

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENTS, RENEWALS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE IN THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Fall 2011

The Faculty Manual of Vanderbilt University sets forth standards of performance and procedures for faculty appointments, renewals, promotions and the award of tenure by the University. It is authoritative. This document supplements the Faculty Manual by providing details regarding the procedures used in the School of Engineering.

Endorsed by a vote of the Faculty of the School of Engineering on November 10, 2011

I. Tenure-Track and Tenured Positions

A. Titles and Terms of Tenure

The titles Instructor and Assistant Professor designate non-tenured positions that are normally in the tenure track. Service in these positions is counted as part of the probationary period leading to tenure. Faculty candidates who have not held tenure-track positions prior to joining the School usually are appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor, provided that they hold the doctoral degree. Faculty candidates who are in the process of completing their Ph.D. degree are normally appointed to the rank of Instructor.

The title Associate Professor normally signifies a tenured position unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment to that rank. Initial appointment to the position of Associate Professor without tenure is possible, but promotion to the rank of Associate Professor carries tenure. The title Professor normally signifies a tenured position.

B. Procedures for Initial Appointments

Standards of Performance

Candidates recruited to positions at the rank of Assistant Professor or Instructor are evaluated on the basis of their potential as researchers and teachers. There must be definitive evidence of capacity for excellent scholarship.

External candidates for tenured positions must meet the same standards as those required of faculty promoted to such positions from within the University, i.e., excellence in research, a high level of effectiveness in teaching, and satisfactory service. These standards are set out in the Faculty Manual and are elaborated later in this document. A person appointed at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure must show substantial promise of meeting the criteria for tenure within the term of the initial appointment.

Search Committees

The Dean appoints search committees in each of the departments in which faculty members are sought. Search committees, adhering to the relevant Federal statutes and to the Affirmative Action Plan detailed in the Faculty Manual, advertise vacant positions, interview candidates, read scholarly works of the candidates, and evaluate the candidates' references. Using such information, a search committee ranks candidates and invites qualified candidates to visit the campus to present seminars to the faculty and to meet with various faculty members within the Department and with members of the administration, as appropriate.

Candidate Files

The file of a candidate for an initial appointment to the faculty of the School of Engineering shall contain all material as directed by the Provost.

Offer of Appointments

After collecting comments of faculty members who have met the candidate during the campus visit and evaluating the candidate's promise as a researcher, teacher and colleague, a search committee may recommend to the Chair the appointment of the candidate to a faculty position. The Chair will then seek the concurrence of the voting members in the Department, as specified in the Faculty Manual. Those voting for the Department are faculty, with primary appointments in the originating Department, of rank equal to or greater than that of the offer in question. A majority vote is required, defined in terms of the departmental roster. For offers at the Professor level, a second vote to award tenure must be made by the tenured faculty. The details of the concurrence shall be discussed in a memorandum of recommendation prepared by the Chair for the Dean.

After the Dean and the Chair agree on the appointee and the conditions of the appointment, the Dean will seek the approval of the Provost. The Dean, following the Provost's approval, sends the official offer letter to the candidate.

C. Actions Regarding Renewal of Faculty Appointments Prior to Tenure

1. All tenure-track faculty normally receive an initial appointment of three years, normally followed by appointments of two and then three years, assuming that their records support additional appointments. This 3-2-3 scheme would normally lead to reappointment reviews in the candidates' second and fourth years, and a tenure review in the candidates' seventh year. Candidates may be considered for tenure earlier if merited by their accomplishments and promise.
2. Tenure-track faculty members will be recommended for reappointment only if their performance provides a reasonable basis on which to project continued progress that could ultimately enable them to qualify for tenure. More evidence is needed with continued time in rank. However, some degree of evidence is needed at each renewal period.
3. Candidates who receive reappointments at the second- and fourth-year renewal periods will also receive detailed counseling from their Chairs on the strengths and weaknesses of their performance and promise. This counseling will be in both written and oral forms. The specific evaluation and recommendations made in the counseling sessions will be agreed in advance of the session by the Dean and Department Chair. The written record of the counseling sessions must be included in each candidate's file. All tenure-track faculty will receive feedback about their performance. Most often, additional feedback is self-evident to the candidates and may consist of course evaluations, actions by journal or book editors, funding decisions on grant applications, and so forth.
4. The Chair will appoint a department review committee from the tenured faculty to evaluate the candidate's performance and promise for future success. The review committee will provide a written evaluation and recommendation. The quality of the candidate's scholarship will be evaluated through a critical reading by the departmental review committee of scholarly works authored or co-authored by the candidate over the most recent review period. The Chair will convene a meeting of all the tenured faculty. A summary or minutes of the meeting will be recorded to include the names of all present and absent at the

meeting at which the vote was held, the vote tally, and the minutes of that meeting. The report should reflect the full range of views expressed by those faculty eligible to vote. The Chair will report the vote of all the tenured faculty in the Department and will make a recommendation to the Dean.

5. The Dean will review carefully all recommendations he or she receives for reappointment from the Chairs. If the Dean concurs with the recommendation to reappoint a tenure-track faculty member, the recommendation, along with all supporting documents, will be sent to the Provost for final approval. The file will contain, at a minimum, (1) a copy of the candidate's vita, (2) an evaluation of the candidate's teaching, including all relevant course evaluation summaries and student comments, (3) an evaluation of the candidate's research accomplishments and promise by the departmental review committee, the Chair, and the Dean; (4) an evaluation of the candidate's service, and (5) a copy of the written record of any formal counseling session(s) with the candidate. In addition, recommendations for a second reappointment (normally at the end of the fourth-year review) will include a specific statement of the candidate's performance between the second- and fourth-year reviews, evaluating this performance both from an absolute perspective and in light of the specific counseling given at the second-year review and at other relevant points.

Junior Faculty Mentoring

It is important that junior faculty have access to the advice of senior colleagues on issues directly relevant to their academic progress. In many, if not most cases, this advice is adequately provided through informal channels or through the formal second- and fourth-year reviews. In some cases, however, junior faculty may voluntarily request additional help in establishing a mentoring relationship or the Chair may suggest such additional help. If the individual requests specific mentoring, the Chair is responsible for establishing such a mentoring relationship. The Chair should assure that the advice received is informed, fair, cautious, and helpful.

Each tenure-track faculty member will receive upon appointment a copy of the University and School guidelines for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The University guidelines are contained in the Faculty Manual. The School of Engineering guidelines are contained in this document.

The Dean is responsible for evaluating the mentoring activities of the School and making an annual report on junior faculty mentoring to the Provost.

Recommended Schedule for Faculty Evaluation for Renewal (see also Appendix A)

The following events comprise the evaluation cycle (the exact deadlines will be announced each year). Dates in parentheses refer to faculty originally appointed at the start of the spring semester:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| May 1 | Notification of the Department by letter from the Dean to the Chair of the names of candidates who must be considered for renewal to a term position in the next academic year |
| May 15 | Chair notification of the candidate(s) by written memo with the present document as an attachment |
| January 1 - 31
(August 1 – 31) | Candidates prepare dossiers per this document format |

February 1 - March 15
(September 1 – October 15)

Departmental reviews conducted
Departmental eligible faculty voting completed
Chair writes administrative letter on the candidate to the Dean
Dossier forwarded to the Dean

March 16 - April 15
(October 16 – November 15)

Dean reviews all dossiers
Dean prepares recommendations to the Provost for all positive recommendations
Dean notifies Chairs, who then notify faculty of negative recommendations

April 15 (November 15)

Dossiers due in the Provost's Office

June 1 (January 1)

Written notification of renewal or non-renewal is normally due to faculty who have appointments exceeding one year

D. Procedures for Awarding Tenure

Standards of Performance

Promotions are based solely on merit and not upon seniority or length of service. A person shall attain promotion as rapidly as merited. Consideration for promotion should allow for the recognition of exceptional productivity and unusual achievement, but nominations leading to a tenure review before a candidate's seventh year require justification by the Department in the tenure dossier. There shall be no age restriction on the various ranks.

For the award of tenure, the School of Engineering requires (a) excellence in research, (b) a high level of effectiveness in teaching, and (c) a satisfactory record of service to the profession of engineering and to the University.

1. Research Excellence

The principal measure of excellence is a significant and sustained record of high-quality, scholarly research. Candidates for tenure are expected to demonstrate an independent record of scholarly research based primarily on their own work and that of graduate students they supervise. The most important specific evidence of sustained scholarly research accomplishment is a record of publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed, archival journals. Publication of abstracts and non-reviewed conference proceedings provides evidence of appropriate and desirable exposure of the candidate's work, but in the tenure review process such publications are not as important as refereed journal articles. In some disciplines within the School, papers published in certain conference proceedings undergo a rigorous process of selection, peer review, and subsequent revision. Such publications may be comparable to refereed journal articles, and should be clearly documented and identified as such.

Although a precise number of journal articles appropriate for promotion to tenure is not to be specified, a typical candidate for tenure will have published a significant volume of work in reviewed journal articles. The quality of the work will be judged by the reputation of the journals,

by the written opinions of external evaluators, and by Vanderbilt faculty members who will read the papers.

The School of Engineering normally expects its faculty to generate externally funded research to support scholarly investigations, graduate students, and other professional activities. Therefore, additional appropriate evidence of excellence in research may be shown by a consistent record of success in generating external funding. In some cases, this additional supporting evidence may include success in generating collaborative funded research, if it is clear that the candidate has had a significant role in developing the funding, designing and performing his or her portion of the research, and reporting the results. When working in a collaborative environment, the candidate's individual contributions should be substantial and documented.

2. Teaching Effectiveness

Evidence of highly effective teaching is supported by a chronological compilation of anonymous student ratings in regularly taught classes. Additional supporting evidence may include teaching awards, design of new courses and curricula, peer reviews of classroom teaching and curricular materials, and publication of textbooks. The candidate should also show evidence of a high degree of effectiveness in educating graduate students through graduate classroom instruction, student projects and research.

3. Service to the Profession

A candidate for tenure will have demonstrated a satisfactory level of service to the profession, including activities such as chairing conference sessions, serving on external professional committees, and reviewing journal papers and federal agency proposals. These activities should indicate that the candidate is prepared to assume a leadership role in the profession. In addition, the candidate should have carried out his or her service activities within the University with professional dedication and effectiveness. These activities may include service on appropriate committees in the Department, School, or University, and advising student organizations.

Review Committee Responsibilities

The examples presented herein should not be considered definitive of a successful promotion dossier. The attainment of tenure is not contingent upon a specific number of publications or a particular rating of classroom teaching. It is based upon the judgment of faculty colleagues and administrators and is awarded to those who show clear evidence of excellent scholarship, highly effective teaching, and satisfactory service and whose dossiers demonstrate the likelihood of continuing productivity and improvement.

The most detailed consideration in any recommendation for promotion or tenure should be a comprehensive evaluation by the appropriate faculty of the candidate's department. Therefore, the Chair, with the advice of his/her tenured faculty, will form a departmental review committee by September 1 to facilitate the promotion and tenure process. In cases where the candidate's teaching and/or research transcends the department of primary appointment, persons from other departments may be asked to serve on the review committee. The departmental review committee is directly responsible for working with the candidate to assemble the evidence in the tenure case and for submitting a written report on its findings to the tenured faculty of the Department.

This evaluation shall include a detailed review of the candidate's scholarly works, teaching record, external letters of review, and other available evidence pertinent to the above stated criteria. For those candidates engaged in multi-disciplinary work that crosses over departmental boundaries,

evaluations shall also be sought from the secondary department, center, or other administrative body responsible for the research. The departmental review committee is expected to assign appropriate members to critically review and assess the impact of the candidate's scholarly publications, funded research, and graduate student productivity. The combined works shall be reviewed for their intrinsic quality and relation to the mission of the department or research center in which the work is being accomplished. The quality of the archival journals and the impact for the publications are to be assessed. The quality of the candidate's scholarship will be evaluated through a critical reading by the departmental review committee of scholarly works authored or co-authored by the candidate. The scholarly quality of the research is to be assessed in terms of its engineering or scientific challenge, opportunity for impact, and dissemination of the research findings.

The departmental review committee is also to provide an evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness that is broader than the student evaluation forms. The review may include data and evaluations of the candidate's teaching based on valid classroom observations, appropriateness of materials such as written material, laboratory manuals, web-based support material, and other teaching tools and supplements. Student achievements, presentations, awards, and other evidence tied to the candidate's role in educating and developing students may be considered. Finally, such material as textbooks, web-based educational products, research on learning and teaching, and other evidence of teaching excellence is to be considered by this committee.

Departmental Action

All voting members of the faculty are to be given a report by the departmental review committee and a chance to participate in a discussion of the findings with that committee. The eligible faculty are to meet to discuss and vote on each case. Minutes or a summary of the discussion and the vote are to be recorded. The minutes (or summary) and the voting tally must be made available to all who were eligible to participate in the meeting and are to be included in the dossier. In general, the full range of views about the candidate as expressed by those eligible to vote should be contained in the report.

All tenured faculty with primary appointments in the Department are eligible to vote on promotion to and tenure decisions for the position of Associate Professor. All Professors¹ are eligible to vote on promotion to the position of Professor in the Department. The Chair will record and report the voting in all such cases. The record of the voting is to be reported by the Chair as part of the promotion and tenure dossier, normally in the letter from the Chair to the Dean containing the Chair's recommendation and evaluation. The Chairs will furnish formal recommendations for all candidates together with dossiers of supporting documents to the Dean's Office. The principal responsibility for presenting the case for evaluation rests with the Chair.

All voting shall be in accordance with rules established by the Department. The ballot is secret if any eligible member of the faculty so requests. Thus, such rules should include the nature of votes to be cast and whether faculty not present may vote. For example, the chair could open the meeting with a request that all ballots be secret. Only those eligible members of the faculty participating in the discussions shall be entitled to vote. Special arrangements for voice or video conferencing with eligible faculty on leave should be made whenever practical. The faculty recommendation is based

¹ Professor, as referred to herein, has in the past been called Full Professor, as distinct from Assistant Professor and Associate Professor.

on a simple majority based on the department roster. The Chair participates fully in the discussion and the voting.

School Consultative Committee on Promotion and Tenure

This committee serves as a consultative body on faculty evaluation to the Dean. All dossiers associated with promotions and award of tenure submitted by Chairs will be reviewed by the committee. Recommendations in each case will be communicated in writing to the Dean at the conclusion of deliberations. These deliberations are strictly confidential; consequently, no one other than the Dean shall communicate with the committee.

The committee and its chair are appointed by the Dean. The appointed professors must have full-time appointments in the school and must not hold administrative appointments. Terms will be staggered so that the committee has a reasonable level of continuity from year to year. Appointments to this Consultative Committee are made public by October 1. The nominal term of appointment is three years.

Recommended Schedule for Faculty Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure (see also Appendix A)

The following events comprise the evaluation cycle (the exact deadlines will be announced each year. Dates in parentheses refer to faculty originally appointed at the start of the spring semester

May 1	Notification of the Department by letter from the Dean to the Chair of the names of candidates who must be considered for promotion to a tenured position in the next academic year This is also an appropriate time for tenured departmental faculty to take preliminary votes regarding early promotion to Associate Professor and promotion of individuals from Associate Professor to Professor. The initiative for such promotions is within the Department
May 15	Chair notification of the candidate(s) by written memo with the present document as an attachment
May 15 – August 31 (May 15 - July 30)	Candidates prepare dossiers per this document format Chair consults Dean for approval of external reviewers Chair solicits and receives external letters on candidates
September 1 – November 15 (August 1 - August 31)	Departmental reviews conducted Departmental eligible faculty voting completed Chair writes administrative letter on the candidate to the Dean Dossier and recommendations forwarded to the Dean
September 1	Dean's Consultative Committee appointed

November 15 – December 31 (September 1 - September 15)	Dean’s Consultative Committee reviews all submitted dossiers Dean’s Consultative Committee provides dossier assessments to the Dean
December 1 – January 31 (September 1 - September 30)	Dean reviews all dossiers Dean prepares recommendations to the Provost for all positive recommendations Dean notifies Chairs, who then notify faculty of negative recommendations
January 10	Two-thirds of dossiers due in the Provost’s Office
February 1 (October 1)	Balance of dossiers due in the Provost’s office
March 1 (November 1)	Written notification of renewal or non-renewal is due to academic-year faculty on one-year appointments
June 1 (January 1)	Written notification of renewal or non-renewal is normally due to faculty who have appointments exceeding one year, in the year preceding the candidate’s final year
Appeals	All policies, procedures, and timing regarding appeals are contained in the Faculty Manual

Contents of the Tenure Dossier

The format of the tenure dossier is standardized and will include the following items in the indicated order. The official requirements for the dossier are specified by the Provost.

1. Cover sheet with Table of Contents for the dossier. The dossier will normally have tabbed markers for each major section and each tab will be clearly annotated.
2. Memo of transmittal/recommendation from the Dean to the Provost.
3. Memo of transmittal/recommendation from the Chair to the Dean. Any correspondence between the Chair and the Dean is to be included in this section.
4. Recommendation of the tenured faculty that includes:
 - (a) a report of the departmental committee evaluation of the candidate's research, teaching and service accomplishments and prospects. The report should be detailed, comprehensive, and rigorous as an assessment of both the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching and research of the candidate. The assessment should relate explicitly the candidate’s accomplishments to Vanderbilt’s standards and justify consideration prior to the seventh year, if applicable. The quality of the candidate’s scholarship will be evaluated through a critical reading by the departmental review committee of scholarly works authored or co-authored by the candidate. It should also include an analysis of the candidate’s contributions to jointly authored publications, multiple investigator research projects, and team-taught courses including appropriate input from research colleagues or team members.

- (b) a summary report or minutes of the meeting of the Department's tenured faculty in which the recommendation regarding tenure was made. This report is to include the names of all present and absent at the meeting at which the vote was held, the vote tally, and the minutes of that meeting. The report should reflect the full range of views expressed by those faculty eligible to vote.

Both reports are to be made available to the tenured faculty and any faculty comments on the two reports are to be included herein. There are to be no other letters or administrative contacts made in regard to a candidate other than in this manner. See the Faculty Manual on ex parte letters for background.

5. A statement of any expectations for the nature of the candidate's research and scholarship that differ from those that normally apply in the candidate's department and that are part of an agreement reached with the candidate, either at the time of the initial appointment or subsequently.
6. The candidate's curriculum vitae. The curriculum vitae format is not specified. However, specific additions to the normal CV are required for the dossier. The CV should be dated, and scholarly work should be presented in clearly labeled categories such as: books, book chapters, articles in refereed journals, articles in conference proceedings, book reviews, working papers, and invited presentations. The full citation (including beginning and ending page numbers in book chapters, journal articles, and proceedings) to published works must be provided. Indicate all authors in the order that the names appear in the article. Highlight the candidate's name in all publication citations. Add a discussion of the candidate's role following each citation, including an estimated percentage contribution. Clearly identify the graduate student authors.

List all proposals submitted as a researcher, with requested or funded budget totals. Indicate the names of the principal investigator and all collaborators for each proposal. State the candidate's offset and matching percentages for each proposal. Clearly indicate the status of each proposal as rejected, funded, or pending. Show the submission date for each proposal and the period of performance for all funded proposals. List graduate and undergraduate student support proposals such as NASA GSRPs or training grants separately from other research proposals. List equipment grants separately from other research proposals. Indicate all proposals submitted as SBIRs or STTRs separately from other research proposals (cite the outside business with which the proposal was submitted).

Include the names, dates, and research thesis or dissertation titles for all graduate students. Clearly indicate the status of each by graduation date actual or anticipated.

List all courses taught by term, subject, enrollment, and whether or not the course is required.

7. An analysis, prepared by the candidate, of the candidate's contributions in developing and writing proposals on which there are multiple investigators and to any group teaching.
8. Numerical course ratings, together with averages and other descriptive statistics for all courses the candidate has taught. The course ratings are to be summarized in the key evaluation categories using a bar chart type of format for ease of interpretation for each course showing all years of data. Appropriate departmental and school averages and other statistical measures should be provided for comparison. Written student course-evaluation

comments are to be included in the dossier. The written student course-evaluations should be re-typed by the Department in compact form, with one row per student. Copies of the original student-written comments must be maintained by the Department so that they are available for review at later stages in the process.

9. The candidate's statements on research accomplishments and plans, teaching, and service to the profession and to the University. The content and organization are at the discretion of the candidate, but the following topics are appropriate: description of the main themes of the candidate's research, a discussion of the linkages between various projects, and an indication of future plans. Similarly, a description of the candidate's teaching philosophy and objectives, including past and planned course and curriculum development, is often instructive.
10. External reviews. The School of Engineering requires that the candidate submit a written list of from three to six suggested reviewers within two weeks of being notified to prepare his or her dossier. The Chair, in consultation with the eligible review faculty in the Department, shall supplement the candidate's list with an equal or greater number of highly qualified and distinguished external faculty. The final list will be a subset of the submitted list from the candidate and the suggestions of the faculty.

The chair will submit in advance to the Dean for comment and concurrence the Department's list of potential external reviewers and the rationale for their choice. Reviewers should be leading scholars in the field and normally will hold the rank of Professor. They will ordinarily be selected from distinguished universities or other institutions with exemplary programs or faculty in the relevant field, preferably from those that rank among the top twenty-five in the discipline. If exceptions to this guideline are proposed, they should be justified in the initial proposal to the Dean. The list of external reviewers to be approached must be agreed in advance by the Dean and the Department.

The selection of the external reviewers is one of the more important elements in obtaining the data necessary to judge the candidate's research impact and professional standing. Therefore, external reviewers are to be selected who are most able to provide objective comments on the candidate. Both the candidate and the Chair must keep this central requirement in mind when recommending and selecting external reviewers. The Chair is to provide the rationale for selecting each invited external reviewer and to document his/her credibility by discussion of the professional standing of the external reviewer. This documentation is to be included in the candidate's dossier.

It is the Department's responsibility to prepare a complete dossier for the candidate. At least six external letters should be included in the dossier prior to the time when the Department makes its formal decision.

The candidate is to prepare his or her CV and attach reprints of principal research journal publications for use in soliciting external reviews. The package containing the CV and attachments is to be completed by the candidate as expeditiously as possible. The Chair shall contact the potential external reviewers during this same time period. As soon as the candidate package is complete, the package and the formal letter of request for review will be mailed by the Chair to each external reviewer.

The following materials should be included in the external reviews section of the dossier:

- (a) a sample letter sent to potential reviewers (see Appendix B);
- (b) a list of no more than six reviewers suggested by the candidate;
- (c) a list of reviewers suggested by tenured members of the Department;
- (d) a list of all reviewers from whom the Department requested evaluations;
- (e) biographical information about the reviewers;
- (f) all external evaluation letters which were received, at least three of which must be from the candidate's list and at least three, and preferably more, of which must be from the Department's list;
- (g) any correspondence with actual or potential reviewers and reports/summaries of telephone conversations between tenured faculty members/Chair and any reviewers.

The Chair is responsible for collecting and documenting the various lists of reviewers.

11. Previous dated curriculum vitae used for the two-year and four-year reviews and counseling information prepared as a result of those reviews.
12. All correspondence between the Department and the candidate regarding the tenure process.
13. Other material, including reprints of principal journal publications.

All dossiers received prior to the announced deadline will be submitted to the School's Consultative Committee on Promotion and Tenure for review. After receiving the committee's report, the Dean will make a decision on the appropriate action to be taken in accordance with established procedures set forth in the Faculty Manual.

E. Procedure for Promotion to Professor

Promotions are based solely on merit and not upon seniority or length of service. A person shall attain promotion as rapidly as merited. Consideration for promotion should allow for the recognition of exceptional productivity and unusual achievement. There shall be no age restriction on the various ranks.

The Standards of Performance discussion in Section I.D of this document contains the appropriate language regarding the evaluation elements for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. The University criteria are spelled out in the Faculty Manual. In all cases, promotion to Professor requires that the individual demonstrate through his/her dossier and external letters that the candidate has achieved a high level of national or international standing in his/her areas of research. Also, the record of scholarly publications is expected to continue to be highly productive. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated a consistent record of graduate student production at both the Master and Ph.D. levels. In engineering, additional evidence of qualification for promotion to Professor is appropriate in terms of a continuing record of sponsored research including collaborative research projects. The candidate is expected to give evidence of leadership in the program, the School, and the profession.

A departmental review committee will be formed and will be composed of all Professors in the Department. Professors from other departments may be asked to participate if the Department does not have a reasonable number to serve as a review committee, in the judgment of the Chair.

F. Distinguished Professorships and Chairs

Appointments and promotions to Distinguished Professorships and Chaired Professorships are made by the Dean with the advice of the Chair and the recommendation of all tenured and tenure-track faculty of the appropriate department. Qualifications for these positions are given in the Faculty Manual.

G. Basis for Non-Renewals and Non-Promotions

The excellence of the School of Engineering and the rights of individuals require that, in the matters of appointments, renewal, promotion, and tenure, members and prospective members of the faculty be judged solely on the basis of recognized academic criteria and standards that pertain to professional qualifications and conduct, and be judged by fair and established procedures.

Recommendations for non-renewal or non-promotion must meet the following tests.

1. They must not violate the constitutional rights of faculty members, nor prevent the exercise of those rights;
2. they must not violate the academic freedom of faculty members, nor prevent the exercise of that freedom in either the University or the larger society;
3. they must represent the deliberate exercise of professional judgment; and
4. they must not be arbitrary or capricious.

Permissible reasons for non-renewal or non-promotion include the following (any other reasons must be similar):

1. The candidate's failure to meet the School's stated standards of performance for reappointment or promotion; and
2. termination of the position because of financial exigency or a major change in the academic program. In each case of this type, the decision to terminate the position must be justified by the Department or the Dean on grounds independent of the individual candidate's qualifications.

The candidates who are not renewed or promoted are to be notified in writing, following the procedures given in the Faculty Manual.

II. Non-Tenure-Track Positions

A. Titles

Eligible titles for non-tenure-track positions are detailed in the Faculty Manual. In the School of Engineering, the following titles may be used:

1. Lecturer or Senior Lecturer.
2. X of the Practice of Engineering (or other appropriate area), where X stands for "Assistant Professor," "Associate Professor," or "Professor."
3. Adjunct X.
4. Visiting X.
5. Research X.

B. Procedures for Appointment, Renewal, and Promotion

The procedures for initial term appointments and standards and procedures for their renewal are indicated in the Faculty Manual. Appointments of non-tenure-track faculty members are made by the Dean, on the advice of a Chair, often upon recommendation of a sponsoring faculty member. Non-tenure-track appointments, whether full-time or part-time, are reviewed each year by the appropriate Chair. That review may or may not lead to renewal. Renewals are made by the Dean with the advice of a Chair, often upon recommendation of a faculty member.

B.1 Research Titles

Persons holding Research titles are expected to conduct research, generate externally funded research to support research programs, publish, and supervise graduate students.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor will prepare a dossier with the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member. This dossier will document the impact the candidate has on his/her field of activity. It will contain the following

1. A research statement written by the candidate in which contributions to the field are documented,
2. A complete curriculum vitae prepared in the format used for tenure-track dossiers, including full details on research proposals, awards, and support,
3. A letter of endorsement written by the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member.

The dossier will be presented by the Chair to the tenured department faculty holding the title of Associate Professor or Professor who will vote on it. The Chair will report the vote of the faculty to the Dean and will make a recommendation for promotion. The Dean will review the dossier and make the final decision.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Research Professor will prepare a dossier with the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member. This dossier will be similar to the dossier required for promotion to the rank of Research Associate Professor, except that it will also include a minimum of three letters of recommendation written by prominent members in the candidate's area of expertise, at least two of whom are affiliated with academic institutions. Reviewers will be selected by the Chair or the sponsoring faculty member in consultation with the candidate. Letters will be solicited by the Chair.

Once it is assembled, the dossier will be presented by the Chair to the tenured department faculty holding the title of Professor who will vote on it. The chair will report the vote of the faculty to the Dean and will make a recommendation for promotion. The Dean will review the dossier and make the final decision.

B.2 Other Titles

B.2.1 Practice of Engineering Titles

Persons holding Practice of Engineering titles will be evaluated by criteria consistent with standards outlined at the time of hire. These factors may include, but are not limited to (a) instruction and student advisement, (b) program development, and (c) contributions to the field. Specific weighting of factors will be indicated at the time of appointment and appointees will be advised if changes are made in the criteria or the approximate weights given them during the term of appointment.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice of Engineering will prepare a dossier with the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member. The dossier will document the contribution and impact of the faculty in the areas specified in the letter of appointment, with appropriate weighting.

The dossier will contain the following

1. A statement written by the candidate in which contributions to areas specified in the letter of appointment are detailed,
2. A complete curriculum vitae prepared in the format used for tenure-track dossiers. Specific information to be included in the dossier will depend on the candidate's area of professional activity. In all cases it should clearly document the candidate's contributions,
3. A letter of endorsement written by the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member.

The dossier will be presented by the Chair to the tenured department faculty holding the title of Associate Professor or Professor, who will vote on it. The Chair will report the vote of the faculty to the Dean and will make a recommendation for promotion. The Dean will review the dossier and make the final decision.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor of the Practice of Engineering will prepare a dossier with the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member. This dossier will be similar to the dossier required for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice of Engineering. A higher level of accomplishment is required for promotion to Professor of the Practice of Engineering than that required for Associate Professor of the Practice of Engineering. The dossier will be presented by the chair to tenured departmental faculty holding the rank of Professor, who will vote on it. The Chair will report the vote of the faculty to the Dean and make a recommendation for promotion. The Dean will review the dossier and make the final decision.

B.2.2 Lecturers

Persons holding the title of Lecturer will be evaluated by criteria consistent with standards outlined at the time of hire. These factors may include, but are not limited to (a) instruction and student advisement, and (b) program development. Specific weighting of factors will be indicated at the time of appointment and appointees will be advised if changes are made in the criteria or the approximate weights given them during the term of appointment. It is considered that this appointment will be for persons specifically involved in classroom or laboratory instruction.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer of Engineering will prepare a dossier with the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member. The dossier will document the

contribution and impact of the faculty in the areas specified in the letter of appointment, with appropriate weighting.

The dossier will contain the following

1. A statement written by the candidate in which contributions to areas specified in the letter of appointment are detailed,
2. A complete curriculum vitae prepared in the format used for tenure-track dossiers. Specific information to be included in the dossier will depend on the candidate's area of professional activity. In all cases it should clearly document the candidate's contributions,
3. A letter of endorsement written by the Chair of their Department or a sponsoring faculty member.

The dossier will be presented by the Chair to the tenured department faculty holding the title of Associate Professor or Professor, who will vote on it. The Chair will report the vote of the faculty to the Dean and will make a recommendation for promotion. The Dean will review the dossier and make the final decision.

C. Schedule for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion

The promotion process can be initiated at any time the Chair and the candidate deem appropriate.

Appendix A: Recommended Schedule for VUSE Renewal, Promotion and Tenure

1. Dean

May 1

Notify departments of tenure-track and non-tenure-track candidates who must be considered for renewal or promotion and tenure the next academic year.

September 1

Appoint Consultative Committee.

September 1 - 30

Review dossiers of tenure-track candidates, initially appointed in spring semester, for promotion and tenure and write Provost. Dossiers must be in Provost's Office by October 1. Notify Chair if decision negative.

October 16 – November 15

Review dossiers of tenure-track candidates, initially appointed in spring semester, for renewal and write Provost. Notify Chair if decision negative.

December 1 - January 31

Review dossiers of tenure-track candidates for promotion and tenure and write Provost. Two-thirds of dossiers must be in Provost's Office by January 10. Notify Chair if decision negative.

February 1 - 28

Review dossiers of non-tenure-track candidates for renewal and write Provost. Notify Chair if decision negative.

March 15 - April 15

Review dossiers of tenure-track candidates, initially appointed in fall semester, for renewal and write Provost. Notify Chair if decision negative.

Review dossiers of non-tenure-track research faculty candidates for promotion and write Provost. Notify Chair if decision negative.

2. Department Chair

February 1 - March 15

Appoint departmental review committees for renewal of tenure-track candidates with initial appointments in the fall semester. Convene departmental faculty meetings for these candidates. Sent letters and dossiers to Dean.

April 15

Consult tenure-track/tenured faculty in department that are potential candidates for early promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor and research faculty that are potential candidates for promotion.

May 1

Convene department faculty meetings for preliminary votes on early promotion of tenure-track faculty to Associate Professor, on promotion of tenured faculty to Professor, and on research faculty promotions.

May 15

Notify all candidates, including those identified by the Dean's Office.

May 15 - July 31

Consult Dean for approval of external reviewers for tenured/tenure-track faculty initially appointed in spring semester; solicit and receive external letters on tenured/tenure-track candidates initially appointed in spring semester.

May 15 - August 31

Consult Dean for approval of external reviewers for tenured/tenure-track faculty; solicit and receive external letters on tenured/tenure-track candidates.

August 1 - 31

Appoint departmental review committees for promotion (and tenure) of tenured/tenure-track candidates initially appointed in spring semester. Convene departmental faculty meetings for these candidates. Send letters and dossiers to Dean.

September 1 - November 15

Appoint departmental review committees for promotion (and tenure) of tenured/tenure-track candidates. Convene departmental faculty meetings for these candidates. Send letters and dossiers to Dean.

September 1 – October 15

Appoint departmental review committees for renewal of tenure-track candidates with initial appointments in the spring semester. Convene departmental faculty meetings for these candidates. Send letters and dossiers to Dean.

November 15 - January 31

Appoint departmental review committees for renewal of non-tenure-track candidates. Convene departmental faculty meetings for these candidates. Send letters and dossiers to Dean.

Appoint departmental review committees for promotion of non-tenure-track research faculty. Convene departmental faculty meetings for these candidates. Send letters and dossiers to Dean.

3. Consultative Committee

September 1 - 15

Review tenured/tenure-track dossiers of candidates initially appointed in the spring semester for promotion and tenure. Write recommendations to Dean.

November 15 - December 31

Review tenured/tenure-track dossiers for promotion and tenure. Write recommendations to Dean (two-thirds by December 15).

February 1 - March 15

Review non-tenure-track research faculty dossiers for promotion. Write recommendations to Dean.

4. Candidates

April 15

Tenured/tenure-track faculty, who wish to be considered for early promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor, confer with Chair.

Research faculty, who wish to be considered for promotion, confer with Chair.

May 15 - July 30

Tenured/tenure-track faculty initially appointed in the spring semester, to be considered for promotion and tenure, establish list of three to six suggested external reviewers and prepare dossiers.

May 15 - August 31

Tenured/tenure-track faculty, to be considered for promotion and tenure, establish list of three to six suggested external reviewers and prepare dossiers.

August 1 - 31

Tenure-track faculty (initial appointments in spring semester), to be considered for renewal, prepare dossiers.

September 1 - November 15

Non-tenure track faculty, to be considered for renewal, prepare dossiers.

Research faculty, to be considered for promotion, establish list of three to six suggested external reviewers and prepare dossiers.

January 1 - 31

Tenure-track faculty (initial appointments in fall semester), to be considered for renewal, prepare dossiers.

Appendix B: Sample Letter Soliciting Outside Review of a Tenure* Candidate

*(Make necessary changes for promotion to Professor.)

(Date)

(Address)

Dear _____:

Professor _____ of our faculty is currently being considered for promotion to Associate Professor, with tenure. As part of the review process, we solicit the opinions of recognized scholars outside Vanderbilt regarding the research accomplishments and scholarly potential of candidates for tenure. I hope that you will be able to help us in this important task.

Our standards for tenure are summarized in the Faculty Manual of Vanderbilt University as follows: "For the award of tenure, Vanderbilt requires (1) excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression in one's discipline and (2) a high level of effectiveness in teaching. ... In addition, Vanderbilt expects satisfactory performance in the area of service."

We would be grateful for your comments on the quality, quantity, and impact of Professor _____'s scholarly research. It would be particularly helpful to us if you could address the following specific concerns in the course of your discussion:

1. Please describe your relationship to Professor _____. Do you know Professor _____ well? In what context?
2. Which of Professor _____'s works have you had the opportunity to read?
3. How has Professor _____'s work contributed to the advancement of the field?
4. To what extent does Professor _____'s research show signs of independence from graduate school mentors?
5. How would you rank Professor _____ in relation to other scholars in the field at similar stages of their careers?
6. How do you rate Professor _____'s promise for future research?
7. Considering only the research dimension of the tenure decision, does Professor _____ satisfy the research standard for tenure typically applied at leading research universities?

To assist you in this evaluation, I have enclosed Professor _____'s resume and principal research papers and a statement of research direction prepared by Professor _____.

Under current policies and practices at Vanderbilt University, peer evaluations are (within limitations imposed by law) regarded as confidential. They are for limited use within the University. However, various government agencies may have a legal right to such evaluations, and it is possible that in the future federal or state law may afford the person being evaluated access to the evaluations.

I appreciate your assistance in this important tenure review process and would be grateful if you would be able to provide your evaluation by August 31, 20___. Thank you, in advance, for your help.

Sincerely,

Chair of Department