

Strategies for Effective RPT Mentoring & Review Process: A Focus on Emerging Concerns

Presenters:

- Carolyn Bonifield, Associate Professor of Marketing, Grossman School of Business (GSB); Chair, Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee (PSC)
- Jane Okech, Professor of Counselor Education & Supervision (CESS); Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Description

This workshop will offer strategies for effective faculty mentorship through the RPT process. Discussions will include issues and concerns about RPT process management and documentation.

Intersecting Roles of the Chair/AD Equivalent



1. Serve as **supervisors** to faculty, overseeing their work & guiding their professional development.
2. They play a crucial role as **evaluators**, assessing faculty performance objectively.
3. **Advocate** for faculty needs and resources within the institution.
4. They act as **mentors**, fostering growth and collaboration within the unit.
5. Serve as **colleagues**, promoting a supportive team environment.***

Introduce Faculty to the RPT Process

Actions to address with faculty during your initial meetings:

- 1. Complete workload assignment for the initial year
- 2. Share current unit AEG, CE, & RPT guidelines with faculty
- 3. Map out faculty's RP/T Timeline
 - Share any exceptions as a result of current concerns***
- 4. This is especially critical for faculty members who have non-traditional reappointment & promotion timelines.
- 5. *Include a reference to the unique RPT clock of such faculty in your chair section so that the dossier makes sense to reviewers (re: teaching/service/advising load disparities with other dossiers from your unit)

Introduce Faculty to Mentoring & RPT Resources at UVM



1. Discuss formal and informal mentorship opportunities on campus



2. Recommend that they participate in the Comprehensive Faculty Mentoring Program

First-Year Faculty Experience

Mid-Career Faculty Experience

Demystifying RPT Experience at UVM



3. Recommend that they attend *The Demystifying RPT Series* that examines the RPT process at UVM

1. The First Year Faculty Experience of the First Formal Reappointment Review, 3/21/25 @12.00-1.30pm

2. Preparation for Second Reappointment Review, 3/26/25 @12.00-1.15pm

3. Preparation for Promotion and Tenure Review, 4/11/25 @10.00-11.15am

4. Follow up session Focused on Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty (Follow-up to DRPT I-III), 4/30, 12.00-1.15pm

5. Follow up session Focused on Historically Underrepresented/Underrecognized Faculty (Follow-up to DRPT I-IV), 5/2, 12.00-1.15pm

Inform Faculty about the RPT Process in your Unit

-
- Each Academic unit has RPT Guidelines and unique processes for:
 - *Dossier assembly & review*
 - *RPT Action Vote (in person/ remotely/ department meeting, etc.)*
 - RP documentation is handled digitally, using PDF forms (accessible online)
 - Address Privacy & Confidentiality of such documents and their content
 - In some units:
 - a faculty reporting system (*e.g., Digital Measures*) is available + can assist with *preparing files*
 - faculty have to complete the *assembly of their dossier independently*

Chair/AD Role During RPT Process

1. Ensure all faculty are using the correct RPT form and know where to find it (*Latest forms updated February 23, 2023*)
 - <https://www.uvm.edu/dofa/guidelines-and-forms-reappointment-promotion-and-tenure-rpt>
2. Ensure that external reviewers meet the threshold of arm-length relationships.
3. Ensure that your letter, seeking external review letters, addresses the need for scholarship evaluation if a faculty member has Research/Scholarship on their workload
4. Communicate the different kinds of votes available to faculty (*Yes, No; Abstentions, Recusal*)
5. Ensure that your chair sections are accurate and provide the information necessary for review.
 - Avoid cut and past errors where Chair sections do not pertain to the faculty member under review.
 - Offer a faithful report of faculty discussion and an aligned recommendation.
 - *It makes no sense to recommend promotion/reappointment when your reported data does not support such an action.*
 - *Tell an accurate story that captures the faculty member's strengths and growing edges*

Contextualize Rebuttals

The [CBA](#) provides information regarding letters of rebuttal and supporting documentation, including timelines that must be adhered to by the candidate

Rebuttals are useful tools for correcting misrepresentation of faculty records or inaccurate interpretations, including to external reviewers:

See Article 14.9 of the [CBA](#) for more information about the grounds on which the Provost's decision could be grieved.

Chair-Submitted within 7 days and may respond to external reviewers as well

Dean & FSC-Submitted within 10 days

RPT Issues and Concerns

Overall Organization of Dossiers:

1. Order of materials, bookmarking of dossiers (e.g., all supporting materials after basic dossier entries; external reviewer CVs positioned *after* all external letters rather than after each letter)
2. Do not include scanned documents.
3. Once assembled, candidate's dossier should be combined into one pdf with bookmarks, rather than separate pdf files.
4. Adhere to word limits – make strongest case in a concise manner.
5. Limit excessive discipline-specific language and acronyms.

RPT Issues and Concerns

Dossier Issues

Workload distribution:

- Assure that the workload distribution is consistent throughout the dossier
- Include information on number of courses taught with the estimates of workload percentages
 - How courses are counted varies (e.g., in some units, 40% of teaching equals five course, and in others, it equals four courses).

Nature of contributions to scholarship

- Helpful to know approximate nature and percentage of applicant's contribution to co-authored scholarship
- Colleges/Schools, Departments, and Chairs are encouraged to continue to clarify expectations for scholarship, depending on the percentage of workload allocated to scholarship and the pathway (e.g., the volume and type of acceptable scholarship might differ for a Clinical or Extension faculty member, compared to a Research or Tenure track faculty member).

RPT Issues and Concerns

Dossier Issues

External letters

- Arm's length external letters for tenure and promotion
 - Both the faculty member and their Chair share responsibility.
- The credibility of external letters is enhanced when letters are from reviewers who:
 - are at a university at least comparable to UVM or other relevant organization
 - have attained the same rank or a higher rank as the promotion being sought
 - have submitted a CV that reflects a substantial body of work that establishes them as an appropriate reviewer
 - have no real or perceived bias related to the applicant

At all voting levels: critical to provide rationale for votes recorded as No, Abstain, or Recuse

- Particularly true for 'No' votes

Q&A

• .