

Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering Reappointment and Promotion Guidelines for Research Faculty

1. Introduction

In accordance with the Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter) dated 12/12/2014, this document provides reappointment and promotion guidelines for Research Faculty in the Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering (EBE). The EBE Department 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 (Article 14 Section 10), and has the following additional specifications.

2. Scholarship, Research and Creative Activities

Research Faculty with more than a one-year contract 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 reviews (or pink and blue sheet reviews) but shall take place at the Department/Dean's office level.

Notwithstanding the above, a research faculty must have at least one formal peer review up to and including the Dean's level **every four years**. Such research faculty 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.

A candidate for reappointment must be able to demonstrate a sustained production of research and scholarly work.

A candidate for promotion should be able to demonstrate a strong and sustained production of research and scholarly work in the two years prior to applying for promotion and also a path showing this research and scholarship work can be sustained at least in the subsequent two.

Metrics for research and scholarly work includes but is not limited to refereed articles in journals and conferences, book chapters, patents, invited technical presentations and extramural support for research and contracts since the last appointment; for example:

- Publications of original research articles in peer-reviewed journals in the field of expertise of the candidate. Professional publications include authorship of books and articles in refereed journals, books, and book chapters. Other evidence of scholarly activities may include peer-reviewed conference proceedings.

Websites, blogs are not equivalent to publications.

- 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.
- Acquisition of or participation in competitive grants and research work.
- Presented talks at scientific meetings, invitations to present seminars at other universities or within UVM.
- Any research awards or other special recognition of scholarship.
- Service as a reviewer for research manuscripts and extramural research grants, and participation and service in professional societies.

3. Faculty Input and Eligible Voters for RP Reviews

3.1. Faculty Input and Schedule for RP Reviews

The Department Chair (hereinafter denoted as Chair) will set an appropriate schedule for each review so that the complete dossier (pink or blue sheet) will be ready for review at least 2 weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided by the candidates.

Once the candidate's dossier is ready for faculty review, all full-time 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 14.10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Chair shall summarize anonymous written comments from the faculty of the candidate's dossier. This will be shared with the Department RP committee.

At the beginning of the second week after the candidate's review dossier is complete, the Chair of the Department will convene 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 Chair. The first part of this meeting is open to all faculty where non-eligible voters may share their comments. This is followed by a second part with only the eligible faculty voters who will vote by secret ballot on the candidate's reappointment or promotion. The 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 prepare a brief written report containing the vote and a summary of the faculty discussion. That vote and report will be recorded on the Chair's Evaluation.

After the above faculty feedback and eligible voters' vote, the Chair 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 Chair's Evaluation.

3.2. Eligible Voters for Research Faculty Reviews

- Tenure-Track faculty member who have past their first reappointment and Tenured Faculty members are eligible voters.
- Research faculty who have similar or greater standing than the candidate.
- The Chair is not an eligible voter.
- 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 RP process at either the Department or College level.
- Only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.