

To: Department Chairs and Program Directors, College of Arts and Science

From: Cindy D. Kam, Dean of Faculty Affairs, College of Arts and Science 

Re: Guidelines and Call for Recommendations for Promotions and Reappointments of Tenure-Stream Faculty and for Promotions, Reappointments, and Appointments of Continuing-Track Faculty

Date: May 28, 2024

In compliance with the Rules and Procedures for Appointments, Renewals, Promotions, and Tenure of the College of Arts and Science, this memorandum formally requests your department or program's 2024- 2025 recommendations for promotions and renewals of appointments. You may access a copy of our Rules and Procedures (revised May 2018) [here](#).

These guidelines are divided into separate sections, each addressing a specific category of personnel actions: (I) promotions to Associate Professor with tenure and Professor; (II) reappointments of tenure-track faculty; (III) continuing-track instructional faculty appointments and reappointments of; (IV) continuing-track non-teaching faculty appointments and reappointments; and (V) other continuing-track appointments.

The Department Chair, Program Director, or *ad hoc* committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that each promotion, reappointment, and appointment file submitted to this office contains all of the materials identified and is assembled in a manner consistent with the guidelines described in the following sections.

Thank you for your assistance in these important matters.

cc: Office of the Provost
Department and Program Administrators

A&S PROMOTION & REAPPOINTMENT FILE DEADLINES

University guidelines require the timetable for receipt of your recommendations provided in the chart below. **The majority of cases follow the Spring Decision dates (highlighted below).** *Fall decision dates apply only to cases in which the initial appointment commenced at the start of the calendar year or for those who have specific promises for early consideration.* If you have a compelling reason for requesting an extension, please inform the Dean’s Office at least one month prior to the specified deadline or, in the case of an unexpected delay, as soon as you realize the necessity of an extension.

	Fall Decisions (notification expected by 12/31/2024)	Spring Decisions (notification expected by 6/1/2025)	Fall Decisions (notification expected by 12/31/2025)
Promotion to Professor	Sept 9, 2024	Sept 9, 2024	Sept 8, 2025
Promotion to Associate Professor w/tenure	Sept 9, 2024	Oct 21, 2024	Sept 8, 2025
Tenure-track reappointments (3 rd year review)	Sept 16, 2024	Jan 27, 2025	Sept 15, 2025
Renewal of one-year, <i>continuing-track</i> appointments	Sept 16, 2024	Jan 27, 2025	Sept 15, 2025
Renewal of multi-year, <i>continuing-track</i> appointments	Sept 16, 2024	Mar 3, 2025	Sept 15, 2025

General Contact Information Regarding Faculty Appointments (until 7/31/24)

A revised version of these Guidelines with updated contact information for 8/1/24 and onwards will be issued later this summer

- Dean Cindy Kam, in consultation with Dean McNamara, will oversee processes for reappointment and promotion of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
 - For questions regarding T/TT faculty (other than compensation issues), such as questions about leaves, appointments, recruitment, and promotions, please contact Melissa Woche at 615-343-3143 or melissa.wocher@vanderbilt.edu.
- Dean Bonnie Dow, in consultation with Dean McNamara, will oversee processes for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of all continuing-track *instructional* faculty.
 - For questions regarding continuing-track *instructional* faculty (other than compensation issues), such as leaves, appointments, recruitment, and promotions, please contact Jeffrey Keever at 615-343- 9724 or jeffrey.r.keever@vanderbilt.edu.
- Dean John McLean, in consultation with Dean McNamara, will oversee processes of

appointment, reappointment, and promotion of continuing-track *research* faculty.

- For questions regarding continuing-track *research* faculty (other than compensation issues), such as leaves, appointments, recruitment, and promotions, please contact Zoe Canales at 615-343-0459 or zoe.canales@vanderbilt.edu.

I. PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE AND PROFESSOR

Standards

The College of Arts and Science upholds the standards set forth in the Vanderbilt *Faculty Manual*:

In actions relating to promotion to Associate Professor with tenure: “For the award of tenure, Vanderbilt requires (1) excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression in one’s discipline; (2) a high level of effectiveness in teaching; and (3) satisfactory performance in the area of service” ([Faculty Manual](#), Part II, Ch 3, Section C).

In actions relating to promotion to Professor: “Vanderbilt expects the level and quality of achievement in (1) research, scholarship, or creative expression; (2) teaching; and (3) service to be equivalent to that required of Professors in leading departments and schools of other major research universities. The candidate must have attained national or international recognition among leading scholars in their/her/his discipline for sustained and excellent research, must have taught the courses requested by the department or school at a consistently high level of effectiveness, and must have demonstrated a well-developed and recognized record of service both the University and their discipline” ([Faculty Manual](#), Part II, Ch 3, Section E).

The College of Arts and Science [Rules and Procedures for Appointments, Renewals, Promotions, and Tenure](#) document contains information about the rules and procedures that govern these faculty actions. Please consult it closely as you prepare promotion and reappointment files.

Eligible Voters

The College of Arts and Science *Rules and Procedures for Appointments, Renewals, Promotions, and Tenure* (Section II, Part D, #1) specifies eligibility for voting on promotion and tenure.

For promotion cases involving faculty in departments/programs that do not contain at least five eligible voting members, an ad hoc committee will be constituted that will include the eligible voting members of the unit, plus the appropriate number of faculty from related fields of appropriate rank such that the ad hoc committee has five members (*A&S Rules and Procedures* document, Section II, Part D, # 2). The ad hoc committee will serve as the eligible voting body, and the chair of the ad hoc committee will complete the tasks designated below for Department Chairs/Program Directors.

For promotion cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments with a tenure-line in more than one unit and whose administrative home unit includes at least five eligible voting members, a single ad hoc committee will be appointed by the Dean or the Dean’s designee, in consultation with the chairs/directors of the relevant units. The chair of the ad hoc committee will be appointed from the faculty member’s administrative home. The remainder of the committee will be constituted by an equal representation of members from each unit. The committee will write a single report that is reviewed by each of the units, and the eligible voters in each unit will discuss and vote on the promotion. Each unit’s vote should be conveyed in a letter from the unit Chair/Director, addressed to the Dean, for inclusion in the file. Minutes from each meeting (in

the format and with the content described below) will also be gathered. The chair or director of the unit that is the faculty member's administrative home will be responsible for overseeing completion of the file (through Interfolio).

For promotion cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments with a tenure-line in more than one unit but whose administrative home unit does not contain at least five eligible voting members, a single *ad hoc* committee will be appointed by the Dean or the Dean's designee, in consultation with the chairs/directors of the relevant units. When possible, the chair of the committee will be appointed from the faculty member's administrative home. The *ad hoc* committee will include all eligible members from the administrative home unit and be supplemented with eligible members in related fields in order to reach five members. The *ad hoc* committee will write a single report and will constitute the voting unit of the administrative home unit. The eligible voters in the unit that is not the administrative home unit will review the ad hoc report and vote on the promotion. Each unit's vote (i.e., the ad hoc committee standing for the administrative home unit, and the department/program that is not the administrative home) should be conveyed in a letter, addressed to the dean, for inclusion in the file. Minutes from each meeting (in the format and with the content described below) must also be submitted. The chair of the ad hoc committee, in collaboration with the Chair/Director of the unit that is not the administrative home, will complete the tasks designated below for Department Chairs/Program Directors (through Interfolio). For joint appointments where neither the administrative home unit nor the second unit has five eligible voting members, a single *ad hoc* committee will be formed.

Responsibility for Promotion Process

The Department Chair or Program Director is responsible for overseeing the promotion process for a faculty member in the Department/Program. In the event that an *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Dean or the Dean's designee, the chair of the *ad hoc* committee shall complete the tasks designated below for Department Chairs/Program Directors.

Dossier Contents

All promotion and review files must be submitted via [Interfolio](#).

All promotion files should contain the required documents outlined in the Interfolio template for the case and must conform to the following guidelines. In addition, *all documents must be searchable, not scanned, PDF files.* A sample checklist of documents required is provided on page 24 of this document.

All documents except for books authored by candidates will be submitted in electronic form via Interfolio.

1. Chair's or Program Director's recommendation to the Dean

- The Chair/Director must submit a detailed statement commenting on the promotion. This is an evaluation and recommendation separate from that provided by the department or program. It is also an opportunity for the Chair/Director to explain any aspect of the file that may require interpretation and context. There will be an upload field in Interfolio for this document. The statement should address:

- How the candidate's field of research relates to the discipline as a whole
- The quality of the candidate's publications, including the quality of journals where articles were published or the presses where books were published
- The impact of the candidate's publications/creative works on the research and work of others in the field
- The candidate's external funding record
- The candidate's promise for future productivity
- Detailed comments on strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record in research, teaching, and service
- The Chair/Director's assessment of the external reviewer letters, including discussion of any conflicting opinions expressed.

2. **Recommendation of the eligible tenured faculty of the Department or Program**

- The first sentence of the recommendation should include the enumerated vote of the eligible faculty: the number favoring, opposing, proxy votes (if applicable) and abstaining, along with the date of the vote. Recording a vote as "unanimous" is not adequate; please state the number of faculty members casting votes relative to all faculty members eligible to vote.
- *Minutes*: The recommendation should be accompanied by detailed minutes that reflect the full range of discussion by the eligible tenured faculty at the meeting. Please do not submit a verbatim transcript of the meeting. Minutes should be taken by a designated faculty member other than the Chair/Director or by an appropriate staff person. Do not send an audio recording of the discussion. There will be an upload field in Interfolio for this document.
 - The minutes should include the names of those present and absent, and the number of proxy votes, if any, together with a statement of the department's or program's policy on proxy voting on personnel decisions.
 - The minutes should report the faculty's evaluation of and comments on the candidate's accomplishments and prospects in (1) research or creative expression; (2) teaching; and (3) service.
 - If the department or program appoints a committee to review the candidate's publications, rather than having all eligible tenured faculty do so, the minutes should identify those designated members of the faculty who served on this review committee and have therefore read (1) relevant publications by the candidate appearing since the last personnel action, and (2) relevant samples of his/her earlier work. If this committee prepares any written reports or presentations, these documents must also be included in the dossier.
 - If minutes of the meeting do not satisfy all these requirements, a candid accompanying statement from the Chair/Director must do so.
 - Minutes of the meeting must be signed and dated by the person responsible for their composition.
 - In accordance with the *Faculty Manual*, and *Arts and Science Rules and Procedures* document, minutes must be made available for 2 working days to all eligible faculty before the file is forwarded to the Dean. Within 2 working days after eligible faculty are notified that the minutes are available, they may make responses to the minutes that will be included in the file. Such responses must be

available to all eligible faculty members or *ad hoc* committee members.

- Research: The recommendation should also include any department- or program-specific definitions of the nature of the research, scholarship, or creative expression expected of the candidate. Please include any statements of expectations of productivity contained in any special agreement between the Dean's Office and the candidate, either at the time of initial appointment or subsequently.
- Teaching: The eligible tenured faculty's assessment of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels must include a review of the following evidence:
 - student ratings, including a complete summary of numerical ratings from course ratings that must be provided along with the raw responses. See #4 below for further details.
 - a list or statement about graduate theses the candidate has supervised
 - the candidate's contributions to the development of new courses, curriculum, instructional methodology, and other strategies for stimulating learning.
 - a formal peer teaching report written by two voting-eligible faculty members. The peer teaching report is required for candidates being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. For AY24-25 cases, it is strongly recommended for candidates being considered for promotion to Professor. **As of AY25-26, a peer teaching report will be required for promotions to Associate Professor with tenure and Professor with tenure.** The peer report of teaching should be based on (a) in-class observations by each of the two voting-eligible faculty members and (b) a careful evaluation by the same faculty members of all relevant course materials such as course syllabi, reading lists, assignments, grading policies, and examinations to develop and provide a comprehensive view of the course's goals, design, and implementation. The peer teaching report is part of the formal dossier and should be written in a way that makes it accessible to non-specialists. The peer teaching report that is prepared for tenure and promotion actions is a confidential part of the file that is accessible only to the voting-eligible faculty; it should not be shared with the faculty member being considered for promotion.¹
 - If relevant, materials documenting the candidate's contributions to non-course activities that the department or program considers as constituting teaching (e.g., supervision of internships, work with students in the laboratory).
- Research and Teaching Reports
 - If an internal review committee is formed and prepares a report for presentation to the department's tenured faculty, a copy of the report should be included in Interfolio.
 - Reports from review committees formed to evaluate scholarship/creative expression of candidates with an interdisciplinary field, and/or from *ad hoc* review committees constituted for candidates from departments/programs with fewer than five voting-eligible faculty should be included in Interfolio.
 - The peer teaching report should be uploaded into Interfolio if it is not already

¹ Departments are welcome to institute complementary *formative* peer teaching evaluation processes where faculty members receive oral and written feedback from colleagues that encourages reflection and adaptation of their practices. However, the peer teaching report submitted for the tenure and promotion dossier is a confidential part of the file that should be accessible only to the voting-eligible faculty.

included in the above reports.

3. The candidate's current curriculum vitae

- The *c.v.* will be uploaded by the candidate in Interfolio in Step 1.
- The current *c.v.* must be dated and conform as closely as is reasonably and appropriately possible to the following format. A sample *c.v.* is attached as an example (see p. 44).
 - Date, name, and contact information
 - Degrees earned (include university, date of degree, subject, title of dissertation, and mentor's name)
 - Employment history (include post-docs and name of mentor(s))
 - Honors and awards (include information from undergraduate and thereafter. Provide details)
 - Research/Creative Expression: All of the following categories of research and/or creative expression must be separated from each other in the CV. For example, book reviews should not be listed under articles. Similarly, works in progress must be separate from published works. For all published works, the full citation (including full list of authors in order as printed; and beginning and ending page numbers in book chapters, journal articles and proceedings) must be provided. For works accepted but not yet published, include full list of authors in order as will be printed and provide the respective number of manuscript pages.
 - Books (in print or accepted for publication); list separately (i) authored and co-authored works; (ii) edited volumes
 - Articles (in print or accepted) in refereed journals
 - Book chapters
 - Articles in conference proceedings
 - Book reviews
 - Working papers and books. Please avoid the word “forthcoming,” or any other ambiguous descriptor; instead, describe the work’s publication status precisely (e.g., when the work was submitted for consideration; the nature and timing of editorial response, if any; whether the work is under contract with a specific publisher, whether a publication date has been announced by the publisher).
 - Research grants received (including granting agency, other investigators, period of grant, amount of grant per year and in total, including direct and indirect costs).
 - Research grant proposals currently under review
 - Invited presentations (list title of talk and any support provided by host institution)
 - Published abstracts
 - Conference presentations
 - For Co-authored Works:
 - Complete citations listing all co-authors in printed order are required.
 - Include explanation of candidate role following each bibliographic entry of a co-authored work in the *c.v.*; (percentage of the candidate’s contribution is helpful but not sufficient)

- Further elaboration on collaborations can be included in the Statement of Endeavors.
 - Teaching-Related Activities: please list:
 - any new courses introduced
 - graduate students on whose Masters/Ph.D. dissertation committees the candidate has served or whose committees the candidate has directed
 - training grants received
 - undergraduate research/immersion projects supervised
 - Service: List service to the:
 - Department
 - College
 - University
 - Profession
 - Community (professionally related)
- On occasion, the candidate may prefer to have a *c.v.* sent to reviewers that is formatted along more conventional disciplinary lines. In these cases, the file must contain both versions of the *c.v.*, with each version clearly labeled, at the time the file is submitted for evaluation by the department and to the Dean's Office.
- A sample *c.v.* is attached as an example (see p. 44).

4. **Cumulative teaching summary chart**

- The cumulative teaching summary chart(s) will be generated and uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.
- All available data while in rank must be presented.
 - For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, data must include all courses the candidate has taught since being appointed to the tenure-track.
 - For promotion to Professor, data must include all courses that the candidate has taught while holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure.
- For those courses rated *prior* to Fall 2016 (using the VOICE system), provide a composite chart using the numerical information from the candidate's teaching evaluations (*an Excel spreadsheet is available [here](#).*)
 - The number of students enrolled in each course as well as the number of students completing the forms must be included for each course rated.
 - Data should be listed from the oldest (on the left) to the most recent.
- For those courses rated *as of* Fall 2016 and onwards (using the BLUE system), provide a composite chart, using the numerical information from the candidate's student ratings (*an Excel template is available [here](#).*)
 - The number of students enrolled in each course as well as the number of students completing the forms must be included for each course rated.
 - Data should be listed from the oldest (on the left) to the most recent.

5. **Student course ratings and comments**

- The student ratings will be uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.
- Please upload the entire course instructor report, which includes the objective responses, as well as the bar graphs and the student comments.
 - For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, data must include all courses

that the candidate has taught since being appointed to the tenure-track.

- For promotion to Professor, data must include all courses that the candidate has taught while holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure.

6. **Candidate's Statement of Endeavors**

- Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and for promotion to Professor should provide a clear, complete, and well-documented report of their activities and achievements in each of the three areas of performance: research/creative expression, teaching, and service. This report, typically six to eight pages, should be more than a list of activities; it should articulate the candidate's research agenda and trajectory; discuss the candidate's teaching philosophy, contributions, and evolution; and summarize the candidate's service.
 - Candidates in some disciplines may feel the need to have two separate research portions of their statement of endeavors: one for the "expert" external reviewers and a second constituting a more accessible version that is used internally at Vanderbilt and read by individuals outside of the candidate's immediate field. In these cases, it is imperative that the file contain both versions of the research statement, with each statement clearly labeled, when it is submitted for evaluation by the department and each succeeding level.
 - The candidate will upload the research portion of the Statement of Endeavors to be sent to external reviewers in Step 1 in Interfolio. The candidate will have the opportunity to upload the more detailed internal Statement of Endeavors covering research, teaching, and service used for internal review at Vanderbilt in Step 2 in Interfolio.
 - A candidate is permitted to update the internal Statement of Endeavors prior to the department vote, but all versions of the statement must be dated and included in the file at the time of the faculty discussion and vote on promotion. (As noted below, no updates can be made to materials sent to external reviewers)
- The candidate should be informed of the following guidelines for the three required parts of the Statement of Endeavors:
 - Research
 - The introduction should be understandable to a non-expert.
 - Describe how the research relates to the discipline as a whole and to other academic programs.
 - Describe works in progress, expected dates of completion, book contracts or expressions of publisher's interest.
 - Discuss roles in any collaborative projects.
 - Do not include in the Statement of Endeavors peer-review comments on research contracts, grant proposals, publications, and the like. They may be included in Appendix A.
 - Teaching
 - The statement must be more than a list of activities. It should articulate the candidate's teaching philosophy and objectives.
 - The candidate should also endeavor to provide a detailed discussion of the evolution of their overall teaching record and performance. This can include a discussion of how and why their courses and teaching approach

have evolved and improved over time based on feedback from students, faculty peers, and their own intellectual development and growth.

Wherever helpful, the candidate should also explain their engagement with resources such as the Office of Educational Design and Development (formerly the Center for Teaching) that enhanced their teaching efforts.

- Include past and planned course and curriculum development and any pedagogical initiatives, innovations or experiments and their results.
- Do not include syllabi, course materials, and the like in the Statement of Endeavors. These may be included in Appendix B.
- Service
 - Briefly describe roles as departmental, college and university citizen
 - Identify those areas of service that have been particularly rewarding, and those in which continued involvement is desired
 - Discuss service to the discipline in this section
 - Discuss professionally related service to the community
- COVID-19 Impact Statement (Optional)
 - Candidates may choose to discuss the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on their research and teaching within their Statement of Endeavors.
 - Alternatively, candidates may instead append a COVID-19 Impact Statement (2 pages maximum) to their internal Statement of Endeavors (this will be shared internally at Vanderbilt only). The statement may explain major pandemic-related hindrances in research or creative expression; grant progress; publication, production, or exhibition; or teaching. Such hindrances may be related to travel restrictions, institutional closures, supply chain disruptions, caregiving burdens, illness, etc.
- **Appendix Materials:** The candidate must provide *in the relevant Appendix* supporting documentation for items listed in the Statement of Endeavors as “accepted,” “submitted,” “under review,” “in press,” etc. Copies of editors’ letters and/or referees’ comments on manuscripts that have been “provisionally accepted” should be included. The candidate may also include other pertinent information related to research, teaching, and service. Examples include press reviews, peer-review comments on research contracts, grant proposals, or journal articles; testimonial letters from students and peers; and comments on manuscripts or publications.

7. **External reviews**

- **Minimum and recommended number of letters:** Promotion files must include at least six but preferably eight to ten external letters of evaluation. These letters are solicited in writing by the Chair or Director (never by the chair of an internal review committee) from reviewers approved in advance by the Dean’s Office. These letters are written from two sets of reviewers (described below):
 - **The Candidate’s list:** At least three letters must be from individuals from a list compiled by the candidate at the request of the Chair/Director.
 - **The Department’s/Program’s list:** At least three letters must be from a separate set of reviewers chosen by the Chair/Director. Chairs/Directors may consult

tenured department or program members in order to identify potential referees with relevant expertise.

- **Confidentiality of reviewers:** Please remind your colleagues that the identity of external reviewers (potential or actual) should not be shared with the candidate at any stage of the promotion process, even after the process has reached its conclusion.
- Qualifications of reviewers:
 - Reviewers should be leading scholars in the field who hold the rank of full professor at top institutions (i.e. peer institutions of Vanderbilt or better) with highly ranked doctoral programs in the field of the candidate.
 - In extremely rare cases (for example, small fields), and only in cases of untenured assistant professors who are candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure, associate professors may be approved as reviewers.
 - Reviewers from high-profile universities outside the United States are permissible.
 - Reviewers should not have any vested interest in the outcome of the case and should not have interacted with the candidate in ways that could compromise their objectivity. Typical examples of reviewers who would be ineligible are a recent coauthor of an article or book, a Ph.D. mentor or advisor, a dissertation committee member, or a postdoctoral advisor.
 - In case of promotion to full professor, it is permissible to include up to three scholars who have written previously on the candidate's behalf for the initial appointment or his/her previous promotion, but such individuals must have exceptional professional standing and should not be research collaborators of the candidate.
 - All external reviewers must have different affiliations. Preferably, reviewers will be drawn from different institutions, but reviewers from the same institution who are in different schools (i.e., School of Medicine vs. College of Arts and Science) may be permitted. In case the candidate and the Department's lists contain two reviewers from the same institution and school, the Dean's office will authorize reviewers by alphabetical order.
 - In order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, external reviewers who were formerly Vanderbilt faculty members while the candidate has been in rank are discouraged.
- **Compiling the two lists:** The Candidate's list of reviewers should be compiled before the Department's list. Chairs/Directors should follow the following steps when compiling the two lists of reviewers:
 - Chairs/Directors should first ask candidates for names of six reviewers. Candidates should be advised in advance about the characteristics of reviewers that will make them most credible to those who assess the file. In particular, candidates should be made aware that reviewers must be full professors at top institutions and that they should not have a vested interest in the outcome of the case and must not have interacted with the candidate in ways that might compromise their objectivity. Failure to choose qualified reviewers with such characteristics may delay the candidate's case and require the submission of additional names by the candidate. The candidate should detail any previous interaction with the proposed reviewers as appropriate.

- Once the candidate's list is in hand, the Department should construct its proposed list comprising of an entirely different set of reviewers (from those named by the candidate). Any reviewer appearing on both the candidate's and the Department's list is automatically assigned to the candidate's list (and NOT the Department's).
- If a candidate for promotion to full professor turned down for promotion in a previous year is being reconsidered for promotion, it is permissible to include, alongside letters from new reviewers, some letters (no more than 2) from reviewers who wrote for the candidate when last considered. In such cases, letters must be solicited from at least four new reviewers and all reviewers should receive the candidate's updated materials for evaluation.
- Any exceptions to the guidelines other than those described above must have the explicit approval of the Dean.
- The file must note any personal or professional associations between the candidate and any contributing referee.
- If fewer than four reviewers from the Candidate's List agree to provide a letter of evaluation, additional names of potential reviewers should be solicited from the candidate, but under no circumstances should the reasons for the additional request be revealed to the candidate.
- Similarly, if fewer than four reviewers from the Department's List agree to provide a letter of evaluation, the Department/Program should submit additional names of potential reviewers for approval by the Dean.
- **Preapproval of reviewers:** The two lists should be submitted by the Chair/Director (via email) to the Dean of Faculty Affairs for approval before any contact is made with reviewers. When seeking approval from the Dean's office, it is essential to fully explain the credentials of the set of recommended reviewers. In particular, the request to approve external reviewers must include:
 - A brief summary of each reviewer's professional credentials along with a link to their webpage (do not include the reviewer's curriculum vitae)
 - A statement regarding the reviewer's professional relationship to the candidate, if known
 - The candidate's curriculum vitae
 - The Dean of Faculty Affairs will send an official memo to the Chair/Director confirming the approved reviewers and detailing any special arrangements that might have been agreed upon.
 - Please keep a copy of all correspondence between the Chair/Director and Dean regarding the reviewer approval process, including the official memo, and include it in the appropriate section in Interfolio.
- **Contacting external reviewers:** After the two lists of reviewers have been approved by the Dean's Office, the Chair/Director should contact the reviewers to seek their approval in the following fashion:
 - Contact at least five reviewers from each list in the first round.
 - Initial contact with reviewers: *Potential reviewers should first be contacted individually by the Chair/Director through regular email to determine their willingness to serve.* A sample email is included in this document on page 18.
 - The candidate's CV may be attached to the email/letter soliciting the external assessment.

- *Once the reviewer accepts the initial invitation, each reviewer should be sent the candidate's materials to review via Interfolio. [A step by step tutorial with screenshots can be found here](#). Within Interfolio, the reviewer will have the option to click "I Accept" or "I Decline." If the reviewer accepts, they will then gain access to the documents the department has selected for reviewers. This should include a detailed letter (see instructions below) from the Chair/Director along with the:

 - Scholarly materials (journal articles, essays, book chapters, monographs, etc.) to be reviewed
 - The current curriculum vitae of the candidate
 - The research portion of the Statement of Endeavors (do not include the Teaching or Service portions of the Statement of Endeavors)*
- If the reviewer declines, they will be asked to provide a reason.
- Any and all correspondence with the reviewers conducted outside of Interfolio must be kept and uploaded into Interfolio in the appropriate section.
- **General directions for Chair/Director's letter to reviewers:** The Chair's or Director's formal email soliciting assessments from external reviewers should comply with the following guidelines (see the templates on pp. 21- 23):
 - All communications, including telephone conversations and email, should state simply that the candidate is being considered for promotion.
 - All communications (written or oral) must be objective. It may not refer to preliminary or provisional judgments, hopes, or fears of the Chair/Director or the tenured faculty about the candidate's chances for promotion.
 - Prejudicial statements about the candidate are strictly prohibited. For example, do not say: "I very much appreciate your willingness to help with what (I am absolutely certain) will be an open-and-shut case," or otherwise indicate your opinion of the merits of the case.
 - The letter should make no reference to the possible outcome of the case.
 - The letter should state that the referee is asked to evaluate scholarship or creative expression (as the case may be), and that the department will assess teaching and service.
 - The letter and other communications with external referees should contain the following statement: "Under current policies and practices at Vanderbilt University, peer evaluations such as that being requested from you are, within limitations imposed by law, regarded as confidential. They are for limited use within the University. However, governmental agencies may have a legal right of access to such evaluations. Federal or state law or the courts may afford others, including the person being evaluated, access to the evaluation."
 - Letters should be submitted via Interfolio to the candidate's file. If the letter is sent via email (i.e. outside of Interfolio), the department administrator will need to upload it to Interfolio in the proper section. All correspondence related to this letter will also need to be part of the section in Interfolio for correspondence with external reviewers.
- Once the candidate's dossier is sent to the external reviewers, no further status updates can be provided to those reviewers; that is, it is not possible to send additional materials to the reviewers, nor is it allowable to send updates on the status of publications or

information about additional publications, grants, etc.

- **Letter to reviewers for considerations of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**
 - The Chair's/Director's letter should quote the criteria and standards for tenure rank as set forth in the first sentence of Part II, Chapter 3, Section C of the [Faculty Manual](#).
 - It should also quote the elaboration of this quoted passage contained in Section II, Part A, number 2 of the "Rules and Procedures" of the College of Arts and Science as follows: "For appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, judgments should be based on performance in research, teaching, and other kinds of intellectual and academic service. Excellence in all these activities is desired. Excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression is required. A high level of effectiveness in teaching is required. Satisfactory performance of service to the University and/or to professional and learned societies is required."
 - Further, the letter should ask the reviewer to:
 - describe their professional relationship to the candidate, if any
 - indicate which of the candidate's works he/she has read
 - describe and evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarship (and/or creative expression) and its influence on and/or advancement of the field(s)
 - assess the promise and probable impact of the candidate's future research
 - rank the candidate in relation to his/her cohort at other research universities; and
 - state whether the candidate would meet the research standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure typically applied at leading research universities
 - A sample letter addressing these points is appended (see page 22).
- **Letter to reviewers for considerations of promotion to the rank of Professor**
 - The Chair's/Director's letter should quote Section II, Part A, number 3 of the "Rules and Procedures" of the College of Arts and Science, which elaborates on the criteria and standards prescribed by the [Faculty Manual](#) for appointment to tenure rank as follows: "For appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor, the College expects the level and quality of achievement in research, scholarship, or creative expression and teaching required of professors in corresponding departments and schools at other leading major research universities. The candidate must have attained national or international recognition among leading scholars in his or her discipline for sustained and excellent research, must have taught the courses requested by the department or school at a consistently high level of effectiveness, and must have demonstrated a well-developed and recognized record of service both to the University and his or her discipline."
 - The Chair's/Director's letter should ask the referee to address the pertinent points of that quoted passage with sufficient specificity to enable readers to reach a reasoned and informed judgment about the candidate's qualifications.
 - Further, the letter should ask the referee to:
 - describe their professional relationship to the candidate, if any
 - indicate which of the candidate's works he/she has read

- describe and evaluate the character and importance of the candidate's scholarship (and/or creative expression) and its influence on and/or advancement of the field(s)
 - assess the promise and probable impact of the candidate's future research/creative expression
 - compare the candidate to his/her scholarly cohort at other leading universities; and
 - state whether the candidate would meet the research standard for promotion to the rank of Professor typically applied at leading research universities
 - A sample letter addressing these points is appended (see page 23).
- Additional materials related to the external review process should be uploaded into Interfolio into the appropriate section.
 - Lists of approved reviewers. Upload the Dean's memo of approved reviewers, along with the resulting disposition for each reviewer. Beside each name, please make the following notation, as appropriate:
 - Letter received OR
 - Agreed but did not send OR
 - Declined OR
 - Did not respond to the request OR
 - Not solicited
 - For those who declined to write, provide the reason if given
 - A brief biographical summary of each approved reviewers' professional credentials, including those who were approved, but did not send a letter. Do NOT include each reviewer's curriculum vitae.
 - Copies of all correspondence, postal and electronic, with actual or potential reviewers not conducted within Interfolio, including summaries of telephone conversations between tenured faculty members and/or the Chair/Director and any reviewers.
 - If letters are collected outside of Interfolio, the file should contain scanned PDFs (with signatures) of the letters and email messages sent to the referees and of reviewers' responses. A copy of the form letter sent to each reviewer will not suffice.
 - Copies of all correspondence between the department or program and the Dean on the choice and decanal approval of external reviewers. A list of proposed reviewers and the dean's approval is not sufficient. If there is any back and forth between the chair and the dean on the names of the reviewers and their qualifications or relationship to the candidate, this correspondence must be included.

8. **Previous curriculum vitae and counseling information**

- These documents are required and should be uploaded to Interfolio for evaluation by faculty prior to the department/program/*ad hoc* committee's vote on the file.
- **For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure**
 - dated copies of the candidate's *curriculum vitae* that were submitted for the initial appointment/hire and from any and all pre-tenure reviews

- copies of the counseling memoranda for pre-tenure reviews and the summaries prepared by the Chair/Director after completion of those reviews with the candidate.
- **For promotion to Professor**
 - a dated copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae submitted with the recommendation to promote to Associate Professor with tenure, or with the initial appointment if the candidate was hired into a tenured position.
 - Do not include pre-tenure committee reports or counseling memos in files under consideration for promotion to Professor.

9. Correspondence between the Chair/Director and the candidate

Copies of all correspondence between the Chair/Director and the candidate *about the tenure review or promotion process(es)* not conducted within Interfolio must be uploaded.

10. Published reviews of published works

A copy of all available published reviews of published works should be uploaded to Interfolio. All documents within the Appendices should be uploaded to Interfolio, excluding books.

11. Appendix A

Other relevant materials concerning research/creative expression, such as letters from editors and readers' reports. Please include an index of the materials submitted in this appendix within the Table of Contents, making sure that each item in the Table of Contents corresponds to an easily identifiable document in the appendix.

12. Appendix B

Other relevant materials (optional) concerning teaching: copies of syllabi, outlines, reading lists, examinations, and similar materials, may be included here. Please include an index of the materials submitted in this appendix within the Table of Contents, making sure that each item in the Table of Contents corresponds to an easily identifiable document in the appendix.

13. Appendix C

Publications: Copies of all publications submitted by the candidate for review by the external reviewers and the department or program should be included with the file. *Do not include any publications unavailable to the eligible tenured faculty prior to the decision meeting.* Please include an index of all publications sent to this office, including articles, manuscripts, and books within the Table of Contents, making sure that each item in the Table of Contents corresponds to an easily identifiable document in the appendix.

Role of the voting eligible faculty member

A few clarifications regarding the limited role to be played by some faculty in the deliberations concerning the candidate:

- Vanderbilt University's Conflict of Interest Policy prohibits members of the University community from participating in the hiring process or any employment related decisions pertaining to their family members. Hence, members of the faculty may not participate in any aspect of deliberations or votes concerning appointments or renewals of family members, including spouses and partners.

- If a faculty member has served in any significant fashion as a mentor to the candidate *prior* to the candidate's appointment at Vanderbilt (e.g., as a doctoral or postdoctoral advisor or as a dissertation committee member), that faculty member should not serve on any *ad hoc* committee that a department might create to evaluate an aspect of the candidate's qualifications (e.g., a committee providing a report on research, teaching, or service). Such a faculty member would normally still be eligible to vote on the case; please check with the dean in each case.

Confidentiality of personnel matters

- Please remind your colleagues of their professional responsibility to maintain the strictest confidentiality concerning personnel decisions.
- They may not reveal or discuss the transactions of the decision meeting, the votes, the contents of letters, the names of referees or the outcome of the meeting.
- Your colleagues should be advised at each meeting that the Chair/Director alone speaks for the tenured faculty of the department or program in communicating with the dean's office.
- The faculty meeting should commence with the reading by the Chair/Director of the following statement:

“It is the role of the Chair (Program Director) to represent the voting faculty in any communications with the candidate. All matters relating to this case are confidential; in particular, the tally of votes, the details of the discussion at this meeting, as well as any contents of the candidate's file such as the names of the reviewers must not be revealed to the candidate.

I also take this opportunity to remind you that the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) does NOT meet with the Dean or the Chair but rather relies almost exclusively upon the written documentation included in the candidate's file. The minutes of this meeting are a vital part of that file and as such your comments will be considered at the highest levels of the decision-making process. I therefore urge you to speak out for the record on any issues that you deem crucial to this case.”

Ex Parte Communications

Except as set forth below, the entire contents of the dossier, including all solicited or unsolicited letters regarding appointment, renewal, promotion or tenure that will be included in the candidate's file for transmittal to the Dean must be available for review in Interfolio by the eligible faculty members prior to their vote. Only members of the faculty who are eligible to vote shall have the opportunity to review the contents of the dossier. Unsolicited letters from faculty members outside the department or school should not be included in the dossier either before or after faculty deliberations.

By the end of the second business day after the vote, any faculty member eligible to vote may write a letter to the department chair or Dean for inclusion in the dossier expressing his or her views on the deliberations by the faculty. These letters are to be made available to all faculty who are eligible to vote.

The department must prepare minutes or a summary of the faculty deliberations, and the summary will be appended to the dossier, after first being circulated to the voting members of the faculty. Any faculty member who believes that the minutes or summary does not fairly reflect the deliberations at the meeting may submit a letter to the Chair/Director or Dean before the end of the second working day after distribution of the minutes or summary. All such letters shall be made available to the faculty eligible to vote and will be included in the dossier in Interfolio.

Except as stated above, no faculty member other than the Chair/Director or Dean may add materials to the dossier at higher levels of review of the faculty decision.

It is inappropriate for faculty members, including those outside the department or school, to attempt to influence the deliberations on renewal, promotions, or tenure that come after the vote of the faculty. Persons involved in subsequent levels of review should not accept or consider additional unsolicited documents and should discourage any communications that seek to influence their decisions.

Allegations of professional misconduct by faculty members involved in the process should be reported following procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual. "Professional misconduct" means any conduct on the part of a faculty member that might reasonably lead to disciplinary action under Part IV, Chapter 1 (Disciplinary Actions) of the *Faculty Manual*.

Notification of the department's or program's decision and disclosure of information

- The Chair/Director must advise a candidate for promotion, **in writing (with a copy to the Dean)**, within three days of the departmental or program meeting, of the decision reached by the tenured faculty (whether or not to recommend promotion).
- The vote tally must **not** be reported to the candidate. Please also do not report to the candidate whether the vote was unanimous or divided.
- The letter informing the candidate of the department's or program's decision should not elaborate on the rationale for it.
- When reporting a favorable departmental or program recommendation on promotion, the Chair/Director should also remind the candidate of the additional stages of the review process. These include:
 - the Dean
 - the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee
 - the Provost
 - the Chancellor
 - the Board of Trust (on tenure decisions)
- Concurrence at stages prior to the vote by the Board of Trust is not reported, but lack of concurrence is.
- If a candidate requests from you a written statement detailing his or her strengths and weaknesses as reflected in the tenured faculty's deliberation of the case, please consult with the Dean before providing it. The statement can be written only after the final disposition of the file.
- Final decisions in cases of promotion to tenure are normally but not always announced immediately following the Board of Trust meetings in late April/early May.

Occasionally, cases are announced in June.

- Please bear in mind that if a candidate for promotion asks to see his or her personnel file, under the provisions of the legislation passed by the faculty, the right of access does not include evaluations, departmental recommendations, or solicited letters of recommendation. Please contact the Dean's Office if a candidate makes such a request, and *prior* to sharing the information.

Sample of Initial Email to Potential Reviewers of a Candidate for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure or to Professor

(to be sent by the Chair/Director outside of Interfolio)

Dear *Professor X*,

I am writing to ask that you perform a very important service for the (*Department of XXXX*) at Vanderbilt University. One of our (*Assistant/Associate*) Professors, (*name of candidate*), will be reviewed for promotion to (*Associate Professor with tenure / Professor*) in the fall of XXXX. As you know, decisions on such promotions are among the most important that a university makes. Your name has been chosen with great care as a person who is eminently qualified to assess the scholarship of Professor (*last name of candidate*).

We would be very grateful if you would agree to provide an assessment of Professor (*last name of candidate*)'s scholarship. Should you agree to assist us, the appropriate materials will be sent to you via Interfolio in the near future, and we would expect your report by (*date*).

To facilitate your decision-making, I am attaching an abbreviated version of Professor (*last name of candidate*)'s *c.v.*

Please let me know by return e-mail within the next week or so if you would consider taking on this important task. We of course would very much like to count on your expertise and assistance in this matter.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Sample Letter Requesting Recommendation of a Candidate for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (to be sent via Interfolio)

Dear Professor X:

The (*Department of XXXX*) at Vanderbilt University is considering *Firstname Lastname*, *Assistant Professor of XXXX*, for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

As you know, decisions on promotions to tenure are among the most important a university makes. Thank you for agreeing to help us render a judgment on Professor *Lastname's* accomplishments and potential as a scholar. For the award of tenure, Vanderbilt requires: 1) excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression in one's discipline; 2) a high level of effectiveness in teaching; and 3) satisfactory performance in the area of service. The College of Arts and Science at Vanderbilt stipulates the following expectations for appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure: "For appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, judgments should be based on performance in research, teaching, and other kinds of intellectual and academic service. Excellence in all these activities is desired. Excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression is required. A high level of effectiveness in teaching is required. Satisfactory performance of service to the University and/or to professional and learned societies is required."

The (*Department of XXXX*) will assess Professor *Lastname's* record of teaching and service; we ask you to focus on Professor *Lastname's* research, scholarship, or creative expression. In your view, has Professor *Lastname* made an original and significant contribution to the discipline? If so, to what extent and in what ways has this contribution advanced scholarly knowledge and otherwise enriched the discipline? Does Professor *Lastname's* scholarly work demonstrate originality and intellectual independence? What are the special strengths and weaknesses of Professor *Lastname's* contributions and what is your estimate of the promise of future research? What is your assessment of where Professor *Lastname* ranks in relation to others at similar stages in their careers? In your judgment, does Professor *Lastname* satisfy the research standard for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure typically applied by leading research universities? Any other comments you care to make evaluating Professor *Lastname's* scholarship would be most welcome. We would be grateful if you would describe how long and in what capacity you have known the candidate, and the extent to which you are familiar with the candidate's research.

I enclose Professor *Lastname's curriculum vitae*, the research portion of the Statement of Endeavors, relevant publications, and a few selections from works in progress. I would appreciate receiving your assessment no later than (insert appropriate date).

Thank you for your help with this crucially important matter. Under current policies and practices at Vanderbilt University, peer evaluations such as that being requested from you are regarded, within limitations imposed by law, as confidential. They are for limited use within the University. However, governmental agencies may have a legal right of access to such evaluations. Federal or state law or the courts may afford others, including the person being evaluated, access to the evaluation.

Sincerely,

Sample Letter Requesting Recommendation of a Candidate for Promotion to Professor
(to be sent via Interfolio)

Dear Professor X:

The (*Department of XXXX*) at Vanderbilt University is considering *Firstname Lastname*, *Associate Professor of XXXX*, for promotion to Professor.

As you know, decisions on such promotions are among the most important a university makes. Thank you for agreeing to help us evaluate Professor *Lastname*'s accomplishments and potential as a scholar. The College of Arts and Science at Vanderbilt stipulates the following expectations for appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor: "For appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor, the College expects the level and quality of achievement in research, scholarship, or creative expression and teaching required of professors in corresponding departments and schools at other leading major research universities. The candidate must have attained national or international recognition among leading scholars in his or her discipline for sustained and excellent research, must have taught the courses requested by the department or school at a consistently high level of effectiveness, and must have demonstrated a well-developed and recognized record of service both to the University and his or her discipline."

The (*Department of XXXX*) will assess Professor *Lastname*'s record of teaching and service; we ask you to focus on Professor *Lastname*'s research, scholarship, or creative expression. In your view, has Professor *Lastname* made an original and significant contribution to the discipline? If so, to what extent and in what ways has this contribution advanced scholarly knowledge and otherwise enriched the discipline? What are the special strengths and weaknesses of Professor *Lastname*'s scholarly contributions and what is your estimate of the promise of future research? What is your assessment of where Professor *Lastname* ranks in relation to others at similar stages in their careers? In your judgment, does Professor *Lastname* satisfy the research standard for promotion to Professor typically applied by leading research universities? Any other comments you care to make evaluating Professor *Lastname*'s scholarship would be most welcome. We would be grateful if you would describe how long and in what capacity you have known the candidate, and the extent to which you are familiar with the candidate's research.

I enclose Professor *Lastname*'s *curriculum vitae*, the research portion of the Statement of Endeavors, relevant publications, and a few selections from works in progress. I would appreciate receiving your assessment no later than (insert appropriate date).

Thank you for your help with this crucially important matter. Under current policies and practices at Vanderbilt University, peer evaluations such as that being requested from you are regarded, within limitations imposed by law, as confidential. They are for carefully limited use within the University. However, governmental agencies may have a legal right of access to such evaluations. Federal or state law or the courts may afford others, including the person being evaluated, access to the evaluation.

Sincerely,

Checklist of documents for Promotion Files (to Associate Professor with Tenure or Professor)

1. Chair's/Director's Recommendation
(For Joint appointments with tenure-line in more than one unit – include Chair/Director recommendations from each unit.)
2. Faculty Recommendation – including any subcommittee reports prepared for the faculty
(For Joint appointments with tenure-line in more than one unit – include ad hoc committee report in addition to any reports from the relevant departments/programs.)
3. *Curriculum Vitae* in the format detailed on p. 8
4. Teaching Summary Chart(s)
5. Student Reviews and Comments. This should be the entire instructor report – not just an excerpt.
6. Candidate's Statement of Endeavors in Research, Teaching and Service. Optional COVID-19 Impact Statement may be appended to the internal version not sent to external reviewers.
7. External Letters of Recommendation
Memo from Dean with final list of approved reviewers, along with dispositions
Letters from candidate's list
Letters from the department's list
Brief biography of the writers
All correspondence with reviewers
Rationale and approval of department's list of reviewers
8. Previous *Curriculum Vitae* and for promotion to tenure only, also include Counseling Memorandum
9. Correspondence between the Chair/Director and the Candidate
10. Published reviews of published work

Appendix A: Other relevant material concerning research

Title/description of item a

Title/description of item b

Appendix B: Other relevant material concerning teaching

Title/description of item a

Title/description of item b

Appendix C: Copies of publications/creative expression

Title/description of item a

Title/description of item b

II. REAPPOINTMENTS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Standards

The College of Arts and Science upholds the tenure-track reappointment standards set forth in the Vanderbilt *Faculty Manual*:

“Tenure-track faculty members should be recommended for reappointment only if their performance provides a reasonable basis on which to project continued progress that should ultimately enable them to qualify for tenure. The evidence needed becomes more weighty with continued time in rank.” (*Faculty Manual*, Part II, Ch 2, Section E).

The College of Arts and Science [*Rules and Procedures for Appointments, Renewals, Promotions, and Tenure*](#) document contains information about the rules and procedures that govern these faculty actions. Please consult it closely as you prepare reappointment files.

Eligible Voters

The College of Arts and Science *Rules and Procedures for Appointments, Renewals, Promotions, and Tenure* (Section II, Part D, #1) specifies eligibility for voting on reappointments.

For reappointment cases involving faculty in departments/programs that do not contain at least five eligible voting members, an ad hoc committee will be constituted that will include the eligible voting members of the unit, plus the appropriate number of faculty from related fields of appropriate rank such that the ad hoc committee has five members (*A&S Rules and Procedures* document, Section II, Part D, # 2). The ad hoc committee will serve as the eligible voting body, and the chair of the ad hoc committee will complete the tasks designated below for Department Chairs/Program Directors.

For reappointment cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments with a tenure-line in more than one unit and whose administrative home unit includes at least five eligible voting members, a single ad hoc committee will be appointed by the Dean or the Dean’s designee, in consultation with the chairs/directors of the relevant units. The chair of the ad hoc committee will be appointed from the faculty member’s administrative home. The remainder of the committee will be constituted by an equal representation of members from each unit. The committee will write a single report that is reviewed by each of the units, and the eligible voters in each unit will discuss and vote on the reappointment. Each unit’s vote should be conveyed in a letter from the unit Chair/Director, addressed to the Dean, for inclusion in the file. Minutes from each meeting (in the format and with the content described below) will also be gathered. The chair or director of the unit that is the faculty member’s administrative home will be responsible for overseeing completion of the file (through Interfolio).

For reappointment cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments with a tenure-line in more than one unit but whose administrative home unit does not contain at least five eligible voting members, a single ad hoc committee will be appointed by the Dean or the Dean’s designee, in consultation with the chairs/directors of the relevant units. When possible, the chair of the committee will be appointed from the faculty member’s administrative home. The ad hoc committee will include all eligible members from the administrative home unit and be supplemented with eligible members in related fields in order to reach five members. The ad hoc

committee will write a single report and will constitute the voting unit of the administrative home unit. The eligible voters in the unit that is not the administrative home unit will review the ad hoc report and vote on the reappointment. Each unit's vote (i.e., the ad hoc committee standing for the administrative home unit, and the department/program that is not the administrative home) should be conveyed in a letter, addressed to the dean, for inclusion in the file. Minutes from each meeting (in the format and with the content described below) must also be submitted. The chair of the ad hoc committee, in collaboration with the Chair/Director of the unit that is not the administrative home, will complete the tasks designated below for Department Chairs/Program Directors (through Interfolio). For joint appointments where neither the administrative home unit nor the second unit has five eligible voting members, a single ad hoc committee will be formed.

Responsibility for the Reappointment Process

The Department Chair or Program Director is responsible for overseeing the reappointment process for a faculty member in the Department/Program. In the event that an *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Dean or the Dean's designee, the chair of the *ad hoc* committee shall complete the tasks designated below for Department Chairs/Program Directors.

Dossier Contents

All tenure-track reappointment files must be submitted via [Interfolio](#).

All reappointment files should contain the required documents outlined in the Interfolio template for the case and must conform to the following guidelines. In addition, *all documents must be searchable, not scanned, PDF files*. A sample checklist of documents required is provided on page 35 of this document.

All documents except for books authored by candidates must be submitted in electronic form via Interfolio.

1. Chair's or Program Director's recommendation to the Dean

- The Chair/Director must submit a detailed statement commenting on the reappointment. This is an evaluation and recommendation separate from that provided by the department or program. It is also an opportunity for the Chair/Director to explain any aspect of the file that may require interpretation and context. There will be an upload field in Interfolio for this document. The statement should address:
 - How the candidate's field of research relates to the discipline as a whole
 - The quality of the candidate's publications, including the quality of the journals where articles were published or the presses where books were published
 - The impact of the candidate's publications/creative works on the research and work of others in the field
 - The candidate's external funding record
 - The candidate's promise for future productivity
 - Detailed comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record in research, teaching, and service

2. Draft Counseling Memorandum

- After a positive vote in the department, the Chair/Director will submit to the Dean's Office via Interfolio a draft counseling memorandum that accompanies the entire dossier. The draft counseling memorandum should reflect the departmental evaluation of the candidate's record of research, teaching, and service, and should convey the department's advice for the candidate, moving forward. The Dean's office will review the draft counseling memorandum and may recommend revisions. Once the reappointment has been officially approved, the Dean's office will inform the Chair/Director of approval of the renewal and the final draft, and then the Chair/Director will send the counseling memorandum to the candidate. Please see page 33 of this document for a counseling memo template.
- The Chair/Director is required to meet with the faculty member after they have been formally reappointed to discuss the recent review, assess strengths and weaknesses of the record to-date and strategize for the tenure review.
- As part of this process, the Chair/Director should provide the Dean's Office a written summary of that meeting, with a copy also provided to the candidate.
- The format of that summary should mirror the format of the counseling memorandum, discussing research, teaching and service.

3. **Recommendation of the tenured faculty of the Department or Program**

- The first sentence of the recommendation should include the enumerated vote of the eligible faculty: the number favoring, opposing, proxy votes (if applicable) and abstaining, along with the date of the vote. Recording a vote as "unanimous" is not adequate; please state the number of faculty members casting votes relative to all faculty members eligible to vote.
- *Minutes*: The recommendation should be accompanied by detailed minutes that reflect the full range of discussion by the tenured faculty at the meeting. Please do not submit a verbatim transcript of the meeting. Minutes should be taken by a designated faculty member other than the Chair/Director or by an appropriate staff person. Do not send an audio recording of the discussion. There will be an upload field in Interfolio for this document.
 - The minutes should include the names of those present and absent, and the number of proxy votes, if any, together with a statement of the department's or program's policy on proxy voting on personnel decisions.
 - The minutes must also include the faculty's evaluation of and comments on the candidate's accomplishments and prospects in (1) research or creative expression; (2) teaching; and (3) service.
 - If the department or program appoints a committee to review the candidate's publications, rather than having all tenured faculty do so, the minutes must identify those designated members of the faculty who served on this review committee and have therefore read (1) relevant publications by the candidate appearing since the last personnel action, and (2) relevant samples of his/her earlier work. If this committee prepares any written reports or presentations, these documents must also be included in the dossier.
 - If minutes of the meeting do not satisfy all these requirements, a candid accompanying statement from the Chair/Director must do so.
 - Minutes of the meeting must be signed and dated by the person responsible for

their composition.

- In accordance with the *Faculty Manual*, and Arts and Science *Rules and Procedures* document, minutes must be made available for 2 working days to all eligible faculty before the file is forwarded to the Dean. Within 2 working days after eligible faculty are notified that the minutes are available, they may make responses to the minutes that will be included in the file. Such responses must be available to all eligible faculty members or *ad hoc* committee members.
- Research: The recommendation should also include any department- or program-specific definitions of the nature of the research, scholarship, or creative expression expected of the candidate. Please include any statements of expectations of productivity contained in any special agreement between the Dean's Office and the candidate, either at the time of initial appointment or subsequently.
- Teaching: The tenured faculty's assessment of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels must include a review of the following evidence:
 - student reviews, including a complete summary of numerical ratings that must be provided along with the full instructor reports. See #5 below for further details.
 - a list or statement about graduate theses the candidate has supervised
 - the candidate's contributions to the development of courses, curriculum, instructional methodology, and other strategies for stimulating learning.
 - any available supplemental evidence available of teaching effectiveness that is routinely gathered by the department or program for all candidates or all faculty, such as reports based on peer observation of teaching. Peer evaluations are strongly recommended for reappointments.
 - If relevant, materials documenting the quality of the candidate's participation in non-course activities that the department or program considers as constituting "teaching" (e.g., supervision of internships, work with students in the laboratory).
 - A formal peer teaching report written by two tenured faculty members for tenure-track reappointments conducted in AY24-25 is highly recommended. **As of AY25-26, a peer teaching report will be required for all tenure-track reappointments.** The peer report of teaching should be based on (a) in-class observations by each of the two tenured faculty members and (b) a careful evaluation by the same faculty members of all relevant course materials such as course syllabi, reading lists, assignments, grading policies, and examinations to develop and provide a comprehensive view of the course's goals, design, and implementation. The peer teaching report that is prepared for tenure-track reappointment is a confidential part of the file that is accessible only to the voting-eligible faculty; it should not be shared with the faculty member being considered for tenure-track reappointment.²
- Research and Teaching Reports
 - If an internal review committee prepares a report for presentation to the department's tenured faculty, please include a copy of the report in Interfolio.
 - Reports from review committees formed to evaluate scholarship/creative

² Departments are welcome to institute complementary *formative* peer teaching evaluation processes where faculty members receive oral and written feedback from colleagues that encourages reflection and adaptation of their practices. However, the peer teaching report submitted for tenure-track reappointment is a confidential part of the file that should be accessible only to the voting-eligible faculty.

expression of candidates with an interdisciplinary field, and/or from *ad hoc* review committees constituted for candidates from departments/programs with fewer than five voting-eligible faculty should be included in Interfolio.

- The peer teaching report, if available, should be uploaded into Interfolio if it is not already included in the above reports.

4. The candidate's current curriculum vitae

- The *c.v.* will be uploaded by the candidate in Interfolio in Step 1.
- The current *c.v.* must be dated and conform to the outline given on p. 8 of this document. A sample *c.v.* is attached as an example (see p. 44).

5. Cumulative teaching summary chart

- The cumulative teaching summary chart(s) will be generated and uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.
- All available data while in rank (on the tenure-track) must be presented.
- For those courses rated prior to Fall 2016 (using the VOICE system), provide a composite chart using the numerical information from the candidate's teaching evaluations (*an Excel spreadsheet is available [here](#).*)
 - The number of students enrolled in each course as well as the number of students completing the forms must be included for each course rated.
 - Data should be listed from the oldest (on the left) to the most recent.
- For those courses rated as of Fall 2016 and onwards (using the BLUE system), provide a composite chart, using the numerical information from the candidate's student ratings (*an Excel template is available [here](#).*)
 - The number of students enrolled in each course as well as the number of students completing the forms must be included for each course rated.
 - Data should be listed from the oldest (on the left) to the most recent.

6. Student course ratings and comments

- The student ratings will be uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.
- Please upload the entire course instructor report, which includes the objective responses, as well as the bar graphs and the student comments.

7. Candidate's Statement of Endeavors

- Candidates for reappointment should provide a clear, complete, and well-documented report of their activities and achievements in each of the three areas of performance: research/creative expression, teaching, and service. This report, typically six to eight pages, should be more than a list of activities; it should articulate the candidate's research agenda and trajectory; discuss the candidate's teaching philosophy, contributions, and evolution; and summarize the candidate's service.
- The Statement of Endeavors should conform to those instructions relating to the Internal Statement of Endeavors outlined on p. 10 of this document; this also includes the ability to append a COVID-19 Impact Statement to the Statement of Endeavors.

8. Curriculum vitae at the time of hiring on the tenure-track

Dated copy of the candidate's *curriculum vitae* that was submitted for the initial

appointment/hire should be uploaded to Interfolio for evaluation by faculty prior to the department/program/*ad hoc* committee's vote on the file.

9. Correspondence between the Chair/ Director and the candidate

Copies of all correspondence between the Chair/Director and the candidate *about the reappointment process(es)* not conducted within Interfolio must be uploaded.

10. Published reviews of published works

A copy of all available published reviews of published works should be uploaded to Interfolio, if applicable. All documents within the Appendices should be uploaded to Interfolio, excluding books.

11. Appendix A

Other relevant materials concerning research/creative expression, such as letters from editors and readers' reports. Please include an index of the materials submitted in this appendix within the Table of Contents, making sure that each item in the Table of Contents corresponds to an easily identifiable document in the appendix.

12. Appendix B

Other relevant materials (optional) concerning teaching: copies of syllabi, outlines, reading lists, examinations, and similar materials, may be included here. Please include an index of the materials submitted in this appendix within the Table of Contents, making sure that each item in the Table of Contents corresponds to an easily identifiable document in the appendix.

13. Appendix C

Publications: Copies of all publications submitted by the candidate for review by the external reviewers, and the department or program should be included with the file. *Do not include any publications unavailable to the tenured faculty prior to the decision meeting.* Please include an index of all publications sent to this office, including articles, manuscripts, and books within the Table of Contents, making sure that each item in the Table of Contents corresponds to an easily identifiable document in the appendix.

Role of the voting eligible faculty member

A few clarifications regarding the limited role to be played by some faculty in the deliberations concerning the candidate:

- Vanderbilt University's Conflict of Interest Policy prohibits members of the University community from participating in the hiring process or any employment related decisions pertaining to their family members. Hence, members of the faculty may not participate in any aspect of deliberations or votes concerning appointments or renewals of family members, including spouses and partners.
- If a faculty member has served in any significant fashion as a mentor to the candidate *prior* to the candidate's appointment at Vanderbilt (e.g., as a doctoral or postdoctoral advisor or as a dissertation committee member), that faculty member should not serve on any *ad hoc* committee that a department might create to evaluate an aspect of the candidate's qualifications (e.g., a committee providing a report on research, teaching, or service). Such a faculty member would normally still be eligible to vote on the case; please check with the dean in each case.

Confidentiality of personnel matters

- Please remind your colleagues of their professional responsibility to maintain the strictest confidentiality concerning personnel decisions.
- This means that they may not reveal or discuss the transactions of the decision meeting, the votes, the contents of the file, or the outcome of the meeting.
- Your colleagues should be advised at each meeting that the Chair/Director alone speaks for the tenured faculty of the department or program.
- The faculty meeting should commence with the reading by the Chair/Director of the following statement:

“It is the role of the Chair (Program Director) to represent the voting faculty in any communications with the candidate. All matters relating to this case are confidential; in particular, the tally of votes, the details of the discussion at this meeting, as well as any contents of the candidate’s file such as the names of the reviewers must not be revealed to the candidate.

The minutes of this meeting are a vital part of the file and as such your comments will be considered at the highest levels of the decision making process. I therefore urge you to speak out for the record on any issues that you deem crucial to this case.”

Ex Parte Communications

See page 18 of this document.

Notification of the department’s or program’s decision and disclosure of information

- The Chair/Director must advise a candidate for reappointment, **in writing (with a copy to the Dean)**, within three days of the departmental or program meeting, of the decision reached by the tenured faculty (whether or not to recommend reappointment).
- The vote tally must **not** be reported to the candidate. Please do not report to the candidate whether the vote was unanimous or divided.
- The letter informing the candidate of the department’s or program’s decision should not elaborate on the rationale for it. When reporting a favorable departmental or program recommendation on reappointment, the Chair/Director should also remind the candidate of the additional stages of the review process. These include
 - the Dean
 - the Provost
- Concurrence at stages prior to the decision by the Provost is not reported, but lack of concurrence is.
- If a candidate requests from you a written statement detailing his or her strengths and weaknesses as reflected in the tenured faculty’s deliberation of the case, please consult with the Dean before providing it. The statement can be written only after the final disposition of the file.
- Final decisions are normally, but not always, announced by the end of May.
- Please bear in mind that if a candidate for reappointment asks to see his or her personnel file, under the provisions of the legislation passed by the faculty, the right of access does not include departmental evaluations or departmental recommendations. Please contact

the Dean's Office if a candidate makes such a request, and *prior* to sharing the information.

Sample of Counseling Memorandum to Candidate from Chair/Director

This document provides suggested language for parts of the counseling memo draft and lists suggestions for topics to address in presenting evaluations of candidates' research, teaching, and service. If you have any questions as you prepare drafts, please do not hesitate to contact the Dean of Faculty Affairs.

Suggested opening paragraphs

Dear <Candidate's Name>:

Congratulations on your reappointment to the tenure-track at Vanderbilt.

As you know, Vanderbilt's Faculty Manual lists the following criteria for tenure: "(1) excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression in one's discipline; (2) a high level of effectiveness in teaching; and (3) satisfactory performance in the area of service."

The tenured faculty convened to evaluate your performance in these three areas and to discuss suggestions for future progress as you advance on the tenure-track. In consultation with the Dean's Office, I write this counseling memorandum to provide you with professional guidance in the domains of research, teaching, and service for the next few years. Your tenure review will take place in < AY XX-YY >.

Suggested content:

Research

- the tenured faculty's assessment of the quantity, quality, and pace of research or creative expression produced during the review period
- the tenured faculty's advice for future progress in research or creative expression, including strategies for achieving a high-quality publication record
- the external funding record during the review period and advice on external funding strategies within the candidate's discipline
- encouragement to schedule a Dean's Research Studio if appropriate

Teaching

- the tenured faculty's evaluation of teaching effectiveness during the review period
- the tenured faculty's advice for improvement of teaching, including strategies to address any shortcomings identified by the tenured faculty
- the tenured faculty's evaluation of contributions to teaching outside of the classroom (i.e., independent research, immersion, graduate student advising)

Service

- the tenured faculty's evaluation of the service contributions in the department, College, and/or profession during the review period
- the tenured faculty's advice about which service invitations to accept and which to defer in the coming years, and for integrating service with research/teaching

Suggested closing paragraphs:

My colleagues and I are committed to supporting you as you progress on the tenure-track. As

[Chair/Director], I am available to discuss strategies for professional success and can assist you in identifying resources on campus to support your professional development. The A&S Program in Career Development can also be a useful resource.

Once you have reviewed this memorandum, please contact me to set up a counseling meeting so that we can discuss it and your plans for continued progress in research, teaching, and service. Ideally, we should schedule our counseling meeting to occur within the next two weeks.

Sincerely,

<Chair/Director>

cc: Dean of Faculty Affairs

Checklist of documents for Tenure-Track Reappointment Files

1. Chair's/Director's Recommendation
(For Joint appointments – include Chair/Director recommendations from each unit.)
2. Draft counseling memorandum
3. Faculty Recommendation: including any subcommittee reports prepared for the faculty
(For Joint appointments – include the ad hoc committee report in addition to any reports from the relevant departments/programs.)
4. *Curriculum Vitae* in format detailed on p. 8 above.
5. Teaching Summary Chart(s)
6. Student Reviews and Comments. This should be the entire instructor report – not just an excerpt.
7. Candidate's Statement of Endeavors including Research, Teaching and Service statements.
Optional COVID-19 Impact Statement may be appended.
8. *Curriculum Vitae* at the time of hiring
9. Correspondence between the Chair/Director and the Candidate
10. Published reviews of published work

Appendix A: Other relevant material concerning research

Title/description of item a

Title/description of item b

Appendix B: Other relevant material concerning teaching

Title/description of item a

Title/description of item b

Appendix C: Copies of publications/creative expression

Title/description of item a

Title/description of item b

III. CONTINUING-TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY APPOINTMENTS & REAPPOINTMENTS

Deadlines

- Reappointment requests for multi-year appointments are expected by March 3, 2025.
- Reappointment requests for faculty holding a term of one-year or less are due by January 27, 2025, or as soon as the need for these term-faculty is obvious. Reappointment requests should be submitted via the [Request for Additional Instructional Staff and Reappointments](#) link to REDCap.

Eligible Voters

All appointments and reappointments require the vote of the eligible department/program faculty.

In the case of the reappointment of continuing-track faculty members on multi-year contracts, a faculty vote must be included. This vote may take place via email as long as members of the department are provided with materials to assess the performance of the faculty member, including the Chair/Director memo, the faculty member's self-assessment, two peer assessments of teaching, the CV, and the student reviews.

Voting eligibility for initial appointments and reappointments differs.

- *Initial Appointments:* All TT/T faculty members are eligible to vote on *initial* appointments of continuing-track faculty members, and continuing-track faculty members *at or above* the rank of the candidate in the same continuing-track category are eligible to vote on initial appointments.
- *Reappointments:* All TT/T faculty members are eligible to vote on *reappointments* of continuing-track faculty members.
- *Reappointments:* Continuing-track faculty members *above* the rank of the candidate in the same continuing-track category are eligible to vote on reappointments. E.g., principal senior lecturers vote on the reappointment of senior lecturers, principal senior lecturers and senior lecturers vote on the reappointment of lecturers (if a vote is taken). NTT associate professors vote on the reappointment of NTT assistant professors; NTT professors vote on the reappointment of NTT assistant and associate professors; associate professors of the practice vote on the reappointment of assistant professors of the practice; and professors of the practice vote on the reappointment of associate and assistant professors of the practice.
- If you have any questions about voting eligibility, please contact Dean Dow.

Chair Voting Rights

- For appointments at the rank of Lecturer *only*, faculty may vote to empower Chairs/Directors to make appointments and reappointments at the rank of Lecturer *only*, without faculty votes on specific cases. This is called "Chair Voting Rights."
- A record of this agreement should be forwarded to Dean Bonnie Dow and Jeffrey Keever as an official record of this agreement by your faculty.
- As chairs/directors change, these votes should be renewed to reflect the change in leadership.

Role of the voting eligible faculty member

A few clarifications are in order regarding the limited role to be played by some faculty in the deliberations concerning the candidate:

- Vanderbilt University's Conflict of Interest Policy prohibits members of the University community from participating in the hiring process or any employment related decisions pertaining to their family members. *Hence, members of the faculty may not participate in any aspect of deliberations or votes concerning appointments or renewals of family members.*
- If a faculty member has served in any significant fashion as a mentor to the candidate *prior* to their appointment at Vanderbilt (e.g., as a doctoral or postdoctoral advisor or committee member), that faculty member should not serve on any *ad hoc* committee that a department might create to evaluate an aspect of the candidate's qualifications (e.g., a committee providing a report on research, teaching, or service).

Confidentiality of personnel matters

- Please remind your colleagues of their professional responsibility to maintain the strictest confidentiality concerning personnel decisions.
- They may not reveal or discuss the transactions of the decision meeting, the votes, or the outcome of the meeting.

Definitions of Continuing-Faculty Ranks

Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Senior Lecturers, Assistant Professors of the Practice, Associate Professors of the Practice, NTT Assistant Professors, and NTT Associate Professors:

- Lecturers
 - Ph.D./terminal degree expected
 - May be appointed for no more than one year at a time
 - Generally limited to introductory (1000-level) courses
 - Department/program faculty can vote to delegate to the chair the ability to appoint lecturers without a faculty vote. The Dean's Office must have this decision on record. See "Chair Voting Rights" above.
- Senior Lecturers
 - Ph.D. /terminal degree or foreign language teaching licensure required
 - Can be appointed for up to 3 years at a time
 - If appointed for a 3-year term, mandatory review occurs in the 2nd year of their current contract
 - May teach introductory (1000-level) and intermediate (2000- or 3000- level) courses
 - Generally not permitted to teach graduate courses
 - Initial appointment requires 3 letters of recommendation
 - For *initial* appointment to the rank of Senior Lecturer: TT/T faculty, Principal Senior Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers are eligible to vote.
 - For *reappointment* at the rank of Senior Lecturer: TT/T faculty and Principal Senior Lecturers are eligible to vote.
- Principal Senior Lecturers
 - A faculty member is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer after completing six years of service at Vanderbilt as a Senior Lecturer.

- Consideration occurs during the mandatory review period in the third SL contract
- Can be appointed for up to 5 years at a time
- If appointed for a 5-year term, mandatory review occurs in the 4th year of their current contract
- May teach introductory (1000-level) and intermediate (2000- or 3000- level courses)
- Generally not permitted to teach graduate courses
- Initial appointment requires 3 letters of recommendation
- For *initial* appointment to the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer: TT/T faculty and Principal Senior Lecturers are eligible to vote.
- For *reappointment* at the rank of Principal Senior Lecturer: TT/T faculty are eligible to vote.
- Assistant Professor of the Practice
 - Ph.D. /terminal degree or foreign language teaching licensure required
 - Can be appointed for up to 3 years at a time
 - If appointed for a 3-year term, mandatory review occurs in the 2nd year of their current contract
 - May teach introductory (1000-level) and intermediate (2000- or 3000- level) courses
 - Generally not permitted to teach graduate courses
 - Initial appointment requires 3 letters of recommendation
 - For *initial* appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor of the Practice: TT/T faculty and Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors of the Practice are eligible to vote.
 - For *reappointment* at the rank of Assistant Professor of the Practice: TT/T faculty and Associate and Full Professors of the Practice are eligible to vote.
- Associate Professor of the Practice
 - A faculty member is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice after completing six years of service at Vanderbilt as an Assistant Professor of the Practice
 - Consideration occurs during the mandatory review period in the third contract as Assistant Professor of the Practice
 - Can be appointed for up to 5 years at a time
 - If appointed for a 5-year term, mandatory review occurs in the 4th year of their current contract
 - May teach introductory (1000-level), intermediate (2000- or 3000-level courses), and advanced courses (4000- or 5000-level courses)
 - Generally not permitted to teach graduate courses
 - Promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice requires 6 letters of recommendation
 - For *initial* appointment to the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice: TT/T faculty and Associate and Full Professors of the Practice are eligible to vote.
 - For *reappointment* at the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice: TT/T faculty and Full Professors of the Practice are eligible to vote.
- NTT Assistant Professor
 - Ph.D. /terminal degree or foreign language teaching licensure required
 - Can be appointed for up to 3 years at a time
 - If appointed for a 3-year term, mandatory review occurs in the 2nd year of their current contract

- May teach introductory (1000-level) and intermediate (2000- or 3000- level) courses
- Generally not permitted to teach graduate courses
- Initial appointment requires 3 letters of recommendation
- For *initial* appointment to the rank of NTT Assistant Professor: TT/T faculty and NTT Assistant, NTT Associate, and NTT Full Professors are eligible to vote.
- For *reappointment* at the rank of NTT Assistant Professor: TT/T faculty and NTT Associate and NTT Full Professors are eligible to vote.
- NTT Associate Professor
 - A faculty member is eligible to be considered for promotion to the rank of NTT Associate Professor after completing six years of service at Vanderbilt as an NTT Assistant Professor
 - Consideration occurs during the mandatory review period in the third contract as NTT Assistant Professor
 - Can be appointed for up to 5 years at a time
 - If appointed for a 5-year term, mandatory review occurs in the 4th year of their current contract
 - May teach introductory (1000-level), intermediate (2000- or 3000-level courses), advanced courses (4000- or 5000-level courses), and graduate courses if appointed to the Graduate Faculty.
 - Promotion to NTT Associate Professor requires 6 letters of recommendation
 - For *initial* appointment to the rank of NTT Associate Professor: TT/T faculty and NTT Associate and NTT Full Professors are eligible to vote.
 - For *reappointment* at the rank of NTT Associate Professor: TT/T faculty and NTT Full Professors are eligible to vote.

Procedures for Promotion in NTT Professorial Ranks

Procedures for promotion should mirror the requirements for promotion at the respective rank of tenured ranks stated in Section I of this document.

Dossier Contents: Continuing-Track Instructional Appointments and Reappointments

All appointment and reappointment materials for continuing-track *instructional* faculty must be submitted here: [Request for Additional Instructional Staff and Reappointments](#). Each appointment request should contain the following items:

1. Candidate's current c.v.

2. A memo from the Chair/Director requesting the appointment

The Chair/Director's memo should be addressed to Dean Dow and must include a detailed rationale for the reappointment. That rationale should include:

- An account of the faculty vote on the reappointment and a summary of relevant aspects of the faculty discussion.
- A description of the role the faculty member plays in the department, including their curricular role and any additional responsibilities/service roles they fulfill.
- The length of service in the faculty role should also be included in the memo.
- Demonstration of a familiarity with the teaching performance of the faculty member and an assessment of it. The memo must include an average of the faculty member's "overall the instructor was" and "overall the course was" ratings from the student reviews. It should also include quotations from a sample of narrative student comments from the student reviews.
 - For an initial appointment – please include all student reviews available to you.
 - For reappointment of faculty with a one-year term or less, please provide the most recent 3 semesters of student reviews available. For those with less experience, provide all student reviews available.
 - For reappointments of faculty with *multi-year* terms, please include all student reviews for courses taught since the faculty member's last review. Every request for reappointment should include a complete summary of numerical ratings from student reviews that must be provided along with the full instructor reports. Example: A senior lecturer was first appointed effective Fall 2022 for a 3-year term. In the spring of 2024, the faculty member will be reviewed. The only new student reviews available would be for Fall 2022, Spring 2023 and Fall 2023 (3 semesters).
- Evaluation of the faculty member's performance in administrative/service and research roles, if any.
- A discussion of any concerns raised by the overall instructor rating or the overall course rating or the narrative comments in the student reviews. The memo should discuss those concerns and what has/will be done to address them (e.g, counseling from the Chair/Director or another senior faculty member, a referral to the Office of Educational Design and Development, formerly the CFT). Be cognizant of the trajectory of student reviews —sometimes student reviews from the first year of a three-year contract indicate problems that later reviews indicate have clearly been ameliorated (i.e., if the candidate for reappointment has developed as an instructor, the memo should discuss that development).
- Any existing special provisions for the faculty member being reappointed (e.g., course release for administrative service, professional development funds, commuting

expenses).

- An explanation of any specific/unique teaching arrangements (e.g., if the faculty member teaches a large course that is the equivalent of two courses, if lab teaching responsibilities should be counted toward overall course load in a specific way).

3. **Self-assessment from the candidate**

- *Not required for one-year lecturer reappointments*
- Generally 1-2 pages for reappointment; length for promotion requests varies.
- Should reflect on the quality of the faculty member's teaching performance since the last reappointment and should make clear that the faculty member has read the student reviews of their teaching.
- Should detail contributions to the teaching mission of the department, any courses developed or revised, and any other ways of contributing to undergraduate education through service to the department/college/university.
- Should make sure to address any concerning issues raised by the student reviews.
- Should detail any professional development undertaken since last reappointment—e.g., Office of Educational Design and Development, formerly the CFT, workshops or consultation.

4. **Peer assessment of teaching**

- *Not required for one-year lecturer reappointments*
- Assessment by two peers is required; 1-2 pages each.
 - Peer assessments may be completed by continuing track faculty and/or tenured/tenure-track faculty. Chairs and Directors may use their best judgment when choosing peer evaluators, although, if continuing track faculty are chosen, preference is for faculty members eligible to vote on the reappointment.
 - The assessments should be based on recent observation of the faculty member in the classroom (in the previous two semesters).
 - The assessments should address course design (based on review of the syllabus) as well as teaching performance (based on observation of the faculty member's classroom).

5. **Letters of Recommendation**

- *Not required for one-year lecturer appointments.*
- *Not required for multi-year continuing track reappointments except when reappointment is accompanied by a request for promotion.*
- 3 letters are required for initial appointment to the rank of senior lecturer, principal senior lecturer, and NTT assistant professor (including visiting).
- 6 letters are required for initial appointment to the rank of NTT associate or full professor (including visiting) or Associate or Full Professor of the Practice.

6. **Record of faculty vote and minutes**

Include this for all appointments/reappointments except for lecturers as specified above, including, if applicable, a record of any faculty discussion regarding the reappointment.

IV. CONTINUING-TRACK RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

- Submission: Recommendations for renewal should be in our office at least *two months prior to the expiration* of the appointment.
- Appointment and reappointment materials for continuing-track *research* faculty should be addressed to Dean-Elect McLean and submitted here: [Request for Research Faculty Appointments](#).

Role of the voting eligible faculty member

A few clarifications are in order regarding the limited role to be played by some faculty in the deliberations concerning the candidate:

- Vanderbilt University's Conflict of Interest Policy prohibits members of the University community from participating in the hiring process or any employment related decisions pertaining to their family members. *Hence, members of the faculty may not participate in any aspect of deliberations or votes concerning appointments or renewals of family members.*

Dossier Contents: Continuing-Track Research Appointments and Reappointments

1. **Candidate's current c.v.**

2. **A memo from the Chair/Director requesting the appointment**

The Chair/Director's memo should be addressed to the appropriate Dean (see below) and must include:

- the start and end dates of the appointment
- proposed salary, if applicable, with indication of source of funds
- percent effort of the appointment
- record of faculty vote, if appropriate
- It is rare for a research faculty member to teach, however, if the candidate has teaching experience at Vanderbilt, and there is an expectation that he/she will be called upon to teach, this information should also be included in the recommendation.

3. **Letters of reference, if applicable (see below)**

- 3 letters are required for initial appointment to the rank of research assistant professor
- 6 letters are required for initial appointment to the rank of research associate professor or research professor.
- Reappointments do not require letters.
- Promotion to Research Associate Professor and Research Professor requires 6 letters of recommendation. Procedures for promotion of research faculty should mirror the requirements for promotion for the respective rank as stated in section I of this document.

V. OTHER CONTINUING TRACK APPOINTMENTS

Secondary, Visiting, Interns and Observers, Postdoctoral Scholars: These continuing track appointments and reappointments should be addressed to the appropriate dean and submitted via the appropriate link:

- Secondary appointments and reappointments: Addressed to Dean Dow and submitted here: [Secondary Appointment REDCap](#).
- Visiting Scholar appointments and reappointments: Addressed to Dean Dow and submitted here: [A&S Visiting Scholar Request](#)
- Interns and Observers: Addressed to Dean McLean and submitted here: [A&S Interns and Observers Application](#)
- Postdoctoral Scholars are now handled through the [Office of Postdoctoral Affairs](#) in the Provost's Office.

VI. SAMPLE CV

Jane S. Doe
Department of Academic Studies
301 Academic Building
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37235
jane.s.doe@vanderbilt.edu
615-555-5555
Last updated: August 16, 2022

DEGREES EARNED

Ph.D., Academic Studies, Academic University, August 2019
M.A., Academic Studies, Academic University, January 2015
B.A., Academic Studies, Academic University, May 2012

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Assistant Professor, Vanderbilt University, Academic Studies, August 2019-present

HONORS AND AWARDS

Outstanding Article of the Year for “Academic Article,” from National Academic Studies Association, 2022.

Jeffrey Nordhaus Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching in the Humanities, College of Arts and Science, Vanderbilt University, 2021.

Phi Beta Kappa, Academic University, 2012.

RESEARCH

Books

Doe, Jane S. Academic Book. New York: Academic University Press, 2019.

Review: John Doe, *Historical Journal of Academic Studies*, 32.3 (2019): 459-462.

Review: Another Doe, *Contemporary Academic Journal*, 16.4 (2019): 795- 798.

Articles in refereed journals

Doe, Jane S. and John M. Doe, “Academic Article,” *Academic Journal*, 1.3 (Fall 2019): 59- 84.

Explanation of each co-author’s contribution to the essay.

Doe, Jane S. “Academic Article II,” *Contemporary Academic Studies*, 14.2 (May 2019): 190-205.

Book chapters

Doe, Jane S. “Academic Book Chapter,” in *Academic Book*, ed. James Doe. New York: Academic University Press, 2019. 243-264.

Book reviews

Doe, Jane S. “Review of *Academic Book* by James Doe,” *Academic Journal*, 16.4 (2019): 798-801.

Work in progress

Doe, Jane S. “Title of Current Unpublished Project.” Explanation of project and status.

Doe, Jane S. "Title of Another Current Unpublished Project." Explanation of project and status.

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities Fellowship, Vanderbilt University, 2019; \$4000 research stipend

Dissertation Fellowship, American Academic Association, 2018-2019. \$20,000 fellowship for the final year of dissertation writing.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

"Title of Presentation," Department of Academic Studies, Academic University, New York, NY, March 2019.

SELECTED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Doe, John and Jane S. Doe. "Title of Presentation," Academic Society of Academics, New York, NY, June 2019.

Doe, Jane S. "Title of Presentation," Academic Society of Academics, New York, NY, June 2018.

TEACHING RELATED ACTIVITIES

New Courses Introduced

Academic Studies in the Real World (ACAD 2020), Fall 2019.

Additional Courses Taught

Academic Studies for Academic Life (ACAD 2021), Spring 2019.

Undergraduate Research Supervised

Littlejohn Undergraduate Research Faculty Fellowship, Vanderbilt University, 2018-2019; year-long supervision of undergraduate research project on academic life, \$3000 research stipend

SERVICE

To Department

Member, Departmental Assessment Review Committee, Vanderbilt University, 2018- 2019.

Member, Search and Hiring Committee, Associate or Full Professor, Department of Academic Studies, Vanderbilt University, 2018-2019.

To College

Member, Committee on Educational Programs, College of Arts & Science, 2019.

To University

Member, Advisory Board for the Writing Studio and Undergraduate Writing Program, Vanderbilt University, 2018-2019.

To Profession

Member, External Review Committee, Academic Studies Department, Academic University, New York, NY, April 2019.

Member, Editorial Board, *Quarterly Journal of Academic Studies*, 2018-present

Book Manuscript Reviewer: Academic Studies Press, 2018; Academic Publishing Press, 2019.