship, excellence in instruction, and public service to the citizens of the state, nation and world. The Department aspires to be a center of excellence in teaching Mechanical engineering at all levels, emphasizing both long-term academic preparation and shorter-term economic importance; and as a center for excellence in research and graduate education, which may also exploit the Department’s unique opportunities for collaborations with other research areas in the University.

Each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is expected to be both an effective teacher and an active researcher in their research area. The quality criteria for effective teaching and active research can be found in the Union Contract (Article 14, Section 5.e); however, the Department’s perspective regarding teaching and scholarship is amplified further in subsequent sections of these guidelines.

2. Timelines

A tenure track assistant professor will be appointed for an initial three-year term and may be reappointed for up to two additional two-year terms (Union Contract, Article 14, 5.a). At the start of the second and fourth years of service, the Chair will notify the candidate for reappointment in writing that the review process must begin. At the end of the second semester of the fifth year of service, the candidate is required to apply for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Any request for an extension of the probationary period for tenure-track is governed by Article 14, Section 5.d as described in the Union Contract.

An untenured associate professor may be hired with an initial two-year appointment, and may be reappointed for an additional two-year period. The procedure for the first reappointment of an untenured associate professor (not the tenure review) will follow the same protocol and timeline

as for the first reappointment of an assistant professor except that the review process commences at the end of the second semester of the initial appointment.

At the discretion of the candidate and the Chair, an expedited tenure review may be requested for those candidates joining the University who previously held a tenured position at another academic institution.

A faculty member may become a candidate for the appropriate action at an earlier date than mandated by the preceding paragraphs. In such a non-mandatory tenure case, the faculty member must notify the Chair and Dean before the end of the preceding academic year of the desire for an earlier review. The Chair may provide informal advice after possible consultation with tenured members in the Department, but the decision for non-mandatory tenure and/or promotion application rests with the candidate. Following discussion with the Chair, a non-mandatory tenure candidate may choose to withdraw their current tenure and promotion application.

The evaluation procedures are identical for both mandatory and non-mandatory tenure reviews. The documentation prepared by the candidate, in coordination with the Chair, will be consistent with the format defined in this document. Candidates are *requested to explicitly address in the RPT documentation any areas recommended for performance improvement or enhancement identified in the prior RPT review.*

An associate professor who wishes to be considered for promotion to the rank of professor must notify the Chair before the end of the preceding academic year in order that arm's-length evaluations can be organized over the following summer.

While no minimum time at the rank of associate professor is required, promotion to the rank of professor implies a well-established and documented record in teaching, scholarship and service. A candidate for promotion to professor should enjoy a recognized national and international reputation through demonstrated scholarship in the candidate's technical area(s) of expertise or scholarship in engineering education, or both.

Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the Chair's Evaluation (see Section 3.3), a candidate for promotion to Professor may choose to withdraw their current application.

3. RPT Evaluations in the Department of Mechanical Engineering

For RPT evaluations, the Department applies the Evaluation of Faculty and Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures in the Union Contract (Article 14), and has the following additional specific descriptions.

3.1 The RPT Committee

The Department's RPT committee will consist of all of its tenure-track, tenured and non-tenured faculty (i.e., the committee of the whole) with primary appointment in Mechanical Engineering.

The RPT committee is led by the RPT chairperson, who is also responsible for writing a faithful summary of the meeting discussions. The RPT chairperson is elected from among the full professors in the Department for a term of two years and may not be the Department Chair. The RPT chairperson is a voting member of the committee. Once the RPT dossier is complete, the RPT committee will meet to consider and to vote as described in the following sections. Voting eligibility for particular cases is outlined in Section 3.4 of this document. The result of the ballot of eligible voters on a particular candidate will constitute the collective assessment and recommendation of the Department's faculty. However, as the College's by-laws require that one of the Department's faculty must serve on the College's Faculty Standard's Committee, that elected member must recuse themselves from voting in the RPT process at either the Department or College level.

3.2 Duties of the Department Chair

The Department Chair will set an appropriate schedule for each dossier review, such that the complete dossier will be ready for faculty review at least three (3) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that all required sections of the dossier are present and ready for faculty review prior to the RPT meeting for that candidate. Once the dossier is ready for review, all faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate with the Chair within one (1) week.

After considering the feedback from the RPT committee and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application, and will prepare the Chair's Evaluation statement. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement will also be made available to those voting members of the committee (Section 3.5) who request it in writing (Section 9 outlines the schedule).

3.3 RPT Meeting

One week after the dossier has been made available to the faculty, the Chair will convene a meeting of the whole RPT Committee, followed by a closed session meeting of all eligible voters (as defined in Section 3.4 of this document). Faculty who are unable to attend the RPT meeting may provide written comments to the Chair up to 24 hours prior to the meeting, who will then provide the comments to the Committee. The Department Chair attends the RPT meeting as an observer and may not participate in the meeting unless asked a question of clarification by the faculty. During the RPT meeting, the candidate's dossier is presented and then discussed by the eligible voters. As per Section 14.5 (f) of the Union Contract, the Chair shall summarize anonymous individual comments from the faculty of the candidate's Department at the RPT meeting following the review of the candidate's dossier and prior to discussion of the dossier. Following discussion of the dossier, a vote is conducted by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend the candidate's application. The vote will be considered complete when votes cast at the meeting are provided to the Chair at the end of the meeting. Of the Department faculty

eligible to vote on the candidate's application, only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, shall be allowed to vote.

The RPT Chairperson shall prepare a summary of the discussion at the meeting that is approved at the meeting by all voters. The RPT Chairperson will provide a final copy of this summary and a record of the vote to the Department Chair within 24 hours following the RPT meeting.

3.4 Eligible Voters for RPT Reviews

When a candidate applies for promotion to a particular rank, only those faculty members who are already at this rank or above are eligible voters. When a candidate applies for reappointment at a particular rank, only those faculty members who have successfully passed their reappointment at this rank are eligible voters.

- The minimum number of eligible voters is three (3). In cases where this requirement is not met, the Department will invite faculty with secondary appointment in Mechanical Engineering who meet the eligibility standards, and if necessary faculty from other cognate departments who do meet these standards.
- For a first tenure-track reappointment review, only tenured faculty members and those faculty who have successfully passed their first reappointment review are eligible voters.
- For a second reappointment review, only tenured faculty members and those faculty who have successfully passed their second reappointment review are eligible voters.
- For a tenure application, only tenured faculty members are eligible voters.
- For a promotion application to associate professor with tenure, only associate professors with tenure and professors are eligible voters.
- For a promotion application to professor, only professors are eligible voters.
- The Department Chair is not an eligible voter, but is required to be present as an observer at the discussion and the vote of the committee of eligible voters.
- Faculty on academic leave and on sabbatical are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document.

4. Teaching

Since one of the primary objectives in the Department has to do with education, effective teaching is absolutely necessary to accomplish the goals of the Department. No one should expect to be recommended for tenure or promotion without a record of good to excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This should be considered as a necessary, but not sufficient criterion. Examples of prime indicators of effective teaching are provided in Article 14, Section 5.i of the Union Contract. As a minimum, the following information (Sections 4.1 through 4.3 of this document) will be included in the dossier.

4.1 Individual Student Input on Candidate's Teaching and Advising

Candidates will provide a summary of all numerical scores pertaining to the instructor for their teaching evaluations of all courses taught from initial appointment or a minimum of the preceding 5 years. The Chair's office will provide copies of all of the students' anecdotal comments for each of the courses listed by the candidate.

The candidate has the option of providing to the Chair the names of students who have either completed coursework or are taking a course with the candidate or have been one of their advisees, the names of students who will opine on the candidate's teaching and advising via anonymous letters.

4.2 Peer Teaching Evaluations

The Peer Teaching evaluations and observations will be conducted in the manner prescribed by the Department's policy on Peer observation guidelines.

For each dossier review, the Chair will invite faculty members to provide peer-teaching evaluations. The candidate may confidentially identify faculty members who for reasonable cause stated should not be invited for this purpose. All peer teaching evaluations will be done by tenured faculty with primary or secondary appointments in Mechanical Engineering and who are eligible to vote on the candidate RPT cases. The Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate, may invite appropriate¹ faculty members from other Departments, Schools or Colleges to provide peer-teaching evaluations. The peer evaluators shall be advised to review the candidate's course materials/teaching portfolio as well as to attend a minimum of one of the candidate's lectures.

Other elements that should be considered if available/appropriate are teaching awards, teaching innovation efforts and participation in professional development activities (e.g., workshops).

Teaching is evaluated according to the following criteria:

- Student evaluation surveys conducted by the College at the end of each semester are used to determine student reactions in the classroom. Survey outcomes are evaluated relative to the mean for comparable courses; in general, these tend to be above an average rating. The results of these evaluations must be interpreted in the proper context; course popularity (or lack thereof) is not always tightly correlated with course quality.
- Peer reviews from department colleagues and/or the chairperson.
- Letters from students.
- Descriptions of the course content and learning goals, including syllabi, reading lists, and

¹ Appropriate faculty are expected to be knowledgeable in the subject area and have teaching experience at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying.

laboratory exercises will be made available, in addition to other material that the faculty member may choose to submit.

- Teaching awards.
- Participation in professional teaching development activities (e.g., workshops)
- Implementation of innovative teaching methods.

4.3 Advising & Mentoring

4.3.1 Undergraduate

Candidates preparing dossiers will include a separate section on advising and mentoring undergraduates. In addition to student advisee numbers, it is important to include details with regard to both undergraduate and graduate advising, including:

1. Availability for student contact,
2. Frequency of meetings and other interactions with advisees,
3. In service training for advising,
4. Efforts to support the Department in advising,
5. Mentoring and involvement in undergraduate research, organizations and projects.

4.3.2 Graduate

With regard to the Department's graduate education mission, a candidate for tenure should provide evidence of successful graduate student advising/supervision which includes:

- Evidence of student's scholarly publications, and
- Evidence of student graduation or substantial progress toward graduation for PhD student.

5. Research & Scholarship

5.1 Research

According to the Union Contract, "each faculty member is expected to engage continuously and effectively in creative professional activities of high quality and significance." All tenure-track and tenured faculty members must provide evidence responsive to this requirement for their RPT reviews. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Department are expected to actively engage in high-quality research and scholarship consistent with the Mission of the Department and in support of the graduate education program in the Department. For our faculty, the criteria for evaluation of research and scholarship are:

- Publications of original research articles in major international peer-reviewed journals in the field of expertise of the faculty is required. Professional publications include authorship of articles in refereed journals, books, book chapters. Other evidence of

scholarly activities may include peer-reviewed conference proceedings. In the case of multiple authorship, as well as in the case of collaborative research, the candidate may want to comment on the contributions of parties involved. Websites, blogs are not equivalent to publications. All reprints and preprints of publications which have appeared since appointment at UVM will be made available to the RPT committee.

- Patents and Disclosures – successful translation of research products into commercial or public applications is evidence of innovative research, although it is not expected that all research programs will yield patentable discoveries.
- Sustainable Research Program – Critical to this criterion is the ability of the faculty to demonstrate a pattern of sustained external funded research. While not required, competitive research funding from major federal agencies (NSF, NIH, DoE, DoD, ...) or scientific foundations and societies is strong evidence for good quality scholarship.
- Professional judgment of extramural peer-reviewers in the case of tenure and promotion.
- Additional criteria may include:
 - Impact factor of publications, lifetime citation index,
 - Invitations to present seminars within UVM and at other universities and to present talks at national and international scientific meetings,
 - Research awards or other special recognition for scholarship, and
 - Invitations to serve as a reviewer on research manuscript and on extramural research grants.

The Department does not simply count the number of publications and/or the financial value of grants or contracts, nor does it take a restrictive, static view of what constitutes Engineering research. The emphasis in all instances is on research quality.

The Union Contract states: “In cases involving tenure and promotion to Associate or (Full) Professor the quality and significance of the work must be evaluated.” Accordingly, the candidate is required to provide evidence of the quality and significance of their scholarly products. For peer-reviewed journal publications, impact factors, number of citations and related statistical measures may be provided. The candidate may provide other information as desired to establish quality and significance of the work, such as acceptance rates and other information on the standards of the journal and its standing in the discipline. For conference proceedings, the candidate is asked to distinguish the level of peer-review (either fully-refereed, abstract-refereed, or non-refereed) and to provide information about the conference acceptance rates, if possible. For monographs and book chapters, the candidate is advised to provide information regarding the review process of the press, and whether or not the work was invited. Candidates are encouraged to outline the significant contributions of each major publication. For multi-author publications, the candidate may state the degree of their contribution towards the research.

Collaborative, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary research is encouraged.

For joint publications, the candidate should describe their role in, and contributions to, the joint effort. The Chair has the prerogative to contact selected co-authors for comments on the candidate's contribution to the specific collaboration. For interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary work, the candidate is advised to describe the nature of the publication venue and the relationship of the research to Engineering.

6. Service

Candidates must provide evidence of their involvement in service activities to their profession, to the University (including the College, and their Department), and external service to the community/public. The expectation for a faculty applying for tenure should remain commensurate with workload effort, with University services and external services that contribute directly to building the candidate tenure case (e.g. federal agency funding review panel, journal refereeing). For promotion to full professor, there should be clear and well documented service to the Profession, such as, but not limited to, journal editorship, chair of a national conference, chair of professional standard committees, or service as a major officer in a professional society.

7. Arm's-Length Evaluation

7.1 Selection of Arm's-Length Evaluators for Promotion and Tenure

For the following tenure-track/tenured faculty dossier reviews, "arm's-length" evaluators will be solicited to provide external reports:

- tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and
- promotion to the rank of Professor.

Arm's-length evaluators are individuals who do not have a significant personal relationship with the candidate. Former students, thesis advisors, colleagues, co- authors, or collaborators, for example, generally do not constitute arm's-length evaluators. In addition, arm's-length evaluators should:

1. Be "acknowledged scholars and practitioners in the discipline of the candidate at other institutions. These scholars and practitioners should ... be capable of providing an objective, informed assessment of the candidate's work." [The Union Contract, Article 14, Clause 5 (e, ii)]
2. Be tenured at their home universities (and for promotion to the rank of Professor, have the same or an equivalent rank), if they come from academia.
3. Have expertise in at least one of the candidate's research areas, and in the case of evaluators not from academia, their standing in the research area must be clearly identified.

The Chair will inform the arm's-length reviewers of all pertinent facts regarding the candidate (including their teaching load/record), with the candidate's representative publications and other

creative work, and will ask them for their assessments of:

- the quality of the candidate's research, and service,
- the candidate's research contributions to, and its impact on, their research field,
- the candidate's productivity relative to other academics at a similar stage in their career,
- the candidate's potential as a research leader for tenure and promotion Associate Professor and the candidate's stature as a research leader for promotion to full Professor, and
- the publication and review standards of the journals and conference proceedings in which the candidate has published, and their standings in the discipline.

7.2 The Selection Process for reviewers:

1. The candidate is asked to provide 10 nominations.
2. The Chair compiles 10 other names from other sources.
3. The Chair shows the 10 other names to the candidate and asks the candidate to identify (i) any names that are not at arm's-length, and (ii) any names that the candidate deems inappropriate as evaluators (for reasonable cause). Candidates should provide written justification for dismissal of evaluators, which is included in the dossier. The Chair may repeat steps 2-3 in order to have a sufficient number of names.
4. The Chair selects and contacts 10 names from the combined list, with at least half selected from the candidate's list.

In extraordinary cases, exceptions to these guidelines may be made by mutual agreement of the Chair and the candidate, and in such instances the Chair will document reasons for all adjustments.

In the dossier for all faculty to review, the Chair will list the final 10 names (step 4) and mention who were nominated by the candidate and who were solicited by the Chair independently. In all cases, the Chair should provide a clear explanation of the professional qualifications of the evaluators and the process by which they were selected. The Chair should document the evaluators who decline to provide a review.

7.3 Dossier Contents

Although external evaluators are asked to comment specifically on the research contributions of the faculty candidate, the final dossier provided to evaluators should paint a full picture of the candidate's responsibilities to contextualize their research output. Therefore the dossier should include at least the following components:

1. *Extended CV*. The format should conform to the general UVM guidelines (described here: https://www.uvm.edu/~facsrcs/CV_guidelines.pdf), as well as any additional recommendations of the Department.

2. *Research statement.* This should include a summary of the candidate's research interests, a selection of 5 representative publications, and a summary of major contributions the candidate has made to their field of research. The statement should also summarize and research funding, and accomplishments that illustrate sustainability of the candidate's research program.
3. *Teaching/advising statement.* This should include a summary of courses taught since at least the last RPT action of the candidate, including enrollments and instructor evaluation score, and credits for each teaching assignment. The statement should also include a summary of advising activities especially of graduate students.
4. *Service statement.* This should include a summary of service assignments since at least the last RPT action of the candidate, along with a description of associated responsibilities and commitments.

The candidate is encouraged to consider expectations of the UVM Green Sheets to inform content and structure of the research, teaching/advising, and service statements. The candidate is also free to include any additional information in their dossier that they feel may support their case.

8. General Guidance on Expectations

The requirements for personnel decisions are progressive from one rank to the next. Successful achievement at one stage cannot be taken as an assurance that there will be no new concerns at the next stage. In the probationary stages, the performance must build toward the high standard required for promotions and tenure. The level of commitment must be sustained and high, and the level of accomplishment consistently increasing through the point of promotion to the rank of full professor.

First Reappointment:

Teaching – Commitment to effective education of students must be evident. A strategy to develop effective teaching methods with the goal of achieving excellence in classroom performance is expected. This should include responsiveness to constructive critique from student and peer evaluations and the pursuit of on-campus or external professional development related to development as a teacher.

Research – There should be evidence of continuous scholarship, building of an independent research program since appointment at UVM and efforts to establish on-campus and/or external collaborations. Successful candidates generally have one or more publications in high quality refereed journals since appointment at UVM and are able to demonstrate the pursuit of competitive external funding and recruitment of graduate students.

Service – Service as a professional reviewer, active participant in professional associations and joining department committees is expected.

Second Reappointment:

Teaching – Significant progress toward excellence in teaching performance is expected at undergraduate and graduate level, as reflected in peer teaching evaluations, student teaching evaluations, and documentation of teaching techniques and continuous quality improvements. A plan to develop a portfolio of courses that include a diversity of teaching formats or academic levels is expected.

At second reappointment, documentation of advising of both graduate and undergraduate students is expected. This should include academic advising of undergraduate students, and advising undergraduate and graduate researchers.

Research – Successful candidates typically have four or more high quality refereed journal publications of which a majority of the research, data analysis, and manuscript preparation has been carried out since appointment at UVM. There should be active conference participation. Successful candidates often have established a regular pattern of application for independent or collaborative research funding, and often a funded project in which the candidate serves as principal investigator. It is expected that the candidate targets diverse funding agencies for competitive funding applications.

Service – Moderate on-campus service should be presented as well as professional activities at the state or national level (e.g. manuscript and proposal reviewer/panelist).

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

Teaching – Successful candidates often have a strong record of good to excellent classroom teaching and advising, and have corrected deficiencies identified in earlier reviews. The candidate should have developed a portfolio of courses that include a diversity of teaching formats or academic levels. Expertise about departmental and university general requirements should be adequate for good advising of undergraduate and graduate students. Successful candidates are often able to demonstrate excellence in graduate and undergraduate student mentoring.

Research – Successful candidates often have twelve or more high quality refereed journal publications/patents/book chapters. The majority of these products should be based on research conducted at UVM and/or with UVM student researchers as co-authors. There is evidence of conference participation and invited presentations on and off-campus. Successful candidates typically have a major competitive research grant in which the candidate serves as principal investigator by the time of the tenure and promotion decision. For collaborative grants, documentation of role and contribution to the research should be clarified. Efforts for continuing a sustained level of extramural support in the form of a detailed research plan is often evident. Other evidence may include any research-related awards and recognition. A major element in making the case for national stature of the research program will be the arm's-length letters,

solicited in confidence from extramural colleagues. These arm's-length evaluation letters are often uniformly favorable for successful candidates.

Service – For promotion to associate professor, in addition to the involvement in the Department, College or University committees, there should be clear and well-documented service to the Profession, such as reviewing technical articles, review panels on proposals submitted to funding agencies and organizing sessions at conferences.

The key question at this juncture concerns past momentum as a predictor of future achievement. Is there a self-sustaining pattern of professional growth? Are the patterns of strong performance in teaching, research production, and service self-reinforcing and indicate an upward trajectory towards continued professional accomplishments beyond tenure? A short spurt of excellence in the fifth year will not compensate for deficiencies in earlier years.

Promotion to Full Professor:

Professional growth must have continued beyond the standard achieved for promotion to associate professor. The research contributions must be excellent, showing a sustained pattern of productivity as demonstrated in refereed journal publications, conference involvement, repeated extramural competitive funding, and growing national or international professional stature. Extramural evaluations must be solicited at the time of this decision. These arm's-length evaluation letters are often unequivocally favorable for successful candidates. The teaching contributions must reflect experience and effectiveness at many levels. Advising activities should exceed those for probationary faculty. Successful candidates often have a strong record of graduated Ph.D. students. The service contributions should be consistent, of high quality, and should have clear impact at the national or international level. For promotion to full professor significant involvement in the Department, College and University committees is expected. Service contributions at UVM may include administrative roles. In addition, there should be clear and well-documented service to the Profession, such as journal editorship, chair of a national conference, chair of professional standard committees, or service as a major officer in a professional society.

9. Key Dates

The following table summarizes the schedule that is generally followed for conducting RPT evaluations of tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department.

Date	Action
April 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="415 1608 1448 1682">• Chair notifies the candidates up for mandatory RPT action in the following academic year.<li data-bbox="415 1703 1448 1768">• Candidates notify the Chair in writing if they wish to apply for early tenure or early promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to [full] Professor in

	the following academic year.
May 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate provides to Chair their CV and 10 nominations for external arm's-length evaluators including their name, rank, affiliation, email address and link to webpage. • Chair invites RPT committee members to suggest arm's-length reviewers.
May 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair and candidate agree on 20 final names, and the Chair contacts (via email) about 10 individuals (with at least half the individuals from the candidate's list) to request their evaluations. At least six arm's-length evaluation letters are sought.
August 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event that an insufficient number of evaluators have agreed to provide arm's-length evaluation letters, the Chair in consultation with the candidate will identify additional (beyond the first 10) evaluators to contact, again by selecting at least half the individuals suggested by the candidate.
August 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate provides a complete portfolio (Section 7.3) to the Chair. • The candidate may provide a list of students/alumni for soliciting comments on the candidate's teaching and advising. • The Chair solicits students/alumni letters from the list provided by the candidate.
October 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The candidate provides completed green sheets to the Chair. • The chair gathers external arm's-length evaluation letters. • If the candidate requests, the chair collects up to six students/alumni letters.
October 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair assembles the dossier.
November 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review by the RPT committee, vote of the eligible voters is completed. • The RPT Chairperson summarizes the RPT committee discussion and the voting members of the RPT committee approve the summary at the meeting. • The summary is provided to the Chair within 24 hours.
November 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A voting member of the RPT committee may request in writing a copy of Chair's summary statement.
November 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair prepares a summary statement of their assessment and includes a tally

	<p>of the vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Chair provides the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and makes this statement available to those voting members of the RPT committee who request it by November 20.• Chair submits their evaluation to the Dean's Office.
--	---