

**Addenda for College of Engineering on preparation of Promotion & Tenure Dossiers
2009-2010
Revised 07/20/09**

The University guidelines for submission of P&T documents are applicable for all College of Engineering candidates. This information can be found at the Provost's web site at <http://www.provost.vt.edu/tenure.php>. The following guidelines are supplementary to the University guidelines and should also be followed for all College of Engineering candidates. These guidelines are not intended to conflict with the university guidelines, but if there is a conflict, the university guidelines are the prevailing document.

Guidance on Preparation of Dossiers

The University provides clear instructions on the preparation of the candidate's dossier. Please make sure that you completely familiarize yourself with the instructions for format and structure. The importance of following the format and structure guidelines, as described, cannot be overstated. If you have a specific question about the format or structure, please direct those questions to the College of Engineering Dean's Office. If necessary, we will seek the answer to your question from the Provost's Office.

Dossier Length

The dossiers should be concise. Every effort should be made to avoid the 100-page documents of the past.

Candidate Statement – Please refer to the University guidelines for specific instructions regarding the candidate's statement. The statement should explain but **not** evaluate the work; subjective comments should be avoided.

Letters of Recommendation

For Sections II.A and II.B of the dossiers, the Statement from the Dean and from the College Committee, the College of Engineering will insert and bookmark these pages.

For SBES "Core" faculty, a letter should be included from the SBES Director.

The College has issued special guidance for its candidates regarding letters of recommendation. The following information should be viewed in context of Section II.G in the Provost's documentation:

Letters of recommendation will be included for all nominees for promotion and/or tenure. Please carefully read section II.G of the university P&T guidelines.

- The University Policy requires a minimum of four external letters.
- The College of Engineering prefers to receive a minimum of five (5) external letters.
- The committee should first create a list of potential external reviewers without consulting with the candidate. Next, the candidate should be advised of the importance of the external letters and then asked to submit to the Department

Head and the Departmental P&T committee chairperson (i) a list of at least five names for potential external reviewers (please note that the university P&T guidelines (II.G) prohibits letters from reviewers that are too close to the candidate - for example, classmates, former colleagues, advisors, current research sponsors, or co-authors); (ii) copies of 3-5 papers (representing the recent and most significant research published to date); and (iii) a current CV.

- Academic reviewers are expected to be at peer institutions. If the best person to evaluate the work is not at a peer institution, an explanation should be provided by the departmental committee.
- These materials will be provided no later than October 1 of the academic year in which the case is prepared for consideration by the College P&T Committee. These materials will be sent, along with the cover letter indicated below, to reviewers to aid in the evaluation of the candidate's scholarly qualifications. Neither members of the Departmental P&T committee, nor the Department Head, should solicit supplemental materials, including external letters, after the dossier has been created and the Departmental P&T Committee has made formal its recommendation on a candidate.
- The department (via the departmental P&T committee or committees) will secure at least three reviewers whose names were independently identified by the Department P&T committee. Because of possible overlap between the Department's list and the candidate's list, the final list of names may possibly include more than two names suggested by the candidate. The candidate may not suggest all of the outside reviewers. It is advisable to ask the candidate if there are any individuals who they would prefer not be contacted. The final list of outside reviewers must never be shared with the candidate.
- All letters of recommendation must be from outside Virginia Tech. The majority of letters must be from academic institutions. Letters may be solicited from industry or government personnel as well as university personnel. The individual's rank and the school, company or agency at which "the supporter" is employed will greatly influence the strength of the recommendation.
- All academic reviewers for candidates from associate to full professor should be from individuals at the rank of full professor or higher at peer institutions.
- All letters that are received will be included in the dossier of the faculty candidate under consideration.
- The College suggests that the following letters be used to solicit external references. These recommendations do not need to be followed verbatim, but the substances of items (i) – (vi) should be included. Special cases (such as promotion from associate professor without tenure to associate professor with tenure) should be obvious by interpolation from the examples given.

For promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure:

[Date]

«Name»
«Address1»
«Address2»
«Address3»
«City»

Dear «Salutation»:

My department is considering «name1», currently an assistant professor, for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure, effective [Effective date]. At Virginia Tech, such promotion is contingent on the accomplishments, stature and promise of the individual as a researcher, teacher and scholar. External evaluations by leading experts in the candidate's field(s) of endeavor are an essential part of the decision-making process. It is in this connection that I am writing to ask you to act as a reference for «name2». I am requesting a letter in which you detail your assessment of the candidate to the extent you are able. Please tell us how you know the candidate and what interactions you have had in the past.

It will be particularly helpful if your assessment includes:

- (i) An evaluation of current research activities and past accomplishments;
- (ii) An estimate of the extent to which the candidate has attained or shows the potential for attaining national and international stature in the field;
- (iii) If you are able, we would welcome an appraisal of the candidate's teaching and professional service contributions;
- (iv) A comparison with others in the field at a similar stage of their career (please feel free to mention names);
- (v) Any other comments you feel would be of importance in our deliberations;
- (vi) A recommendation on the promotion of the candidate, based on the above information;

In order to assist you in preparing your assessment I have enclosed the candidate's curriculum vita, a statement of research and teaching prepared by the candidate, and a set of publications.

The policy of Virginia Tech is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concern here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment, unless we are required specifically to do so by law. The FAX number on this letterhead may be used for confidential material. However, if you FAX or e-mail your letter, please follow it up with an original on official letterhead sent by regular mail.

Since the preparation of promotion files is a time-consuming task, it would help us immensely to have your response by [Date]. Hard deadlines, that we must meet, will come up shortly thereafter. If you are not able to respond by [Date], please contact me at once

I realize that the effort involved in preparing assessments such as this is a substantial one. Your views are very important to us, and we greatly appreciate your help.

Yours sincerely,

For promotion to full professor:

«Name»
«Address1»
«Address2»
«Address3»
«City»

Dear «Salutation»:

My department is considering «name1», currently an associate professor, for promotion to the rank of professor, effective [Date]. At Virginia Tech, such promotion is contingent on the accomplishments, stature and promise of the individual as a researcher, teacher and scholar. External evaluations by leading experts in the candidate's field(s) of endeavor are an essential part of the decision-making process. It is in this connection that I am writing to ask you to act as a reference for «name2». I am requesting a letter in which you detail your assessment of the candidate to the extent you are able. Please tell us how you know the candidate and what interactions you have had in the past.

It will be particularly helpful if your assessment includes:

- (i) An evaluation of current research activities and past accomplishments;
 - (ii) An estimate of the extent to which the candidate has attained or shows the potential for attaining national and international stature in the field;
 - (iii) If you are able, we would welcome an appraisal of the candidate's teaching and professional service contributions;
 - (iv) A comparison with others in the field at a similar stage of their career (please feel free to mention names);
 - (v) Any other comments you feel would be of importance in our deliberations;
 - (vi) A recommendation on the promotion of the candidate, based on the above information;
- In order to assist you in preparing your assessment I have enclosed the candidate's curriculum vita, statement of research and teaching, and a set of publications. I have also enclosed sections of the promotion papers in which the candidate articulates a research and teaching philosophy.

The policy of Virginia Tech is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concern here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment, unless we are required specifically to do so by law. The FAX number on this letterhead may be used for confidential material. However, if you FAX or e-mail your letter, please follow it up with an original on official letterhead sent by regular mail.

Since the preparation of promotion files is a time-consuming task, it would help us immensely to have your response by [Date]. Hard deadlines, that we must meet, will come up shortly thereafter. If you are not able to respond by [Date], please contact me at once

I realize that the effort involved in preparing assessments such as this is a substantial one. Your views are very important to us, and we greatly appreciate your help.

Yours sincerely,

- See II. G.1 for the university mandated chart describing the letters.
- As indicated in II.G. 2. of the university procedures, after the table listing the letters received, be sure to include a 2-3 paragraph biographical sketch for each reviewer, and include the reason that the individual is uniquely qualified to provide an opinion.
- All letters received by the Department P&T Committee must be submitted. If the College P&T Committee deems a letter to be irrelevant or non-responsive, only then can it be stricken from the dossier.
- Approximately two weeks after the request for a letter has been mailed, a follow-up telephone call should be placed emphasizing the importance of the letter to the nominee.

Student Evaluations

In Section IV of the Provost's documentation, Section I calls for information on student evaluations. An example of how the information should be presented is included on Attachment A of this document.

Numbering Papers or Projects in the Dossier

In each section of the dossier the papers and/or projects should be numbered.

Peer Evaluations

In Section IV of the Provost's document, reference is made to Peer Evaluations (J.). Any peer review conducted since the candidate's last P&T review should be included in the dossier.

Documentation of Research Funding Levels (V.C. of the Dossier)

Individual share of responsibility for research expenditures is a matter that should be discussed and agreed upon by the PI, co-PI(s) and other faculty investigators working on each project. Totals shown on individual activity reports and/or P&T dossiers should sum to 100% of the effort given on the official grant/contract documents in OSP. Funding should be separated and summarized in three categories in the P&T dossiers. Educational research (such as SUCCEED) should be differentiated from other scholarly research within each category. Separation of funding by category is an assessment aid for the evaluator and is not intended to place certain types of funding or support in any negative connotation.

Category I - External Funding: This type of funding is contract or grant support that is obtained, in its entirety, externally to the University. Grants or contracts with more than one faculty member should clearly indicate relative contributions of the PI, the Co-PI's and any other faculty investigators who are involved. In particular, the relative sharing of individual faculty efforts in participating in the process to acquire the external financial support should be clearly identified and supported in the proposal/contract

documentation in OSP. Financial support for other faculty members on these programs that is obtained through an internal competition or administrative assignment at the University (See Category II) should not be reported as external funding in this category even though the original source of funds was external to the University.

Category II - External/Internal Funding: This type of funding is obtained internally within the University either via a competitive review process by the faculty member's peers at the University or by administrative allocation from the principal investigator. This type of funding is not Category I even though the original source of funding is external to the University. One example of this type of funding would be competition for funding from a major University or College center by a faculty member who was not a CO-PI or specified as a major investigator on the original proposal or subsequent renewal. Funding in this category could also be obtained by administrative allocation by the principal investigator in a non-competitive procedure.

Category III - Internal Funding: In this type of funding, all support should be listed which is obtained through resources that are completely internal to the University. This category of funding will include such programs as SCHEV, ASPIRES, Pratt and other funding sources at the University.

Papers Presented at Professional Meetings - For each publication, project, or performance, please indicate the lead author's or performer's name in **bold text**, as described in the University guidelines. Papers, publications, or performances in collaboration with current or former students should include an **asterisk** at each student's name.

Keynote Presentations – Please take care to ensure that these are truly keynote presentations.

Diversity Activities - Those being promoted to full professor must address diversity activities.

Service Prior to Appointment at Virginia Tech

Prior service in industry, government, or academic employment is important and summaries of this service should be included in section IX. A. of the dossier. A distinct section in the dossier on prior professional service will assist the review committees in the evaluation of the candidate's performance and accomplishments at Virginia Tech during the term of the faculty member's current appointment. Placement of prior service into a separate section is an aid to the evaluator of the dossier and should not be construed as devaluing professional service prior to the appointment of the faculty member in the College.

ATTACHMENT A (include in IV.I after rating scale and/or dept. averages)

(Note: Carry all averages out to two decimal places)

Courses Taught Since Last Promotion

Semester	Course Number	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total Responses	Total Enrollment	Avg. Rating on 4 Point Scale
Fall '05	MINE 3014	3	7	0	0	10	16	3.30
	MINE 5034	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.00
Spring '06	MINE 4084	2	18	10	0	30	50	2.73
	ENGE 1005	7	10	1	2	20	28	3.10
Fall '06	MINE 3014	2	5	0	0	7	9	3.28
	MINE 3034	7	3	0	0	10	15	3.70
Spring '07	MINE 4084	12	11	0	0	23	29	3.52
Fall '07	MINE 3014	4	7	0	0	11	12	3.36
	MINE 3034	3	5	0	0	8	11	3.37
Spring '08	MINE 4084	6	7	0	0	13	19	3.46
	MINE 5035	1	3	0	0	4	4	3.25
Fall '08	MINE 3014	6	6	1	0	13	15	3.38
	MINE 3034	5	6	0	0	11	17	3.45
Spring '09	MINE 4084	10	13	1	0	24	27	3.37
	MINE 6015	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.00
Average All Courses	Totals	73	101	13	2	189	257	3.29
Average Under-graduate courses	Totals	67	98	13	2	180	590	3.27

Grade Distribution for the '08-09 Academic Year

Semester	Course	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Avg.
Fall '08	MINE 3014	2	2	2	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.91
	MINE 3034	1	0	3	3	2	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	2.60
Spring '09	MINE 4084	4	3	7	1	9	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3.10
	MINE 6015	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.00