

Virginia Tech Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers for 2017-18
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, revised June 27, 2017

All candidate dossiers must be submitted to the university promotion and tenure committee according to the following guidelines.

Document Format: The dossier should be formatted as follows

- font type of either Verdana or Arial
- minimum font size of 11
- single-spaced
- double-spaced between paragraphs
- margins of 1-inch left/right and top/bottom
- pages are not numbered.

Dossiers are prepared and submitted as electronic documents. Using version 8.0, 9.0, or Adobe Acrobat XI Professional, a candidate submits his or her dossier to the department as a pdf-file with the major headings (I – IX and A – M) bookmarked. (It is not necessary to bookmark outline items V.B.1 – 15.) Adobe Acrobat XI Professional software for Mac or Windows is available from the following website: http://www2.ita.vt.edu/software/department/products/adobe/acrobat_pro/index.html

Please be sure to activate OCR Text Recognition (go to Document—OCR Text Recognition—Recognize text using OCR...) on each dossier before bookmarking it.

Section II of the promotion and tenure dossier is not prepared by the candidate. The department head, departmental promotion and tenure committee, dean, and college promotion and tenure committee will insert section II into the candidate's electronic dossier. The departmental and college administrative assistants are responsible for bookmarking those major headings (II. A – G).

A separate table of contents is not necessary. The electronic bookmarks act as a table of contents. If a section is not applicable to a candidate's dossier, please include the outline number in the body of the dossier, but indicate that the section is not applicable or "N/A." There is no need to bookmark a section that is not applicable. The final document should be saved with the bookmarks showing. Go to File → Properties → Initial view → Navigation tab – select *Bookmarks Panel and Page* → Ok.

Dossier Outline: Specific instructions for preparing each section of the dossier are as follows.

Cover Page: The provost provides a standard cover page, available at www.provost.vt.edu. Please note that the cover page includes the specific committee votes. Please record the complete vote, including zeros where appropriate. Department and college administrative assistants should ensure that all information is completed on the cover page before sending the dossier to the next level. It is very important to indicate the appropriate type of promotion (promotion in academic rank, conferral of non-mandatory tenure, conferral of mandatory tenure) so that candidates are reviewed in the appropriate order.

I. Executive Summary

Provide an executive summary, no more than three pages in length in outline form. Consider opening the executive summary with a paragraph that describes the candidate's research and scholarly work and the context in which they are working. The summary should address accomplishments and significant contributions pertinent to the candidate's field, which may include the following, but are not necessarily limited to these topics or to this list order:

- Awards
- Education
- Research and teaching interests
- Professional appointments
- Publications. Full listing of selected (or all, if page limit allows) should be included
- Candidates for promotion to professor should include in the executive summary only publications and other scholarly contributions since their promotion to associate professor. Candidates for promotion to professor may include all publications and scholarly activities in the appropriate section of V. Research and Creative Activities.
- Competitive grants (selected, or all if page limit allows)
- Other sponsored research (selected, or all if page limit allows)
- Courses taught (selected, or all if page limit allows)
- Student advising (selected, or all if page limit allows)
- Outreach and professional service (selected, or all if page limit allows)
- Inclusive practices and diversity initiatives (selected, or all if page limit allows). Candidates should include a list of activities that promote or contribute to inclusive teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Candidates should use tables to summarize their contributions. Please identify important aspects of accomplishments (e.g., first author, corresponding author, new courses developed; graduate student committees chaired).

Sample tables are provided. Please modify the tables to best present the candidate's work in a summary fashion.

Accomplishments (since last promotion)

	After Associate	Before Associate	Total
External Funding Total Amount	\$6,034,423	\$5,064,390	\$11,098,813
External Funding (Candidate) Amount	\$1,712,932	\$1,843,561	\$3,556,493
Internal Funding Total Amount	\$223,589	\$68,295	\$291,884
Internal Funding (Candidate) Amount	\$135,072	\$45,789	\$180,861
Grants	31	27	58
Peer-reviewed publications	29	20	49
Ph.D. Students	5	2	7
M.S. Students Graduated	2	1	3
Undergrad Research	15	17	32
Awards and Recognition	27	12	39
Post docs	2	1	3
Courses Taught	9	8	17
Papers at Prof. Meetings	52	37	89
Invited Keynote Presentations	20	7	27

Publications (since last promotion)

	Lead Author	Co-author	Co-editor	Total
Books	1		1	2
Book chapters	2			2
Papers in refereed journals	7	5		12
Conference proceedings	4	4		8
Other papers and reports		3		3
Total	14	12	1	19

II. Recommendation Statements

A. Statement from the dean

The statement from the dean is an informative, individualized assessment of the candidate's accomplishments as they relate to Section 3.4.4 of the *Faculty Handbook* from the perspective of the college and the dean. The dean's statement should provide an integrative summary of the candidate's contributions to the department, college, and university goals. It should also reflect on the reasons for any split vote, balancing the majority opinion with sufficient information for the next level of review to understand any disagreements among committee members. The dean's statement should be addressed to Thanassis Rikakis, Executive Vice President and Provost.

B. Statement from the college committee

The statement from the college committee should be quite detailed and should include the division of the vote. Indicate the actual vote tally, rather than stating that the vote was "unanimous" or a "positive majority." For example, "The college committee voted (10—yes, 3—no,

1 abstain, 1 ineligible) to recommend the candidate for promotion with tenure to associate professor." An explanation of the negative, abstentions, or ineligible votes must be included. The college committee's statement should be addressed to the dean. Please note that a voting category has been established, ineligible, which should be used by college committee members who served on and voted as a member of the department committee and thus are ineligible to vote at the college level.

C. Statement by the department head, chair, or school director

This statement is limited to 6 pages in length, and should include:

- A summary of the candidate's professional assignment at Virginia Tech.
- An evaluation of the academic performance and effectiveness of the candidate in each of the areas of faculty responsibility: teaching and academic advising; research and creative activities; and outreach. The statement should include the position responsibilities, how these expectations relate to expectations of faculty members in peer departments, and AY or CY designation.
- The expectations for external funding (e.g., grants and contracts), mentoring graduate students (e.g., masters vs. doctoral), publications and the role that funding plays for the faculty member's research and scholarship in your unit and in peers units nationally.
- Information regarding the quality and appropriateness of publication forums.
- Information regarding the significance of keynote presentation/lecture venues.
- A summary of important accomplishments and an interpretation of significant contributions.
- Information regarding the candidate's contributions to an inclusive campus and collegial workplace at Virginia Tech.
- An explanation of the procedures by which the candidate was evaluated.
- An explanation for any split vote, balancing the majority opinion with sufficient information for the next level of review to understand any disagreement amongst committee members.
- A summary of the comments and recommendations from outside reviewers, particularly if an explanation or refutation is warranted.
- Address any gaps in the candidate's record without revealing any confidential information. A gap of two or three years or an inversion of a trajectory (research, teaching, outreach, or service) requires a detailed and careful explanation.
- The head or director's recommendation on the case.
- The head or director's statement should be addressed to the dean.

D. Statement by the department or school promotion and tenure committee

This statement should include a detailed evaluation of the candidate and the division of the vote. Indicate the vote tally, rather than stating that the vote was “unanimous” or a “positive majority.” For example, “The departmental committee voted (8—yes and 0—no) to recommend the candidate for promotion with tenure to associate professor.” Please include an explanation of the negative, abstentions, or ineligible votes. In the absence of a unanimous recommendation, a minority report may be included. In most cases, however, the basis for a split vote should be evident in the committee letter. The department or school committee’s statement should be addressed to the department head or director.

E. Statements from other units for faculty with joint appointments or other formal interaction

If the candidate’s research is primarily through a team in a research center or institute, the center or institute director (or designee) should provide a letter of evaluation. These statements should be addressed to the department head or director.

F. For faculty who present significant interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary and collaborative teaching, research, outreach, or extension as part of the record, the dossier should include one evaluation letter from the director, coordinator, or leader of the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary program. This letter should be addressed to the department head or director.

Do not include an excessive number of “congratulatory” letters.

G. Letters of evaluation submitted by outside reviewers from peer institutions

The committee expects to see *all* external letters received, not just selected letters. The dossier must contain, at a minimum, four external review letters. External reviewers are expected to be professors at major research universities; these reviewers should be viewed as senior contributors to the appropriate related discipline(s) or area of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the departmental promotion and tenure committee and/or department head to solicit evaluations from outside reviewers. In a parallel but independent process, the candidate and the departmental promotion and tenure committee (and/or department head) will each prepare a list of outside reviewers. There may be instances when the committee and the candidate suggest the same outside reviewer. This is perfectly acceptable; however, candidates may not suggest *all* of the outside reviewers. If a candidate and the committee choose the same reviewers, please be sure to indicate that in

the table. The final set of external reviewers should include a balance between those suggested by the candidate and those suggested by the committee. At least three letters should come from those selected independently by the department committee/head/committee chair. Any deviation from this distribution should be explained in the dossier. If a candidate chooses not to submit a list of external reviewers, the dossier should note that the candidate was invited to provide a list, but chose to let the department select the reviewers. The final list of outside reviewers should never be shared with the candidate. Reviewers should not be former advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, or coauthors on recent publications, or should not have other relationships that may be perceived as being too close to the candidate. When possible, avoid selecting external reviewers from the candidate's Ph.D. granting institution or from universities at which the faculty member had a prior faculty position.

Reviewers are expected to be at peer institutions or other major research universities. If the best person to evaluate the work is not at a major research university, please explain. A listing of Virginia Tech's SCHEV-approved peer institutions can be found at http://www.ir.vt.edu/work_we_do/PeerInstitutions/homepage_SCHEV.html. However, other major research universities may be very appropriate sources of external reviewers; committees are not confined to the official SCHEV-peer list. It is important to include senior, accomplished faculty members who will have had experience with the promotion process at their home university. Additionally, it is important to include senior faculty who are national and international leaders to evaluate candidates for promotion to professor.

Department heads and/or department committee chairs should carefully instruct external reviewers about the expectations for promotion: (a) a national reputation for research and scholarly work for promotion and tenure; (b) national leadership and distinction for promotion to professor; and (c) placing the candidate's accomplishments in the context of faculty members who are working in similar fields at other research universities. If a candidate has received an extension of the tenure probationary period, this should be addressed in the external review request as follows: "This candidate has received an extension of his or her tenure probationary period under approved university policies. You are asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and appropriateness for tenure and promotion to associate professor as if the record had been accumulated during our normal six-year probationary period." If a candidate has received a semester or two with modified duties, it is only necessary to inform the external reviewers if the teaching load reduction is substantial and notable. If external reviewers are informed, please do not state a reason for modified duties.

1. Provide information about the outside reviewers in a table format, as follows:

Reviewer	Institution	Suggested by Candidate	Independently selected by Committee
Mary Jones	Stanford Univ.	X	
John Smith	Michigan State Univ.		X
Jane Brown	Oregon State Univ.		X
Bob Akers	Iowa State Univ.	X	X
Sally Smith	Penn State University		X

2. Following the table, provide a brief (two to three paragraphs) biographical sketch of each reviewer and explain why he or she was particularly suited to review the candidate's work. If a reviewer is not from a peer institution or major research university, please address the reasons that the reviewer was selected. The majority of reviewers are expected to be from a peer institution (SCHEV Peers) or other major research university.
3. Following the biosketches, provide a sample copy of the letter of instruction sent to outside reviewers.
4. Following the sample outside review instruction letter, provide the letters from outside reviewers.

III. Candidate's Statement

The candidate's statement should be no more than four pages in length. Neither this statement, nor any part of it, should be repeated or further developed elsewhere in the dossier. The candidate should provide an introductory statement about their professional identity and the context of their work within the broad field(s) in which they are working. This statement should explain such matters as the character, coherence, direction, and purpose of the candidate's scholarly and professional work, including the integration of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. Scholarship, which is pervasive across all three missions of the university, is broadly defined at Virginia Tech as the creation of knowledge that is peer reviewed and publicly disseminated. The candidate should provide the context for her/his work in the specific areas of scholarship and how her/his contributions are evaluated nationally. As a land-grant university, Virginia Tech values the application of teaching and research in fulfillment of its outreach and extension responsibilities. Outreach accomplishments should be reported in context of research and teaching, as well as international and professional service. Faculty with extension appointments should also relate their program accomplishments to teaching, research, and outreach.

The statement should enable members of the university promotion and tenure committee to understand clearly the candidate's professional aims and achievements. The statement should explain the work and its impact. This statement should provide all reviewers with a clear understanding of the candidate's research and creative activities; teaching, outreach, and extension achievements; international activities; and active involvement in diversity and inclusion. Where possible, the candidate's statement should reference specific scholarly achievements documented in the remainder of the promotion and tenure dossier.

IV. Teaching and Advising Effectiveness

Teaching and advising are multifaceted activities. In any assessment of a candidate for promotion and tenure, both the quality and the quantity of the individual's achievements in teaching and advising should be presented in the dossier. A number of measures to demonstrate the quality of teaching and advising are available: development of instructional material and of courses and curricula; student, peer, and alumni evaluations; contributions as an academic advisor; recognition and awards for teaching or advising effectiveness; the long term effect of a faculty member on the personal and professional success of students; student achievements; and incorporating inclusive pedagogy in teaching.

Those evaluating candidates for promotion or tenure should give special consideration to teaching effectiveness. The assessment of teaching and advising effectiveness rests on a comprehensive review of both qualitative and quantitative measures. To be evaluated favorably, an individual should contribute to the accomplishment of the mission of the university in several aspects of teaching.

The promotion and tenure dossier should provide the following information about teaching and advising:

- A. Recognition and awards for teaching or advising effectiveness
- B. A chronological list of courses taught since the date of appointment to Virginia Tech. Candidates who held a position at the same rank at another institution may include courses taught at that rank prior to their appointment to Virginia Tech.

The chronological list should include courses by term and year, credit hours, course enrollments, and the faculty member's role (if not solely responsible for the course).

- C. A chronological list of non-credit courses, workshops, and other related outreach and/or extension teaching since the date of appointment to Virginia Tech.

- D. Completed theses, dissertations, other graduate degree projects, major undergraduate research projects, and honors theses directed
- E. Postdoctoral Fellow training and research

Format the information in this section, as follows:

Student: Mary Jones

Degree and Institution: Ph.D., Dept. of Toxicology, NC State University

Employed: August 2000 – present

Publications: 2

Meeting Presentations: 3

Employment after leaving postdoctoral position: State Toxicologist's Office, Durham, NC

- F. Current positions held by the candidate's masters and doctoral recipients
- G. Special achievements of current/former undergraduate and graduate students
- H. Current academic advising responsibilities—graduate and undergraduate

Please include the students who are currently working on their theses, dissertations, etc.

- I. Course, curriculum, and program development

The dossier must provide a persuasive evaluation of the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher and an advisor. It should explain the point or meaning of any data, information, or examples included as evidence. Data from student evaluations, for example, are not necessarily self-explanatory; the numbers usually require interpretation and comparison. Where comparisons are warranted and would be helpful, they should be included. The quality of a candidate's achievements and ability as a teacher should be clearly demonstrated. Evidence such as the following should be included:

- J. Student evaluations of instruction

Include the rating scale and college and/or department averages. Include data on all courses evaluated, enrollment in each course, number of students turning in evaluations, and numerical averages. Do not include student comments from teaching evaluations. Include evaluations of non-credit courses or other outreach or extension-related teaching, which should include participant data as defined above and evidence of the impact of programs on participants.

K. Peer evaluations of instruction

Provide at least two letters or reports from departmental or college peer reviewers regarding the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness.

L. Alumni evaluations of instruction

Inclusion of alumni evaluations of instruction is optional. If included, describe how the letters/evaluations were solicited.

M. Demonstrated efforts to improve one's teaching effectiveness, including, but not limited to, pursuing training in inclusive pedagogy and incorporating the Principles of Community into course development.

V. Research and Creative Activities

While both the quality and quantity of a candidate's achievements should be examined, quality should be the primary consideration. Quality should be defined largely in terms of the work's importance in the progress or redefinition of a field or discipline, the establishment of relationships among disciplines, the improvement of practitioner performance, or in terms of the creativity of the thought and methods behind it. Original achievements in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods should be regarded more highly than work making minor variations in or repeating familiar themes in the literature or the candidate's previous work. Determination of excellence is difficult and requires informed professional judgment.

Quantity is often easier to measure than quality, since comparisons can be made more readily. However, because scholars and artists sometimes—and for good reasons—disseminate essentially the same information or exhibit the same work, it is important to note the relationships among various publications, exhibitions, and performances where redundancy or duplication appears to occur.

Some disciplines more readily lend themselves to greater numbers of scholarly works. Thus, it is essential that quality be the primary, although not the only, criterion to evaluate a candidate's achievements.

Candidates should list only those publications, projects, or performances which have appeared or been accepted for publication or presentation. They should not include work currently submitted and being reviewed or work in progress.

For each publication, project, or performance, please indicate the lead author or performer's name(s) in bold text, for example:

Jones, M. A. and Smith, J. E., 2001. The role of As60A, a TGF- β homolog, in *Anopheles stephensi* innate immunity and defense against *Plasmodium* infection. Infection, Genetics, and Evolution 1:131-141.

Papers, publications, or performances in collaboration with current or former students should include an asterisk at each student's name.

The dossier should provide a persuasive assessment of a candidate's research and creative achievement. Achievement and ability should be clearly demonstrated. It is important, for example, to identify refereed publications or juried exhibitions and the professional status of a press, journal, performance or exhibition. It is important to show the professional quality of a candidate's achievements through such means as qualified peer evaluations, published reviews, external evaluations, grants, awards, or prizes.

Increasingly, scholarly and professional associations are acknowledging the need for more diverse perspectives within fields. The dossier may address the candidate's involvement with work groups, conferences, special journal editions, or other efforts that advance the scholarship of diversity within her or his field.

The promotion and tenure dossier should provide the following information about research and creative activity:

- A. Awards, prizes, and recognitions
- B. List of contributions

Contributions should be identified by type and presented in a standard appropriate bibliographic form. Cite page numbers. Indicate lead author, per the example given above.

Candidates for promotion to professor should list all scholarly contributions in reverse chronological order, but should indicate which contributions occurred since the last promotion. The contributions since last promotion should be consistent with those reported in the Executive Summary.

1. Books or monographs
2. Book chapters
3. Books edited
4. Textbooks authored

5. Textbooks edited
6. Papers in refereed journals (both print and electronic)

Provide a qualitative assessment of the paper, which may include article-level metrics as well as broader impacts such as media coverage or effect on public policy. For example, counts of citations, views, downloads, Altmetric scores or percentiles, and mentions may be listed with their sources.

Optionally, provide a qualitative assessment regarding the journals in which the candidate has published. This should be a statement about the level of prestige and relevance of the journal in the specific field or area, and may include acceptance rates, journal impact factor, or similar information. For example:

- *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, a leading journal in the field of agricultural economics. Published five times a year by the American Agricultural Economics Association. The acceptance rate is 26 percent.
- *The Physical Review*: the highest regarded journal in condensed matter and solid-state physics. Publisher: *American Physical Society* (APS). Impact factor 2.352.
- Sponsored by the National Council on Family Relations, the *Sourcebook of Family Theory and Research* is the seminal reference work on theory and methods for family scholars and students. The *Sourcebook* represents a “Who’s Who” of family researchers with contributions from the best, innovative, and upcoming researchers in family studies.

7. Papers in refereed conference proceedings
8. Performances, exhibitions, compositions
9. Digital scholarship
10. Reviews
11. Numbered extension publications
12. Prefaces, introductions, catalogue statements, etc.
13. Papers and posters presented at professional meetings
14. Translations
15. Abstracts

16. Other papers and reports

C. Sponsored research and other grant awards (Internal and External)

Explicitly cite the principal investigator(s)—all names that appear on the grant proposal, year, and duration of the award, percentage of candidate's participation, source (agency) of the award, and the amount. Differentiate external and internal research funding.

Identify whether the proposal addresses broadening participation or increasing engagement of underrepresented groups within one's field, or otherwise advances knowledge about diverse populations, as defined by one's field. Indicate the percentage of candidate's participation. Do not include unfunded grant applications. Do not include proposals that have been submitted, but rejected (not funded). The department head's letter may address the issue of grant proposals submitted but not funded if this is deemed an important reflection of effort, for example.

D. Invited keynote presentations or lectures

E. Editorships, curatorships, etc.

1. Journals or other learned publications
2. Editorial boards
3. Exhibitions, performances, displays, etc.

F. Economic contributions and entrepreneurship

1. Start-up businesses (including competitive grants and contracts such as SBIR awards and other notable business achievements)
2. Commercialization of discoveries
3. Other

G. Intellectual properties

Provide insight regarding the significance of the intellectual property and its contribution to the university mission.

1. Software
2. Patents
3. Disclosures (pre-patent)

VI. International and Professional Service and Additional Outreach and Extension Activities

Faculty members should seek ways in which they connect their scholarship to enhance international and global understanding as well as advance their professional disciplines. The quality and effectiveness of international activities and professional service should be documented.

Additional outreach and extension contributions and creative activities not reported under teaching and research may be reported in this section. Simply enumerating activities, identifying committees and task forces, listing reports and studies is not sufficient. It is important to show the professional quality of a candidate's achievements through such means as qualified peer review, stakeholder evaluations, reviews of published materials, conference and workshop assessments, and letters from committee chairs.

The dossier should provide the following information:

- A. International programs accomplishments
 - 1. International recognition and awards
 - 2. International research collaborations
 - 3. Other international activities
- B. Professional service accomplishments, such as:
 - 1. Service as an officer of an academic or professional association
 - 2. Other service to one's profession or field (e.g., service on committees)
 - 3. Professional meetings, panels, workshops, etc., led or organized
- C. Efforts to diversify the disciplines such as:
 - 1. Disciplinary or interdisciplinary efforts to attract underrepresented students to different majors and graduate programs at Virginia Tech.
 - 2. Participation in campus, local, regional, or national organizational efforts to promote diversity and inclusion in scholarly or professional fields.
- D. Additional outreach and extension activities and outcomes

This section is designed to capture outreach and extension-related program activity that is not reported in previous sections. Community

service unrelated to the candidate's professional responsibilities (e.g., leading a youth group, coaching youth sports teams) should not be included in the dossier. Specific areas that may be appropriately reported here include:

1. Peer evaluations of extension program(s)
2. Professional achievements in program development, implementation, and evidence of impact
3. Outreach and extension publications, including trade journals, newsletters, websites, journals, multimedia items, etc.
4. Presentations in area of expertise to community and civic organizations, including schools and alumni groups, etc.
5. Outreach to underrepresented or underserved communities, in the Commonwealth, domestically, or internationally.
6. Service on external boards, commissions, and advisory committees
7. Expert witness/testimony
8. Consulting that is consistent with university/department priorities
9. Recognitions and awards for outreach and extension effectiveness

VII. University Service

Faculty members have significant roles in the governance, development, and vitality of the university and academic profession. Service to the university and academic professional organizations constitutes an important faculty responsibility, as does advising of student organizations.

- A. University meetings, panels, workshops, etc. led or organized
- B. Department, college, and university service, including administrative responsibilities
- C. Service that promotes diversity and inclusion (e.g., participation in a caucus designed to promote inclusion; participation in gateway and pipeline programs; advising and assisting student ambassador programs).

Broad categories and examples of diversity contributions developed by the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity are available at the following website:

http://www.provost.vt.edu/efars/diversity_reporting.html

- D. Service to students—involvement in co-curricular activities, advising student organizations, etc.

VIII. Work Under Review or In Progress

(When appropriate, please provide indicators of the scope of the work such as number of pages for a book manuscript, venue for proposed performance, agency where the grant is or will be submitted, etc.)

- A. Work submitted and under review

- B. Work in progress

IX. Other Pertinent Activities