



**Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidelines 2025-2026**  
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, revised 04/22/25  
**Updates (or sections with content updates) are highlighted.**

All candidate dossiers must be submitted to the university promotion and tenure committee according to the following guidelines. The candidate must submit a signed dossier certification when submitting their materials for review.

Document Format: To ensure clarity and consistency of dossiers, documents submitted must adhere to the following requirements:

- font type of either Arial or Times New Roman
- minimum font size of 11, maximum font size of 12
- black font
- single-spaced
- double-spaced between paragraphs
- margins of 1-inch left/right and top/bottom
- portrait orientation
- pages are not numbered.

Dossiers are prepared and submitted as electronic documents. Using version 8.0, 9.0, Adobe Acrobat XI Professional, or Adobe Acrobat Pro 2020, a candidate submits their dossier to the department as a pdf file with the major headings (I – IX) and subheadings (A – M) bookmarked. (It is not necessary to bookmark outline items V.B.1 – 15.) *Please be sure to activate OCR Text Recognition (go to Document—OCR Text Recognition—Recognize text using OCR...) on each dossier before bookmarking it. Dossiers should be saved with all pages set to 100% actual size.*

Adobe software is available here: <https://software.vt.edu/deptsoftware/adobeavailableproducts.html>

Note that 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 the various letters into Section II of the candidate's dossier. The departmental and college administrative assistants are responsible for bookmarking those subheadings (II. A – G).

Once a dossier is submitted by the candidate, it may not be revised or modified, except to correct non-substantive typographical errors, or to include the information as described in the previous paragraph. If additional substantive information is identified during the review process, they should be addressed in the department head's letter and/or the dean's letter.

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](http://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. Please indicate the type of promotion and whether there is conferral tenure so that candidates are reviewed in the appropriate order.

On the cover page, indicate the percent of assignment to each of teaching/learning, research/creative activities, and service/outreach/extension. The percentages must add up to 100 and, given that tenure track faculty are expected to have duties that encompass all three areas, none should be left blank or shown as zero. These percentages provide context for evaluating a candidate's performance and contributions to the tri-partite mission of the university. While the categories may be defined slightly differently by each college or academic unit, in general:

- Teaching includes classroom instruction, laboratories, clinical practice and instruction, curriculum development, and advising students.
- Research, scholarship, or creative activity encompasses the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or artistic work appropriate to the candidate's discipline.
- Service, outreach, and extension refers to contributions to the university, profession, and broader community, including committee work, community engagement, and applied scholarship.

The purpose of these percentages is not to demand precise accounting, but rather to help committees and reviewers understand how the candidate's time and responsibilities are generally allocated. This allows committees to assess accomplishments and impact in light of the expectations associated with the candidate's appointment.

Dossier Certification: The dossier certification form is incorporated into the dossier immediately following the cover page. The form is signed by the candidate certifying that their dossier is an accurate and truthful record of their scholarly achievement and that they assume full responsibility for the presentation and formatting of the dossier. The name of the department head, chair, of school director, the department/school P&T Committee chair, or the candidate's faculty mentor who reviewed a draft of the dossier and provided the candidate with dossier preparation feedback and mentoring should also be included.

## I. Executive Summary

Provide an executive summary of 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
- Educational history
- Research and teaching interests
- Previous professional appointments
- Publications. A listing of selected publications (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)

Candidates should also include tables to summarize their contributions. Please identify important aspects of accomplishments (e.g., first author, corresponding author, new courses developed; graduate student committees chaired; candidate's portion of internal and external grant funding. The candidate's portion of funding is calculated by multiplying the candidate's percentage of credit by the total award amount for each funded project and totaling these amounts).

Please update the following sample tables to provide a clear summary of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements. The column to the left of 'Total' should reflect accomplishments either since joining the Virginia Tech faculty or since the last promotion at Virginia Tech, *whichever is more recent*, with the appropriate column title. The preceding column should summarize accomplishments prior to that time. Faculty members with creative activities may adjust the rows to best represent their work.

| <b>Accomplishments</b>                              | <b>Prior to VT Appointment/<br/>Promotion</b> | <b>Since VT Appointment/<br/>Promotion</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|---|---|--|--------------|
| External Funding: Total Amount (Direct + Indirect)  | \$6,034,423                                   | \$5,064,390                                | \$11,098,813 |
| External Funding: Candidate Portion of Above Amount | \$1,712,932                                   | \$1,843,561                                | \$3,556,493  |
| Internal Funding: Total Amount                      | \$141,295                                     | \$150,589                                  | \$291,884    |
| Internal Funding: Candidate Portion of Above Amount | \$78,072                                      | \$102,789                                  | \$180,861    |
| Grants (external, internal)                         | 31,5  | 27,2                                       | 58,7         |
| Peer-reviewed publications                          | 8   | 25   | 33           |
| Ph.D. Students Graduated                            | 5   | 2  | 7            |
| Ph.D. Students (advising)                           | 3   | 2  | 5            |
| M.S. Students Graduated                             | 2   | 1  | 3            |
| M.S. Students (advising)                            | 3   | 3  | 6            |
| 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                            | 5   | 19   | 24           |
| Invited Keynote Presentations                       | 20  | 7  | 27           |

| Publications                              | Lead Author |       | Corresponding Author |       | Co-author |       | Total |       |
|---|-------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
|   | Prior       | Since | Prior                | Since | Prior     | Since | Prior | Since |
| Books                                     | 0           | 1     | 0                    | 0     | 1         | 1     | 1     | 2     |
| Book chapters                             | 1           | 2     | 0                    | 0     | 0         | 1     | 1     | 3     |
| Papers in refereed journals               | 2           | 7     | 3                    | 5     | 0         | 2     | 5     | 14    |
| Conference proceedings                    | 3           | 4     | 1                    | 4     | 0         | 3     | 4     | 11    |
| Non-book open educational resources (OER) | 0           | 1     | 0                    | 0     | 0         | 0     | 0     | 1     |
| Other papers and reports                  | 1           | 0     | 1                    | 3     | 1         | 3     | 3     | 6     |
| Total                                     | 7           | 14    | 5                    | 12    | 2         | 10    | 14    | 36    |

## II. Recommendation Statements

To preserve the confidentiality and integrity of the review process, the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools—including generative AI, large language models (LLMs), natural language processing (NLP) systems, or any algorithmic tools that produce, edit, analyze, or summarize text—is not allowed. Candidate materials are confidential and may not be shared with or processed by any external systems. AI tools may not be used to generate, draft, or revise committee or administrator letters or reports, nor to analyze or evaluate any portion of a candidate's materials.

### A. Statement from the dean

The dean's letter 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. A short letter that simply endorses prior letters or votes is *not* sufficient. If there is a split vote in the college committee, the dean's letter should discuss the reasons for it, balancing the majority opinion with sufficient information for the next level of review to understand any disagreements among committee members.

The dean's letter should conclude with a clear recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure with a summary justification. For candidates being considered for promotion to associate professor, the justification should be based on the candidate's demonstrated accomplishments as well as their future promise as a successful and productive scholar, educator, and university citizen. For candidates for promotion to professor, the justification should be based on the candidate's sustained record of excellence and having achieved a national and/or international reputation in their field.

The dean's letter is addressed to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

### B. Statement from the college committee

The letter from the college committee should be quite detailed and provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate's record in the context of the college's expectations for promotion and tenure. It should assess the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions across all areas of their assigned responsibilities, including teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service or outreach. The letter should articulate how the candidate's performance compares to college expectations and whether and how their accomplishments meet or exceed the standards for the rank being considered.

The committee letter should include the actual vote tally, rather than stating that the vote was "unanimous" or a "positive majority." For example, "The college committee voted (10—approve, 3—not approve, 1 ineligible, 2 observers) to recommend the candidate for promotion with tenure to associate professor." An explanation of the negative, ineligible, or non-voting observer votes must be included. The committee statement should also include a list of names of the eligible voting members and note the names of ineligible or non-voting observers.

Please note that the ineligible voting category 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. Also note that a faculty member who is being evaluated may not serve on any promotion committee and faculty members may not serve on any promotion committee evaluating a spouse or partner. It is not sufficient to leave the room while the spouse or partner is discussed.

Voting members for promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track faculty must be tenured.

Consistent with their vote, the college committee statement should explicitly make a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. The college committee's statement should be addressed to the dean.

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

The department head, chair, or school director's letter should provide a comprehensive, evaluative, and contextual assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, research or creative activity, and service. It should clearly articulate the candidate's contributions and trajectory within the discipline, referencing departmental expectations and how the candidate meets or exceeds them. The letter should synthesize insights from peer evaluations, external reviewers, and other relevant materials in the dossier, offering a balanced perspective that acknowledges both strengths and areas for growth. Additionally, the letter should speak to the candidate's collegiality, impact, and potential for continued excellence, serving as a key piece of evidence in support of the promotion and/or tenure recommendation. The letter is addressed to the dean.

The letter is limited to 6 pages in length, and should include:

- **Professional Assignment and Expectations.** Begin with a summary of the candidate's professional assignment at Virginia Tech, including the percentage of effort allocated to teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activity; and service, extension, and outreach. As necessary, define the three categories as they apply to the candidate. Describe the expectations associated with the assignment and provide context for how the candidate's accomplishments—both in quantity and quality—should be interpreted. If

certain expectations are not applicable (e.g., graduate student completions), note this explicitly to avoid confusion at subsequent levels of review.

- **Evaluation of Performance Across Faculty Responsibilities.** Provide a detailed assessment of the candidate's effectiveness in each area of responsibility:
  - Teaching, including student mentorship and academic advising
  - Research, scholarship, and/or creative activity
  - Service, outreach, and extension

This evaluation should reflect the candidate's assigned percentages and whether they hold a calendar- or academic-year appointment. Describe how their performance compares to department expectations and norms at peer institutions. Use tables or figures to illustrate comparisons with peer faculty, where appropriate.

- **Expectations for External Funding and Graduate Student Mentorship.** Describe the expectations for securing external funding (e.g., grants and contracts) and mentoring graduate students (both master's and doctoral). Explain how funding supports the candidate's research or scholarly agenda and the extent to which their level of support is sufficient to sustain their program, including graduate research assistantships. Clearly articulate the candidate's role in graduate student mentorship, indicating whether completion of a Ph.D. or master's student is expected and whether those expectations have been met.
- **Interpretive Summary of Scholarly Contributions.** Summarize the candidate's most significant accomplishments and provide an interpretation of the impact and originality of their work. Describe the quality and appropriateness of publication venues, and the visibility and prestige of keynote presentations, invited lectures, and other recognitions of scholarly reputation.
- **External Reviewers and Summary of Their Evaluations.** Explain why each reviewer was selected and how they are qualified to evaluate the candidate's work. Summarize key insights from the external letters and highlight any points of consensus or divergence. Address any concerns raised or comments requiring clarification.

The letter must include one of the following statements:

- *"I have reviewed this list of reviewers and they are not former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, co-authors on recent publications, or have any relationship to the candidate that may be perceived as being too close."*
- Or, if applicable: *"I have reviewed this list of reviewers and they are not former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, co-authors on recent publications, or have any relationship to the candidate that may be perceived as being too close, with the exception of [Name]."*

Follow this with a clear explanation of the exception and justification for including the letter in the dossier.

- **Commitment to Community and Collegiality.** Provide an evaluative statement on the candidate's contributions to creating a respectful, welcoming, and supportive academic environment, consistent with Virginia Tech's Principles of Community. This should include their role in fostering a collegial and professional culture within their department or school, and—where applicable—their lab, center, or other scholarly or creative workgroup. The evaluation should also address the candidate's treatment of graduate and undergraduate students, particularly in terms of mentorship, fairness, respect, and their contributions to cultivating a positive and inclusive learning and research environment.
- **Clarification of Unmet Expectations or Gaps in the Record.** If there are expectations the candidate has not yet met, explain the reasons where appropriate. *This is particularly important in non-mandatory cases.* For example, if a candidate has not chaired a graduate student to completion, highlight other relevant indicators of mentoring success (e.g., co-authored publications, student progress toward degree milestones). Similarly, if there are gaps in the record—such as multi-year lulls in productivity or sudden shifts in trajectory—provide a reasoned explanation while maintaining confidentiality.
- **Status of Progress and/or Peer Teaching Reviews.** If a scheduled progress review was not completed (e.g., a non-mandatory case prior to a second review), or if a peer evaluation of teaching is lacking, explain why.
- **Departmental Vote.** If the departmental promotion and tenure committee vote was split, provide an explanation that balances the majority view with a clear articulation of dissenting perspectives, to help reviewers at the next level understand the rationale behind the differing opinions.
- **Recent Developments.** Note any recent accomplishments or updates not captured elsewhere in the dossier, or that have occurred since the candidate's submission of the dossier, such as new grants, awards, or progress on graduate student completions.
- **Recommendation.** The letter should conclude with a clear recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure with a final summary justification. For candidates being considered for promotion to associate professor, the justification should be based on the candidate's demonstrated accomplishments as well as their future promise as a successful and productive scholar, educator, and department/school citizen. For candidates for promotion to professor, the justification should be based on the candidate's sustained record of excellence and having achieved a national and/or international reputation in their field.

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

The letter from the department committee should be quite detailed and provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate's record in the context of the department's expectations for promotion and tenure. It should assess the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions across all areas of their assigned responsibilities, including teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service or outreach.

The letter should articulate how the candidate's performance compares to department expectations and whether and how their accomplishments meet or exceed the standards for the rank being considered.

This letter should include the vote tally, rather than stating that the vote was "unanimous" or a "positive majority." For example, "The departmental committee voted (10—yes, 3—no, 1 ineligible, 1 observer) to recommend the candidate for promotion with tenure to associate professor." An explanation of the negative, ineligible, or non-voting observer votes must be included.

Department or school committee members are expected to vote. If they serve on the college committee, they will be ineligible to vote at that level. 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.

Voting members for promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track faculty must be tenured.

The committee statement should also include a list of names of the eligible voting members and note the names of ineligible or non-voting observers. The department committee statement should explicitly make a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. The department or school committee's statement should be addressed to the department head or director.

A faculty member who is being evaluated may not serve on any promotion committee and faculty members may not serve on any promotion committee evaluating a spouse or partner. It is not sufficient to leave the room while the spouse or partner is discussed.

NOTE: The candidate should receive assistance with the initial dossier preparation. The department head, chair, or school director, departmental/school P&T committee chair, or faculty member, should work with the candidate to correct errors or incomplete sections. The name of whomever provides this assistance should be included on the dossier certification form.

- 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, chair, or school 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. If the candidate was asked to prepare a list of external reviewers and chose not to submit a list, the dossier should note this below the chart of external reviewers. The final list of outside reviewers should never be shared with the candidate.

Reviewers must 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. The National Science Foundation (NSF) standard of four years should generally be used to define 'recent' publications, though colleges may apply a longer timeframe in their P&T guidelines. 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 <https://aie.vt.edu/analytics-and-ai/peer-institutions/schev-approved-peers.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 the candidate is engaged in interdisciplinary work (e.g., Destination Areas or Strategic Growth Areas; close collaborations across

disciplinary lines), please provide a description of that work to the external reviewers so they evaluate the faculty member's contributions in that context.

Department heads and/or department committee chairs should instruct external letter writers to describe any relationship with the candidate in their letter. This should include how long they have known the candidate, whether there is a personal or professional relationship with the candidate, and, in general, if there is a potential conflict of interest. Guidance should include instructions asking external reviewers to self-disqualify if they meet any of these criteria. In the event the department selects a reviewer that meets any of these criteria and the external reviewer fails to self-disqualify, the department head's letter should clearly explain the situation and justify whether the letter should or should not be considered by the college and university committees.

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 their 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 the candidate is being evaluated within the standard six-year probationary period without using their extensions, this statement is not required.** 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.

**External reviewers should not use artificial intelligence (AI) to generate, analyze, or draft their response. Department heads should include the following statement on the use of AI: "As part of Virginia Tech's faculty promotion process, we request that your evaluation be based solely on your professional expertise and independent analysis of the candidate's dossier. To ensure confidentiality and maintain the integrity of the review, please refrain from using AI tools to generate, analyze, or draft your response. All materials provided are confidential and should not be shared with or processed by any external platforms, including AI systems. Thank you for your cooperation in upholding the standards of this process."**

See the [Provost's Office website](#) for additional guidance and recommended text for letters to external reviewers.

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                                   |
| Kwan Lin   | Penn State University |                        | X                                   |

\*Please include all letters received. Do not include reviewers who did not submit an outside letter in the table. Provide an explanation if there are any unusual aspects to the outside reviewers.

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 and double-spaced between paragraphs. 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, including graduate and undergraduate student mentorship, outreach, and extension achievements; and international activities. Where possible, the candidate's statement should reference specific scholarly achievements documented in the remainder of the promotion and tenure dossier.

#### A. Professional Impact Statement

To help evaluators understand broader external factors that may have affected a candidate's professional accomplishments, candidates may include a statement describing circumstances beyond their control that had a demonstrable negative impact on their ability to conduct, disseminate, or fund their research, scholarly, creative, or

outreach activities. This may include disruptions related to the COVID-19 pandemic—such as lab closures, restrictions on human subjects research, or the cancellation of performances or publications—as well as impacts stemming from recent federal government actions, such as the loss of grant funding through no fault of the candidate, delays or cancellations of research due to agency shutdowns, or changes in federal policy affecting academic work. The statement should only focus on how these events affected the candidate's professional trajectory and productivity and should be no longer than one-half of a page.

#### 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, student mentorship, and advising are available: development of instructional material and of courses and curricula; student, peer, and alumni evaluations; contributions to graduate student mentorship and/or 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.

All faculty who teach should have multiple forms of teaching evaluations, including SPOT scores and peer evaluations, and these evaluations should be included in the promotion dossier. Two letters or reports from departmental or college peer reviewers since last promotion are required. This includes faculty with low teaching assignments, but who teach or regularly guest lecture. Faculty whose evaluations of teaching, including peer evaluations and SPOT scores, suggest improvements in teaching are warranted should be sure to list what they have done to improve in subsection M below (e.g., CETL and TLOS workshops).

Due to the disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic on teaching, SPOT scores for the calendar year 2020 (spring, summer, and fall) are not required to be reported in any promotion dossier.

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.

Candidates for promotion to professor may choose to provide a listing of teaching accomplishments since the last promotion, or they may choose to provide a selected list of teaching accomplishments if they have been in rank for many years and can demonstrate their effectiveness with a selected list.

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

##### A. Recognition and awards for teaching or advising effectiveness

- B. Chronological list and/or table of courses taught since the date of appointment to Virginia Tech (or since last promotion). 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 and/or table should include courses by term and year, credit hours, course enrollments, and the faculty member's role (if not solely responsible for the course) with the percent of effort or assignment.

- C. Chronological list of non-credit courses, workshops, and other related outreach and/or extension teaching since the date of appointment to Virginia Tech (or since last promotion)
- 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 and mentoring responsibilities—graduate and undergraduate

Please include the students who are currently working on their theses, dissertations, etc. Include a table that shows the progress of each student, the milestones accomplished, and other indicators of progress.

Describe graduate mentoring accomplishments in detail, including exams completed, scholarship published, funding of graduate students on grants and contracts, the successful graduation of master's and/or Ph.D. students, and other milestones that demonstrate effective and successful graduate student mentorship.

Sample table is provided. Please modify the table to best present the candidate's current academic graduate mentoring and undergraduate advising responsibilities.

| Role             | Name           | Degree                    | Status/Degree Date  |
|------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---|
| Chair            | Daniel Lu      | PhD Physics               | Passed proposal defense; published a co-authored paper                  |
|                  | Bob Jones      | PhD Engineering Education | Passed proposal defense; made two professional conference presentations |
|                  | Pearl Chang    | PhD Biological Sciences   | Passed preliminary exam; engaged in field research                      |
|                  | Kevin Taylor   | PhD English               | Passed preliminary exam   |
|                  | Kathy Akers    | PhD Entomology            | Passed qualifying exam Spring 2024                                      |
|                  | Jeremy Adams   | MS Electrical Engineering | 1 <sup>st</sup> year student  |
| Committee Member | Becky Jones    | PhD Sociology             | Passed proposal defense   |
|                  | Mike Walters   | PhD Higher Education      | Passed proposal defense   |
|                  | Betsy Miller   | PhD Computer Science      | Passed qualifying exam  |
|                  | Joe Roberts    | PhD Engineering Education | Created plan of study   |
|                  | Sally Brown    | PhD Geosciences           | Passed preliminary exam   |
|                  | Sandy Williams | PhD Biochemistry          | Passed qualifier exam   |
|                  | Samantha Smith | MS Electrical Engineering | Completing thesis   |

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 perceptions of teaching (SPOT)

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. A sample table may be helpful; see a recommended presentation below.

Explanation of columns:

"enrolled" indicates the number students enrolled in the course at the time the student evaluation was conducted

“response” indicates the number of students who answered the question for which scores are reported

“overall effectiveness” lists the mean response to the question” Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective.” Note that the data are presented as (instructor average) / (maximum score)

“dept. ave.” indicates the average for the Department of XXXXXX for the same question over all courses in the indicated semester

“college ave.” shows the average for all courses in the College of X X X X X for the same questions in the indicated semester

| year | term | course #  | course title                                  | enrolled | response | overall effectiveness | depta ve. | college ave. |
|------|------|-----------|---|----------|----------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|
| 2022 | F    | XXXX 2000 | Introduction to Life                          | 42       | 29       | 5.56 / 6              | 5 / 6     | 5.22 / 6     |
| 2023 | S    | XXXX 5000 | Advanced Topics in Life                       | 10       | 8        | 5.8 / 6               | 5 / 6     | 5.4 / 6      |
| 2023 | S    | XXXX 4000 | Philosophy of Life                            | 22       | 18       | 5.5 / 6               | 5.09 / 6  | 5.25 / 6     |
| 2023 | F    | XXXX 6000 | Advanced Topics of Life Philosophy of Biology | 7        | 4        | 5.5 / 6               | 5.09 / 6  | 5.25 / 6     |
| 2024 | S    | XXXX 5050 | Problem solving Logic                         | 10       | 8        | 5.5 / 6               | 5.09 / 6  | 5.25 / 6     |

#### K. Peer evaluations of instruction

Provide at least two letters or reports from departmental or college peer reviewers since the last promotion regarding the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness. These reviews should be a minimum of two pages each and provide substantive detail regarding the teaching or advising activities. Peer evaluations of teaching may address topics such as course organization and management, pedagogical strategies, content knowledge and communication, assessment strategies, and student engagement, among others. Additionally, the two peer reviews should take place at different points in the review period, such as in separate semesters, and should assess differing instructional events. Peer reviews should be conducted by different reviewers in order to provide diverse perspectives on teaching 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- $\beta$  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.

For multi-authored papers, interdisciplinary papers, and other relevant works, the candidate should include a short statement of her/his contributions to the work. Distinguish the candidate's role as lead or corresponding author.

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. If a candidate reports an H-index, I10, or other metrics, place the number in context for the



field, subfield, or specialty. A seemingly low score in a subfield may be an indicator of impact that is different from other subfields.

Increasingly, scholarly and professional associations are recognizing the importance of fostering a wide range of perspectives within disciplinary fields. The dossier may address the candidate's involvement with work groups, conferences, special journal editions, or other initiatives that promote the advancement of scholarship through the integration of multiple viewpoints and the broadening of intellectual inquiry within their discipline.

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

A. Awards, prizes, and recognitions

**B. List of publications and creative scholarship**

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

The list of publications included in the dossier should, where appropriate, be accompanied by indicators of impact that help contextualize the significance of the candidate's work. These may include citation counts, journal impact factors, awards, or evidence of influence on the field or practice. 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.

For works with multiple authors, a brief description of the candidate's specific contributions—such as conceptual development, data analysis, writing, or project leadership—should be provided to help reviewers understand the nature and extent of their role in collaborative efforts. This information allows evaluators to fairly and accurately assess the candidate's scholarly contributions within the norms of their discipline.

Candidates for promotion to professor should list all scholarly contributions in reverse chronological order and should indicate which contributions occurred since the last promotion. The contributions since the 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 (including peer-reviewed open access textbooks)
5. Textbooks edited (including peer-reviewed open access textbooks)
6. Open educational resource (OER) beyond peer-reviewed open access textbooks, original or adapted, and shared beyond the instructor's own courses.

Supporting quantitative data may be included (e.g. times cited, downloads, and external adoptions) for open access textbooks and other open access educational resources to demonstrate impact.

7. Papers in refereed journals (both print and electronic)
8. Papers in refereed conference proceedings
9. Performances, exhibitions, compositions
10. Digital scholarship
11. Reviews
12. Numbered extension publications
13. Prefaces, introductions, catalogue statements, etc.
14. Papers and posters presented at professional meetings
15. Translations
16. Abstracts
17. Other papers and reports

C. Sponsored research and other grant awards (Please distinguish internal and external awards)

Explicitly cite the principal investigator(s)—all names that appear on the grant proposal, year, and duration of the award, percentage of candidate's credit, 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.

Please specify the candidate's current percentage of credit. In some cases, it may be important to address the candidate's percentage of credit for the funded initiative independent of funding amounts. The candidate's portion of grants should be what is listed in Summit.

There should be clear evidence of external funding to support graduate education at a level appropriate for the candidate's discipline/field. Provide an explicit statement about whether the funding is sufficient to meet the department/college's expectations.

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 (including open source 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.

Candidates for promotion to professor may choose to provide a listing of service and outreach/extension accomplishments since the last promotion, or they may choose to provide a selected list of these accomplishments if they have been in rank for many years and can demonstrate their effectiveness with a selected list.

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 expand the disciplines such as:

1. Disciplinary or interdisciplinary efforts aimed at attracting underrepresented students from a wide range of backgrounds to different majors and graduate programs at Virginia Tech.
2. Participation in campus, local, regional, or national organizational efforts to promote and cultivate broad engagement and varied experiences and viewpoints 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-level service, to include involvement and engagement in shared governance, university meetings, panels, workshops led or organized, etc.
- B. Department, college, and university service, including administrative responsibilities.
- C. Service to students—involvement in co-curricular activities, advising student organizations, etc.
- D. Service that reflects and advances Virginia Tech's Principles of Community, including efforts to cultivate a collegial, respectful, and welcoming academic environment.

#### VIII. Work Under Review or In Progress

Work listed in this section can be updated but cannot be included in early parts of the dossier. For example, a paper that was under review when the dossier was first submitted may be accepted prior to sending the dossier to the college or university committees. An annotation in this section is acceptable.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are encouraged to include work under review or in progress; committees are interested in the continued trajectory of the candidates' work.

(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, and in press or accepted date, etc.)

A. Work submitted and under review

B. Work in progress

IX. Other Pertinent Activities