

**Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering
Reappointment Promotion and Tenure
Guidelines for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

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 Electrical & Biomedical Engineering (EBE). This document incorporates the position appointment titles for tenure-track and tenured faculty as described in Article 14, Section 1 of the Union Contract.

1. Timelines

1.1 Tenure Track Assistant Professor Timeline

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. At the start of the second and fourth years of service, the EBE Chair (referred to as the Chair hereafter) 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.

1.2 Untenured Associate Professor Timeline

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 a peer institution.

1.3 Other Tenure Case Guidelines

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

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

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.*

1.4 Tenured Associate Professor Timeline

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.

2. Department Considerations

The EBE 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 electrical and biomedical 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 EBE Department's unique opportunities for collaborations with other research areas in the University.

Each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is expected to be 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.

3. RPT Evaluations in the Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

For RPT evaluations, the EBE 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 EBE Department's RPT committee will consist of all of its tenure-track, tenured and untenured faculty (i.e., the committee of the whole). Voting eligibility for particular cases is outlined in Section 3.4 of this document. 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 Chair

The Chair will set an appropriate schedule for each greensheet review, such that the complete greensheets will be ready for faculty review at least two (2) 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 greensheets in preparation for the RPT meeting described in Section 3.3.

3.3 RPT Meeting

The RPT committee will meet in the presence of the Department Chair to consider the RPT action and to vote as described below.

At the beginning of the second week after the greensheets are complete, the Chair will convene a meeting at which the following procedures will take place: (i) all Department faculty members discuss the material in the greensheets, and (ii) all eligible voters (as defined in Section 3.4) discuss the material in the greensheets in closed session and then vote 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 EBE 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 result of the ballot of eligible voters on a particular candidate will constitute the collective assessment and recommendation of the Department's faculty. A minimum of four (4) eligible voters (as defined in Section 3.4) must cast their vote at the end of the meeting for the assessment to be complete.

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

If the Department has less than four (4) eligible voters, the Chair must find additional eligible voters from other departments within the College or from among those with secondary appointments in EBE.

After the above faculty feedback and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application, and will prepare a statement summarizing both favorable and unfavorable comments and including a tally of the vote. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement also will be made available to the voting members of the committee (see Section 3.5), if requested in writing.

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.

- 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, only Associate Professors and Professors are eligible voters.
- For a promotion application to Professor, only Professors are eligible voters.
- The 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.
- Only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.
- Faculty on academic leave are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document.

4. Teaching

4.1 Individual Student Input on Candidate's Teaching and Advising

Candidates will provide a summary of the numerical scores regarding instructor quality, course quality, and course rigor for their teaching evaluations by students for all

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

courses for a minimum of the preceding five (5) years. The Chair's office will provide copies of all of the students' anecdotal comments for each of the courses taught by the candidate for the preceding two (2) years.

The candidate may also provide to the Chair the names of former students who have completed their degree. These alumni will be invited to provide letters in which they opine on the candidate's teaching and advising. In addition, the Chair may solicit input from current students on the candidate's teaching and advising in the form of 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.

The Chair will arrange to have peer-teaching evaluations such that there are a total of at least three (3) new evaluations available since the last RPT action, including at least one (1) review of a required undergraduate course. The frequency is expected to be approximately at least one new peer evaluation per year for untenured faculty and at least one evaluation per two years for Associate Professors with tenure. 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 qualified tenured faculty. The Chair, in consultation with the candidate, may invite appropriate 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.

4.3 Advising & Mentoring

4.3.1 Undergraduate

Candidates preparing greensheets 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.

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

6. Knowledge of Department and College guidelines.

4.3.2 Graduate

With regard to the EBE Department's graduate education mission, a candidate for tenure should provide evidence of successful graduate student advising/supervision (as evidenced by, for example, publications co-authored with graduate students, presentations delivered by graduate students, correspondence of support from former graduate students, etc.) and should show evidence of substantial progress of at least one advisee toward the Ph.D. degree before final consideration for tenure. Candidates for promotion to Professor must have a record of effectively advising more than one Ph.D. student through graduation. Participation in graduate student committees should also be documented.

5. Research & Scholarship

5.1 Research

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. The candidate's research activities are expected to be consistent with the Mission of the EBE Department and to support the graduate education program in the Department.

Publication of refereed articles in both archival journals and conferences is important evidence of research and scholarship of high quality and significance; in some areas of Engineering, publication in top-tier, peer-reviewed conference proceedings can be considered as prestigious as publication in top journals. Acquisition of competitive grant and contract support is considered an indication of recognized research competence and productivity; however, this record of support cannot stand alone as evidence of scholarship. Similarly, invited lectures or publications, journal editorship, or service as a major officer in a professional society, may be considered as recognition of scholarly achievement. Patents, software products, monographs, book chapters, unpublished conference presentations, and other products of scholarly activity may also be considered. However, 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.

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for evaluation criteria. 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, a

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

common method for evaluating quality of the publication is the journal impact factor and a common method for evaluating significance of the research is the number of external citations garnered by the publication. 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 should outline the significant contributions of each major publication.

For promotion to Professor, the faculty member must provide evidence of important contributions to their respective field of research and evidence of leadership within their field. Evidence of important contributions could include highly cited papers, important papers in well-regarded journals, patents that have garnered interest from industry, or awards from professional societies. Evidence of leadership could include being an editor for an important journal, leadership positions in industry or academic organizations, organizing important workshops, or being PI on a multi-PI or multi-University grant.

For multi-author publications, the candidate should state the degree of their contribution towards the research. Collaborative, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary research is encouraged. For joint publications and grants, 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.

6. Service

Candidates must provide evidence of their involvement in service activities to their profession, to the University (including the College, and the Department), and external service to the community/public in a capacity that reflects the mission of the EBE Department. The expectation for an untenured faculty applying for reappointments should remain modest. Candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have demonstrated both University and external service that contributes directly to building the candidate's tenure case (e.g. federal agency funding review panel, journal refereeing). For promotion to Professor, in addition to the significant involvement in the Department, College and University committees, 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

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

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 greensheet 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:

1. the quality of the candidate's research and service,
2. the candidate's research contributions to, and its impact on, their research field,
3. the candidate's productivity relative to other academics at a similar stage in their career,
4. the candidate's potential as a research leader, and
5. 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:

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

1. The candidate is asked to provide the names of 10 nominations along with their contact information and area of expertise.
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). 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 greensheets for all faculty members 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.

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 four 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 five (5) representative publications, and a summary of major contributions the candidate has made to their field of research. The statement should also summarize 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

EBE RPT Guidelines (Tenure, Tenure-Track)

least the last RPT action of the candidate, along with a description of associated responsibilities and commitments.

The candidate may include any additional information in their dossier that they believe may support their case.