

Addenda for College of Engineering on preparation of Promotion & Tenure Dossiers Revised 9/4/2020

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

Guidance on Preparation of Dossiers

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

Executive Summary – Important aspects of accomplishments should be identified using tables to summarize these contributions. An example of how the tables should be presented is included in Attachment A of this document. These tables are taken directly from the University's Guidelines. Please modify the tables to best present the candidate's work in a summary fashion (e.g. Assistant Professors would not have an After Associate column).

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

Letters of Recommendation

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

The dossier guidelines also call for letters of evaluation from a director when the faculty member's scholarly work is based in a center or institute. Faculty who are involved in interdisciplinary work which is not based in an institute or center should consult with the Department head and with the chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee to determine if the Committee should invite a letter from a director and/or interdisciplinary research team leader. The invitation, if deemed appropriate, should come from the Department Committee Chair or the Head.

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

1. Letters of recommendation will be included for all nominees for promotion and/or tenure.
2. The University policy requires a minimum of four (4) external letters.
3. The College of Engineering prefers to receive a minimum of five (5) external letters.

4. The Department P&T Committee should first create a list of at least six potential external reviewers without consulting with the candidate. Next, the candidate should be advised of the importance of the external letters and then asked to submit to the Department Head and the Departmental Committee chairperson (i) a list of at least five names for potential external reviewers (please note that the university P&T guidelines (II. G.) prohibits letters from reviewers that are too close to the candidate - for example, classmates, former colleagues, advisors, current research sponsors, or co-authors); (ii) a list of individuals who should not be contacted (iii) copies of 3-5 papers (representing the recent and most significant research published to date); and (iv) the candidate's dossier in the University format.

5. Managing Conflicts of Interest (COI):

Per VT Policy 13010: A faculty member may not serve on any committee that is evaluating a spouse, family member, or other individual with whom the faculty member has a close personal relationship.

Former Ph.D. Advisors and/or post-doc advisors of candidates must not chair the department or college committee nor participate in the department or college deliberations of these candidates. External letters should not be formally requested or received by these same individuals who are considered too close to the candidate.

Additional guidance about COI can be found the following links:

<https://www.research.vt.edu/conflict-of-interest/tips-managing-conflicts-interest-or-commitment>

<https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/forms/nsf1230p.pdf>

<https://www.nsf.gov/ehr/dge/COI-Form.pdf>

6. Academic reviewers are expected to be at peer institutions or other major research universities. If the best person to evaluate the work is not at a peer institution, an explanation should be provided by the departmental committee. Regardless of the reviewer's home institution, a brief biographical sketch should be provided in accordance with the provost's guidelines.
7. All letters of recommendation must be from outside Virginia Tech. While the majority of letters must be from academic institutions, letters may be solicited from industry or government personnel as well as university personnel. The individual's rank and the school, company or agency at which the letter writer is employed will greatly influence the strength of the recommendation.
8. All academic reviewers for candidates from associate to full professor should be from individuals at the rank of full professor or higher at peer institutions.
9. These materials will be provided no later than October 1 of the academic year in which the case is prepared for consideration by the College P&T Committee. These materials will be sent, along with the cover letter indicated below, to reviewers to aid in the

evaluation of the candidate's scholarly qualifications. No supplemental materials, including external letters, should be solicited after the dossier has been created and the Departmental P&T Committee has made formal its recommendation on a candidate.

10. The Department (via the departmental P&T committee or committees) will secure at least three reviewers whose names were independently identified by the Department P&T committee. Because of possible overlap between the Department's list and the candidate's list, the final list of names may possibly include more than two names suggested by the candidate. The candidate may not suggest all of the outside reviewers. The final list of outside reviewers must never be shared with the candidate.
11. All letters which are received will be included in the dossier of the faculty candidate under consideration.
12. The College suggests that the following letters be used to solicit external references. These recommendations need not be followed verbatim, but the substances of items (i) – (vi) should be included. Special cases (such as promotion from associate professor without tenure to associate professor with tenure) should be obvious by interpolation from the examples given.

For promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure:

[Date]

«Name»

«Address1»

«Address2»

«Address3»

«City»

Dear «Salutation»:

My department is considering «name1», currently an assistant professor, for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure, effective [Effective date]. At Virginia Tech, such promotion is contingent on the accomplishments, stature and promise of the individual as a researcher, teacher and scholar. External evaluations by leading experts in the candidate's field(s) of endeavor are an essential part of the decision-making process. It is in this connection that I am writing to ask you to act as a reference for «name2». I am requesting a signed letter on official letterhead in which you detail your assessment of the candidate. Please tell us how you know the candidate and what interactions you have had in the past. Virginia Tech's policy is that reviewers should not be former advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, or coauthors on recent publications, or have other relationships that may be perceived as being too close to the candidate. Please let us know if you have a conflict we have missed.

If you are able, it will be particularly helpful if your assessment includes:

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

In order to assist you in preparing your assessment I have enclosed the candidate's dossier and a set of publications.

The policy of Virginia Tech is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concern here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment, unless we are required specifically to do so by law.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

For promotion to full professor:

[Date]

«Name»

«Address1»

«Address2»

«Address3»

«City»

Dear «Salutation»:

My department is considering «name1», currently an associate professor, for promotion to the rank of professor, effective [Date]. At Virginia Tech, such promotion is contingent on the accomplishments, stature and promise of the individual as a researcher, teacher and scholar. External evaluations by leading experts in the candidate's field(s) of endeavor are an essential part of the decision-making process. It is in this connection that I am writing to ask you to act as a reference for «name2». I am requesting a signed letter on official letterhead in which you detail your assessment of the candidate. Please tell us how you know the candidate and what interactions you have had in the past. Virginia Tech's policy is that reviewers should not be former advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, or coauthors on recent publications, or have other relationships that may be perceived as being too close to the candidate. Please let us know if you have a conflict we have missed.

If you are able, it will be particularly helpful if your assessment includes:

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

In order to assist you in preparing your assessment I have enclosed the candidate's dossier and a set of publications.

The policy of Virginia Tech is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from persons outside the institution. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision of concern here will have access to your letter. It will not be provided to the person on whom you comment, unless we are required specifically to do so by law.

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

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

Yours sincerely,

- See II. G. 1. for the university mandated chart describing the letters.
- As indicated in II. G. 2. of the university procedures, after the table listing the letters received, be sure to include a 2-3 paragraph biographical sketch for each reviewer, and include the reason that the individual is uniquely qualified to provide an opinion.
- All letters received by the Department P&T Committee must be submitted. If either the Department or the College P&T Committee deems a letter to be irrelevant or non-responsive, it should explain why it believes this to be the case.
- Approximately two weeks after the request for a letter has been mailed, a follow-up telephone call should be placed emphasizing the importance of the letter to the nominee.
- Once the dossier has been sent to the external references, no substantive changes should be made to the dossier with the exception of the inclusion of the relevant letters, brief bios, and updating of the coversheet. (Minor editorial corrections are permissible.) Candidates are responsible for providing the Departmental P&T Committee Chair and the Department Head with a summary of any significant changes/accomplishments which occur after the dossier preparation.

Student Evaluations

Section IV.J. of the dossier calls for information on student evaluations. An example of how the SPOT information should be presented is included on Attachment B of this document. Please note that the College P&T Committee expects to see grade distributions within the courses as well.

Peer Evaluations

Section IV.K. of the dossier calls for peer evaluations of instruction. Any peer review conducted since the candidate's last P&T review should be included in the dossier.

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

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

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

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

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

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

To assist the committee in its deliberations, a summary table should be provided. An example of such a table is given in Attachment C.

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

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

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

Service Prior to Appointment at Virginia Tech

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

ATTACHMENT A (include in I.)

Accomplishments (since last promotion)

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

Publications (since last promotion)

	Lead Author	Co-author	Co-editor	Total
Books	1		1	2
Book chapters	2			2
Papers in referred journals	7	5		12
Conference proceedings	4	4		8
Other papers and reports		3		3
Total	14	12	1	27

ATTACHMENT B (include in IV.)

B. Chronological list of courses taught since appointment to Virginia Tech

Semester	Course	Course Name	Credit Hours	Course Enrollment	Percent Responsible
Sp 2011	ME 3304	Heat & Mass Transfer	3	63	100
Fa 2012	ME 4006	ME Lab II	3	250	50 ¹
Fa 2012	ME 2124	Intro Thermal Fluid	2	76	100
Sp 2013	ME 5104	Thermo Dynamics	3	18	100

¹Co-taught with Prof. X

J. Student evaluations of instruction

(Comment: Use this table for courses taught Fall 2011 and later)

(Comment: Use 2 decimal points for the average rating)

(Comment: Averages are not weighted, by course level, nor by the number of responses)

Semester	Course Number	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses	Total Enrollment	Average Rating on a 6-Point Scale
Fa 2012	ME 4006	50	45	30	22	10	8	165	250	4.48
Fa 2012	ME 2124	22	34	13	3	0	0	72	76	5.04
Sp 2013	ME 5104	12	6	0	0	0	0	18	18	5.67
Average All Courses										5.06
Average Under-graduate courses										4.76

College SPOT Survey Summary

(Comment: Use information for the most recent academic year available from <http://www.eng.vt.edu/faculty-staff/pt>)

Mean Response of all College of Engineering Courses
(averages are not weighted, by course level, nor by the number of responses)
Fall Semester 2014

Course Level	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000
No. of Respondents	1638	2365	2359	1888	1350	107
Overall Rating	4.66	4.74	4.78	4.72	5.13	5.44

Mean Response of all College of Engineering Courses
(averages are not weighted, by course level, nor by the number of responses)
Spring Semester 2015

Course Level	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000
No. of Respondents	1260	2014	2338	1977	1206	103
Overall Rating	4.62	4.83	4.81	5.05	5.09	5.61

(Comment: Use this table for courses taught before Fall 2011; remove if not applicable)
(Comment: Use 2 decimal points for the average rating)

Semester	Course	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total Responses	Total Enrollment	Average Rating on a 4-Point Scale
Sp 2011	ME 3304	35	7	0	0	42	52	3.83
Average All Courses								3.83
Average Under-graduate courses								3.83

College Survey Summary

(Comment: This information is from the most recent academic year of the 4.0 scale and should remain static until it is no longer needed)

Mean Response of all College of Engineering Courses
(averages are not weighted, by course level, nor by the number of responses)

Fall Semester 2010

Course Level	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000
Total Respondents	1368	3747	3815	3739	2135
Overall Rating	3.23	3.29	3.36	3.42	3.53

Mean Response of all College of Engineering Courses
(averages are not weighted, by course level, nor by the number of responses)

Spring Semester 2011

Course Level	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000
Total Respondents	4375	4087	4905	4769	2545
Overall Rating	3.08	3.26	3.17	3.26	3.38

Grade Distributions for Courses Taught Since Appointment to Virginia Tech

Semester	Course	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	Avg
Sp 2011	ME 3304	7	5	8	5	7	4	4	4	2	2	3	1	2.64

ATTACHMENT C (include in V.C. before detailed description)

C. Sponsored research and other grant awards

Summary of Research Funding:

Funding Category	Total	Candidate's Portion
Category I (External)		
Category II (Internal/External)		
Category III (Internal)		
Total Funded Research		

Category I - External Funding

Category II – Internal/External

Category III - Internal Funding