



Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidelines 2023-2024
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, revised 05/01/23
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
- black font
- 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, 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 A – M) bookmarked. (It is not necessary to bookmark outline items V.B.1 – 15.) Adobe Acrobat Pro software for Mac or Windows is available from the following website:
<https://itpals.vt.edu/softwarelicensingcenter/deptsoftware/deptswind/adobeavailableproducts.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. Dossiers should be saved with all pages set to 100% actual size.

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).

Once a dossier is submitted by the candidate, other than the correction of non-substantive typographical errors, the dossier may not be revised or modified except as described in the previous paragraph. Should additional substantive information become available or if other important information and/or errors are identified during the review process, they should be included and/or explained as part of 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. 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.

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, 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. 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 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).

Sample tables are provided. Please modify the tables to present the candidate's work in a summary fashion that best describes their scholarly and creative achievements. Faculty members with creative activities may choose an alternative way to summarize their accomplishments.

Accomplishments (since last promotion)

	After Associate	Before Associate	Total
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	\$223,589	\$68,295	\$291,884
Internal Funding: Candidate Portion of Above Amount	\$135,072	\$45,789	\$180,861
Grants (external, internal)	31,5	27,2	58,7
Peer-reviewed publications	29	20	49
Ph.D. Students Graduated	5	2	7
Ph.D. Students (currently advising)	3	2	5
M.S. Students Graduated	2	1	3
M.S. Students (currently 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	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	27

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 explicitly make a recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. The dean's statement should be addressed to Cyril Clarke, 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—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. 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.

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. A faculty member who is being evaluated may not serve on any promotion committee. Faculty members should 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.

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 with value and understanding of candidate's role and expectations at Virginia Tech. Please provide the percentages of assignment for the faculty member across teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service and outreach. Provide the context for how the faculty member's accomplishments in terms of quantity and quality should be evaluated. Clarify what isn't expected if it is a case that might raise questions of the committee (e.g., master's student and/or Ph.D. student completion).
- An evaluation of the academic performance and effectiveness of the candidate in each of the areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, student mentorship,

and/or academic advising; research, scholarship, 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. Use tables or figures as appropriate to show comparisons with peers.

- The expectations and contribution 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.
- If the faculty candidate had an expectation, but did not meet it, please explain the reason(s) for not completing the expectation. This is especially important for non-mandatory promotion and tenure cases. Example: the department expects the candidate to have chaired a doctoral or master's student to completion, but the candidate had not. The department head may wish to highlight other evidence that might show the candidate's success in a related area or intermediate progress (e.g., scholarship published with students, student progress towards degree, such as exams completed, etc.).
- 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. The letter should explain why each reviewer is well placed to write an external letter. If a reviewer has co-authored with the candidate, provide an explanation of how the reviewer is sufficiently removed from the candidate and how they can provide an independent and unbiased review.
- 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.
- Provide any updated accomplishments (e.g., funding, awards, progress of Ph.D. and/or master's students, etc.)
- The head or director's statement should clearly state their 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 (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.

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. Faculty members should 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 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. 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 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 <https://aie.vt.edu/strategic-analysis/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.

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 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.

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; 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.

A. COVID Statement

To help internal and external evaluators understand the issues that candidates for promotion and/or tenure were dealing with during COVID-19 impacted years, candidates may choose to write a faculty COVID-19 statement that highlights changes in circumstances attributable to COVID-19 that had a demonstrable negative impact on their ability to conduct research, scholarly, creative, or outreach activities and/or publish their results. Lab closures, changes in the focus of granting agencies, the cancellation of book contracts due to the closure of university or other presses, the shuttering of performance spaces – these and other kinds of professional issues should be included. This statement will be sent to external evaluators and added to the candidate's dossier. Please see Adaptations to Promotion and/or Tenure Processes Due to COVID-19 (08/01/22) on the Provost's promotion webpages.

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. A 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. A 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 2023
	Jeremy Adams	MS Electrical Engineering	1 st 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 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. 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	dept ave.	college ave.
2019	F	XXXX 2000	Introduction to Life	42	29	5.56 / 6	5 / 6	5.22 / 6
2020	S	XXXX 5000	Advanced Topics in Life	10	8	5.8 / 6	5 / 6	5.4 / 6
2020	S	XXXX 4000	Philosophy of Life	22	18	5.5 / 6	5.09 / 6	5.25 / 6
2020	F	XXXX 6000	Advanced Topics of Life Philosophy of Biology	7	4	5.5 / 6	5.09 / 6	5.25 / 6
2021	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 represent different points of time in the review period and differing instructional events.

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.

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 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 (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.

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
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 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

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 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