

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

From: Kamal Saggi, Dean of Faculty, College of Arts and Science



Subject: Guidelines and Call for Recommendations for Promotions and Reappointments

Date: September 5, 2019

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 2019-2020 recommendations for promotions and renewals of appointments. A copy of our Rules and Procedures (revised May 2018) is enclosed.

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

While the entire document has been updated, extensive clarifications have been made to the sections on External Reviewers (pages 8-13) and the sections on non-tenure-track teaching appointments (pages 30-33). In addition, we have added new examples for your convenience – specifically a sample CV (pages 35-37), updated cumulative teaching summary charts for both BLUE and VOICE (pages 38-40), and a sample counseling memo (page 28). The Provost's Office is also requiring that all documents uploaded into Interfolio must be made searchable.

The Department Chair or Program Director is responsible for ensuring that each promotion and reappointment 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
Dean John Geer
Dean André Christie-Mizell
Dean Bonnie Dow
Dean David Wright
Department and Program Administrators

Arts and Science Reappointment and Promotion File Deadlines: 2019-2020

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 of early consideration.* If you have a compelling reason for requesting late delivery of a file, please inform the dean's office at least one month prior to the specified receipt deadline or, in the case of an unexpected delay, as soon as you realize the necessity of turning in the file after the deadline.

| | Fall Decisions (notification expected by 12/31/2019) | Spring Decisions (notification expected by 6/1/2020) | Fall Decisions (notification expected by 12/31/2020) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Promotion to Professor | Monday, Sept. 9, 2019 | <u>Mon, September 9, 2019</u> | Monday, Sept. 14, 2020 |
| Promotion to Associate Professor w/tenure | Monday, Sept. 9, 2019 | Monday, October 28, 2019 | Monday, Sept. 14, 2020 |
| Renewal of tenure-track appointments (4 th year rvw) | Monday, Sept. 16, 2016 | Monday, January 13, 2020 | Monday, Sept. 21, 2020 |
| Renewal of tenure-track appointments (2 nd year rvw) | Monday, Sept. 16, 2019 | Monday, February 3, 2020 | Monday, Sept. 21, 2020 |
| Renewal of one-year, non-tenure-track appointments | Monday, Sept. 16, 2019 | Monday, January 20, 2020 | Monday, Sept. 21, 2020 |
| Renewal of multi-year, non-tenure-track appointments | Monday, Sept 16, 2019 | Monday, February 17, 2020 | Monday, Sept 21, 2020 |

General Contact Information Regarding Faculty Appointments:

- Dean Kamal Saggi, in consultation with the Dean, will oversee all processes for faculty reappointments and promotions of all tenured and tenure-track faculty actions.
- Dean Bonnie Dow, in consultation with the Dean, will oversee all processes for faculty reappointments and promotion of all non-tenure-track faculty actions, with the exception of research appointments which will be overseen by Dean David Wright, in consultation with the Dean.
- For questions regarding T/TT faculty and anything other than compensation issues, such as questions about leaves, appointments, recruitment, and promotions, please contact Melissa Woher at 3-3143 or melissa.woher@vanderbilt.edu

- For questions regarding NTT faculty and anything other than compensation issues, such as leaves, appointments, recruitment, and promotions, please contact Janice Rouse at 2-3184 or janice.rouse@vanderbilt.edu.

Dossier Contents:

I. Promotions to Associate Professor with Tenure and Full Professor:

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).

For 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 ([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. The University requires all promotion and review files to be submitted via [Interfolio](#).

- **Joint appointments:** For promotion cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments, the following procedures should be followed: 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 committee will be constituted by an equal representation of members from each unit. The committee will write a single memo/report to 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 or 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 completing the file (through Interfolio).

For promotion cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments, but whose administrative home does not contain the requisite number of eligible voting members, an ad hoc committee will be constituted that will include the eligible voting members of the administrative home unit, plus the appropriate number of faculty from the second unit so that the ad hoc committee has 5 members (*A&S Rules and Procedures* document, Section II, Part D, # 2) The ad hoc committee, thus having representation from both units, will be the voting unit on promotion, evaluating the file, voting, producing minutes and the chair of the ad hoc committee will write the chair/director recommendation to the Dean.

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. A sample checklist of documents required is provided on page 20 of this document.

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

1. Chair's or Program Director's Recommendation to the Dean:

- The Department Chair or Program 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 or Program Director to explain any aspect of the file that may require interpretation. There will be an upload field in Interfolio for this document.

The letter 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 tenured faculty of the Department or Program:**

- The first sentence of the recommendation should include the tallied vote of the faculty-- the number favoring, opposing, proxy votes (if applicable) and abstaining--and 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.
- 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 should report the faculty's evaluation of and comments on the candidate's accomplishments and prospects in (1) research, scholarship, 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 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 minutes of the meeting do not satisfy all these requirements, a candid accompanying statement from the Chair 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.

- 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.
- Please also include reports from review committees formed to evaluate scholarship/creative expression of candidates with an interdisciplinary field, and/or for those departments/programs with fewer than 5 voting-eligible faculty who are required to form an *ad hoc* review committee. (See the *Rules and Procedures...* document [Section II, D, #s 2-5] for instructions on the formation of these committees and instructions on voting procedures).
- The recommendation should also include any department- or program-specific definitions on 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.
- The tenured faculty's assessment of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels should include a review of the following evidence:
 - student evaluations, including a summary of numerical ratings from course evaluations.
 - a list or statement about Ph.D. theses the candidate has supervised
 - course syllabi, outlines, and reading lists
 - examinations and grading policies
 - the candidate's contributions to the development of courses, curriculum, instructional methodology, and other strategies for stimulating learning.
 - any available supplemental evidence 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.
 - 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).

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 (pages 35-37).
 - 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)
 - For all publications, the full citation (including beginning and ending page numbers in book chapters, journal articles and proceedings) of published works must be provided.
 - For works accepted but not yet published, provide the respective number of manuscript pages.
 - 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 ones.
 - 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 correct order are required.
- The role of the candidate must be fully explained (indicating percentage of the candidate’s contribution is helpful but not sufficient).
- Explanation of candidate role following each bibliographic entry of a co-authored work in the *c.v.*
- Further discussion of the nature of the collaboration 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 projects supervised.
- Service: List service to the:
 - Department
 - College
 - University
 - Profession
 - Community (professionally related).
- On occasion, the candidate may want to have a *c.v.* sent to reviewers that is formatted in a manner more conventional in the discipline. 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.

4. Cumulative Teaching Summary Chart:

- For those courses evaluated *prior* to Fall 2016 (using the VOICE system), please provide a composite chart using the numerical information from the candidate’s teaching evaluations. (See a sample format on page 38 of this document.)
 - The number of students enrolled in each course as well as the number of students completing the evaluation forms must be included for each course evaluated.
 - Data should be listed from the oldest (on the left) to the most recent

- 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 the candidate has taught while holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. If the candidate has been in rank for more than 10 years, please consult with the Dean of Faculty Affairs or Melissa Wocher about the number of years to be included in the chart.
- For courses evaluated *starting Fall 2016 and thereafter (using the BLUE system)*, please provide a separate composite chart, using the numerical information from the candidate's teaching evaluations and following the stipulations above (see sample format on pages 39-40 of this document).
- The cumulative teaching summary chart(s) will be uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.

5. Student Course Evaluations and Comments:

- The course evaluations will be uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.
- For courses evaluated **prior** to Fall 2016 (i.e. using the VOICE system), simply print the results, including student comments, for each course taught by the instructor during the period being evaluated. There is no need to re-type online student comments.
 - The students' comments should not be selected, excerpted, or edited.
 - For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, comments from all courses taught since the candidate's initial appointment to the tenure-track must be included.
 - Files for promotion to Professor must include all courses the candidate has taught while holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. If the candidate has been in rank for more than 10 years, please consult with the Dean of Faculty Affairs or Melissa Wocher about the number of years to be included in the file.
- For courses evaluated starting Fall 2016 and thereafter (i.e. – using BLUE) please upload the entire course instructor report, which includes the objective responses, as well as the bar graphs and the student comments.

6. Candidate's Statement of Endeavors:

- The candidate will upload the research statement of endeavors to be sent to reviewers in Step 1 in Interfolio. The candidate will have the opportunity to upload a more detailed statement of endeavors covering a research, teaching, and service in Step 2.
- Candidates for reappointment, 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 teaching philosophy and research objectives.
 - 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 the other a more accessible version for those outside of the candidate's immediate field. In these cases, it is imperative that the file contain both versions of the research statement when it is submitted for evaluation by the department and each succeeding level.
 - A candidate is permitted to update the Statement of Endeavors for the internal review, 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.
 - Please inform the candidate of the following guidelines for the three parts of the Statement.

- **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.
 - Amplify on 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.
 - 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
- **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:

- **Number of letters:** Promotion files must include at least six and preferably seven to nine external letters of evaluation solicited in writing by the Department Chair or Program 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 should be from individuals from a list compiled by the candidate at the request of the Department Chair or Program Director.
 - **The Department/Program’s list:** At least three letters should be from a separate set of reviewers chosen by the Department Chair or Program 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 and 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 institutional affiliations. In case the candidate and the Department's lists contain two reviewers from the same institution, the Dean's office will ask the Chair/Director to decide whom to ask for a letter first with the understanding that the second reviewer from the same institution can be asked only if the first declines to write.
- **Compiling the two lists:** The Candidate's list of reviewers should be compiled before the Department's list. In particular, 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 should 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 less 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 less 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 Department Chair or Program Director (via email) to the Dean's Office 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 will send an official memo to the Department Chair or Program 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 sections 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, refer to page 17.
 - 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 example on pages 18 & 19, as well as instructions below) from the Chair or Program 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 her/his 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 or Program Director’s letter to reviewers:** The Chair’s or Program Director’s formal letter/email soliciting assessments from external reviewers should comply with the following guidelines:
 - State whether the department or program is considering promotion of the candidate to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor with tenure. All correspondence, including telephone conversations and email, as well as written correspondence, should state simply that the candidate is being considered for promotion.
 - All correspondence (email, mail and voice) must be objective. It may not refer to preliminary or provisional judgments, hopes, or fears of the Chair or Program 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 Chair or Program Director 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 and automatically attached to the candidate’s file. If a letter is sent via email, complete (including header and date) email versions are permissible during the initial steps in the process such as the department vote.
 - 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..
- **Chair letter to reviewers for considerations of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:**
 - The Chair’s or Program 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 sentence 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 his or her professional relationship to the candidate, if any;
 - indicate which of the candidate’s works he/she has read;
 - assess the quality of the candidate’s publications, productivity, research (and/or creative expression), and its influence on and/or advancement of the field;
 - rank the candidate in relation to his/her cohort at other research universities;
 - assess the promise and probable impact of the candidate’s future research;
 - 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 asking a reviewer to address these points is appended (see page 19).
- **Chair letter to reviewers for considerations of promotion to the rank of Professor:**
 - The Chair’s or Program 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 or Program Director’s letter should ask the referee to address the pertinent points of that quoted sentence 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 his/her 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);
 - state whether the candidate would meet the research standard for promotion to the rank of Professor typically applied at leading research universities;
 - compare the candidate to his/her scholarly cohort at other leading universities; and
 - assess the promise and probable impact of the candidate’s future research/creative expression.
 - A sample letter addressing these points is appended (see page 18).
- **Additional Materials related to the External Review Process:**
 - These documents should be uploaded into Interfolio into the appropriate section.
 - The candidate’s list of all the names and institutional affiliations of approved reviewers. A list only of persons who agreed to serve as referees will not suffice.

Beside each name, please make the following notation, as appropriate:

- Letter enclosed OR
- Did not answer our request OR
- Declined to write OR
- Not solicited
- The department/program list compiled in consultation with the relevant tenured faculty members of all the names of approved reviewers and their institutional affiliations. A list only of persons who agreed to serve as referees will not suffice. Beside each name, please make the following notation, as appropriate:
 - Letter enclosed OR
 - Did not answer our request OR
 - Declined to write OR
 - Not solicited
- A brief biographical summary of each approved reviewers' professional credentials, including those who were approved, but did not send a letter. Please do NOT include the 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 Department Chair or Program 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 letters for pre-tenure reviews and the summaries prepared by the Department Chair or Program 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 counseling memos in files under consideration for promotion to professor.

9. Correspondence between the Chair/Program Director and the candidate:

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

10. Reviews of published works:

A copy of all available 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 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.

14. 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:

- a. 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 deliberations or votes concerning appointments or renewals of family members, including spouses and partners.
- b. 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.

15. The Faculty Meeting:

- Confidentiality: 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 letters, the names of referees or the outcome of the meeting.
 - Your colleagues should be advised at each meeting that the Chair or Program 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 or Program 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.”

16. 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 or school 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 department chair 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 department chair 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), Sections A and B of the current Faculty Manual.

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

- It is mandatory that the Department Chair or Program Director advise a candidate for

promotion and 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 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.
- 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.
- The letter informing the candidate of the department's or program's decision should not elaborate on the rationale for it. This may or may not be uploaded to Interfolio as part of the file.
- A copy of the signed and dated letter should be sent to the Dean's Office for filing.
- When reporting a favorable departmental or program recommendation on promotion, the Chair or Program 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.
 - Concurrence at stages prior to the vote by the Board of Trust is not reported, but lack of concurrence is.
- Final decisions in cases of promotion to tenure are normally but not always announced immediately following the meeting of the Board of Trust that usually occurs in late April or early May.
- 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 Office of the Dean 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 Full 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/Program in XXXX*) at Vanderbilt University. One of our (*Assistant/Associate*) Professors, (*name of candidate*), will be reviewed for promotion to (*Associate Professor with tenure /Full 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*).

I am including below an abbreviated version of Professor (*last name of candidate*)'s *c.v.* to give you an idea of the nature of (*her/his*) work.

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 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 evaluate *his/her* scholarship. In your view, has Professor *Lastname's* scholarship 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 his or her research.

I enclose Professor *Lastname's curriculum vitae*, 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 yours

**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 evaluate *his/her* scholarship. 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 his or her research.

I enclose Professor *Lastname's curriculum vitae*, 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 yours,

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

1. Chair's Recommendation
(For Joint appointments – include both chair/director recommendations.)
2. Faculty Recommendation – including any subcommittee reports prepared for the faculty
(For Joint appointments – include committee report in addition to the report from the joint departments/programs.)
3. *Curriculum Vitae*
4. Teaching Summary Chart
5. Student Course Evaluations and Comments (from the VOICE and BLUE systems)
6. Candidate's Statement of Endeavors
7. External Letters of Recommendation
 - a. Candidate's list of names
 - b. Letters from candidate's list
 - c. Department's list of names
 - d. Letters from the department's list
 - e. Brief biography of the writers
 - f. All correspondence with reviewers
 - g. Rationale and approval of department's list of reviewers
8. Previous *Curriculum Vitae* and Counseling Memoranda (include w/promo to tenure only)
9. Correspondence between the Chair and the Candidate
10. Reviews of published work

Appendix A: Other relevant material concerning research

- a. Title/description of item a
- b. Title/description of item b

Appendix B: Other relevant material concerning teaching

- a. Title/description of item a
- b. Title/description of item b

Appendix C: Copies of publications/creative expression

- a. Title/description of item a
- b. Title/description of item b

II. TENURE-TRACK REAPPOINTMENTS:

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).

Reappointments are based on the demonstration of progress toward fulfilling each of the criteria for tenure. The key sentences for reappointment are as follows: "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. The University requires all tenure-track reappointment files to be submitted via [Interfolio](#).

- **Joint appointments:** For reappointment cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments, the following procedures should be followed: 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 committee will be constituted by an equal representation of members from each unit. The committee will write a single memo/report to 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 or 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 completing the file (through Interfolio).

For reappointment cases involving faculty who hold joint appointments, but whose administrative home does not contain the requisite number of eligible voting members, an ad hoc committee will be constituted that will include the eligible voting members of the administrative home unit, plus the appropriate number of faculty from the second unit so that the ad hoc committee has 5 members (*A&S Rules and Procedures* document, Section II, Part D, # 2) The ad hoc committee, thus having representation from both units will be the voting unit on promotion, evaluating the file, voting, producing minutes and the chair of the ad hoc committee will write the chair/director recommendation to the Dean.

Dossier Contents:

Deadlines for recommendations for renewal of tenure-track faculty are listed in the "Deadlines" section of this memorandum, page 2.

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. A sample checklist of documents required is provided on page 29 of this document.

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

1. Chair's or Program Director's Recommendation to the Dean:

- The Department Chair or Program 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 or Program Director to explain any aspect of the file that may require interpretation. There will be an upload field in Interfolio for this document.

The letter 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

2. Draft Counseling Memoranda (3rd and 4th year reviews):

- The Chair/Director must submit a draft counseling memo for the candidate.
- **Third- or Fourth-year Counseling Memoranda:** After a positive vote in the department, the Department Chair/Program 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 discuss and recommend changes. The Dean's office will inform the Department Chair/Program Director of approval of the renewal and the final draft, and then the Department Chair/Program Director will send the counseling memorandum to the candidate. Please see page 28 of this document for a counseling memo template.
- The department chair/program director is required to meet with the newly renewed faculty member 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 memo – summarizing the discussion of research, teaching and service.

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

- The first sentence of the recommendation should include the tallied vote of the faculty-- the number favoring, opposing, proxy votes (if applicable) and abstaining--and 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.
- 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 p publications by the candidate appearing since the last personnel action, and (2) relevant samples of his/her earlier work.
- If minutes of the meeting do not satisfy all these requirements, a candid accompanying statement from the Chair 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.
- 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.
- Please also include reports from review committees formed to evaluate scholarship/creative expression of candidates with an interdisciplinary field, and/or for those departments/program with fewer than 5 voting-eligible faculty who are required to form an *ad hoc* review committee. (See the *Rules and Procedures...* document (Section II, D, #s 2-5) for instructions on the formation of these committees and instructions on voting procedures).
- The recommendation should also include any department- or program-specific definitions on 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.
- The tenured faculty's assessment of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels should include a review of the following evidence:
 - student evaluations
 - a list or statement about Ph.D. theses the candidate has supervised
 - course syllabi, outlines, and reading lists
 - examinations and grading policies
 - 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
 - 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).

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 pages 5 & 6 of this document. A sample *c.v.* is attached as an example (pages 35-37).

5. Cumulative Teaching Summary Chart:

- For those courses evaluated *prior* to Fall 2016 (using the VOICE system), please provide a composite chart using the numerical information from the candidate's teaching evaluations. (See a sample format on page 38 of this document.)
 - The number of students enrolled in each course as well as the number of students completing the evaluation forms must be included for each course evaluated.
 - Data should be listed from the oldest (on the left) to the most recent
 - 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 the candidate has taught while holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. If the candidate has been in rank for more than 10 years, please consult with the Dean of Faculty Affairs or Melissa Wocher about the number of years to be included in the chart.
- For courses evaluated *starting Fall 2016 and thereafter (using the BLUE system)*, please provide a separate composite chart, using the numerical information from the candidate's teaching evaluations and following the stipulations above (see sample format on pages 39-40 of this document).
- The cumulative teaching summary chart(s) will be uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.

6. Student Course Evaluations and Comments:

- The course evaluations will be uploaded by the department administrator in Interfolio.
- For courses evaluated **prior** to Fall 2016 (i.e. using the VOICE system), simply print the results, including student comments, for each course taught by the instructor during the period being evaluated. There is no need to re-type online student comments.
 - The students' comments should not be selected, excerpted, or edited.
 - For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, evaluations from all courses taught since the candidate's initial appointment to the tenure-track must be included.
 - Files for promotion to Professor must include all evaluations for courses the candidate has taught while holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. If the candidate has been in rank for more than 10 years, please consult with the Dean of Faculty Affairs or Melissa Wocher about the number of years to be included in the file.
 - For courses evaluated starting Fall 2016 and thereafter (i.e. – using BLUE) 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 teaching philosophy and research objectives.*
- The Statement of Endeavors should conform to the outline on pages 7 & 8 of this document.

8. Previous curriculum vitae and counseling information:

- This section is applicable only to those candidates who are undergoing a 4th year review. For those hired with an initial contract of 4 years – and thus who undergo only one pre-

tenure review – this section is no longer valid.

- 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.
 - A dated copy of the candidate's *curriculum vitae* that was submitted for the initial appointment/hire, as well as
 - For a 4th-year review
 - Dated *c.v.* from any and all pre-tenure reviews,
 - copies of the counseling letters for pre-tenure reviews and the summaries prepared by the Department Chair or Program Director after completion of those reviews with the candidate.

9. Correspondence between the Chair/Program Director and the candidate:

Copies of all correspondence between the Department Chair or Program Director and the candidate *about the reappointment process(es)* not conducted within Interfolio must be provided here.

10. Reviews of published works:

A copy of all available 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.

14. 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 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).

15. The Faculty Meeting:

- **Confidentiality:** 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 letters, the names of referees, or the outcome of the meeting.
 - Your colleagues should be advised at each meeting that the Chair or Program Director alone speaks for the tenured faculty of the department or program.
 - The faculty meeting should commence with the reading by the Chair or Program 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.”

16. Ex Parte Communications:

- See page 15 of this document.

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

- It is mandatory that the Department Chair or Program Director advise a candidate for promotion and 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.
- 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.
- The letter informing the candidate of the department's or program's decision should not elaborate on the rationale for it. This may or may not be uploaded to Interfolio as part of the file.
- A copy of the signed and dated letter should be sent to the Dean's Office for filing.
- When reporting a favorable departmental or program recommendation on reappointment, the Chair or Program 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.
- Final decisions are normally but not always announced by the end of May.
- 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 Office of the Dean if a candidate makes such a request, and *prior* to sharing the information.

A&S Guidelines for Second- and Fourth-Year Review Counseling Memorandum to Candidate from Department Chair/Program Director

This document provides some suggested language for parts of the second-year 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 your divisional dean.

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. 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 next review will take place in < AY XX-YY >.

Topics and suggested content:

Research:

- the tenured faculty's assessment of the quantity and quality of research during the review period;
- the tenured faculty's advice for future progress in research, including strategies for achieving a high-quality publications record;
- the external funding record during the review period and advice on external funding strategies within your discipline.

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.

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,

<Department Chair/Program Director>

cc: < Dean Kamal Saggi >

***Checklist of documents for
Tenure-Track Reappointment Files:***

1. Chair's Recommendation: For Joint appointments – include both chair/director recommendations.
- 2.. Draft counseling memo
3. Faculty Discussion and Recommendation: including any subcommittee reports prepared for the faculty (For Joint appointments – include the committee report in addition to the report from the joint departments/programs.)
4. *Curriculum Vitae*
5. Teaching Summary Chart
6. Student Course Evaluations and Comments (from the VOICE and BLUE systems)
7. Statement of Endeavors
8. Previous *Curricula Vitae* and Counseling Memoranda
9. Correspondence between the Chair and the Candidate
10. Reviews of published work

Appendix A: Other relevant material concerning research

- a. Title/description of item a
- b. Title/description of item b

Appendix B: Other relevant material concerning teaching

- a. Title/description of item a
- b. Title/description of item b

Appendix C: Copies of publications/creative expression

- a. Title/description of item a
- b. Title/description of item b

III. NON-TENURE-TRACK TEACHING APPOINTMENTS

- DEADLINES:
 - Reappointments for multi-year appointments are expected on Monday, February 17, 2020.
 - Reappointments for faculty holding a term of one-year or less are due on January 20, 2020, or as soon as the need for these term-faculty is obvious. Reappointments should be submitted via the [Request for Additional Instructional Staff and Reappointments](#) link to REDCap.
- All appointments and reappointments require the vote of the full department/program faculty.
 - In the case of the reappointment of NTT faculty members on continuing 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 CV, and the course evaluations.
 - All TT/T faculty members vote on reappointments of continuing NTT faculty members, and NTT faculty members above the rank of the candidate in the same NTT category also vote. 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 the voting eligibility of your colleagues, please reach out to Dean Dow.
 - However, department chairs and program directors may opt to submit the results of a single vote by their faculty empowering them to make appointments and reappointments at the rank of Lecturer only, without further faculty votes. This is known as “Chair Voting Rights.”
 - A record of this agreement should be forwarded to Dean Bonnie Dow and Janice Rouse 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.
- 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 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).
- Definition of 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. (M.A.s will be considered on a case-by-case basis.)
 - 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.
 - **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
- TT/T faculty and Principal Senior Lecturers must vote on all senior lecturer appointments and reappointments
- **Principal Senior Lecturers**
 - A faculty member may be promoted 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
 - Faculty must vote on all principal senior lecturer appointments and reappointments
- **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
 - Faculty must vote on all Assistant Professor of the Practice appointments and reappointments
- **Associate Professor of the Practice**
 - A faculty member may be promoted 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
 - Initial appointment requires 3 letters of recommendation
 - Promotion requires 6 letters of recommendation
 - Faculty must vote on all Associate Professor of the Practice appointments and reappointments
- **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
- Faculty must vote on all Assistant Professor of the Practice appointments and reappointments
- **NTT Associate Professor**
 - A faculty member may be promoted to the rank of NTT Associate Professor after completing six years of service at Vanderbilt as a 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.
 - Initial appointment requires 3 letters of recommendation
 - Promotion requires 6 letters of recommendation
 - Faculty must vote on all Associate Professor of the Practice appointments and reappointments
- **NTT Professorial Ranks:** Procedures for promotion should mirror the requirements for promotion at the appropriate rank of tenured ranks stated in Section I of this document.

Dossier Contents: Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Appointments and Reappointments:

All appointment and reappointment materials for NTT *teaching* faculty must be submitted via the [Request for Additional Instructional Staff and Reappointments](#) link to REDCap. Each appointment request should contain the following items:

- A **current c.v.**
- A **memo/letter 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.
 - 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 course evaluations. It should also include quotations from a sample of narrative student comments from the evaluations.
 - For an initial appointment – please include all evaluations available to you.
 - For reappointment of faculty with a one-year term or less, please provide the most recent 3 semesters of evaluations available. For those with less experience, provide all evaluations available.
 - For reappointments of faculty with *multi-year* terms, please include all evaluations (both statistical summaries and student comments) for courses taught since the faculty

member's last review. Example: A senior lecturer was first appointed effective Fall 2012 for a 3-year term. In the spring of 2014, the faculty member will be reviewed. The only new evaluations available would be for Fall 2012, Spring 2013 and Fall 2013 (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 course evaluations. 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 Center for Teaching). Be cognizant of the trajectory of evaluations—sometimes evaluations from the first year of a three-year contract indicate problems that later evaluations 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.
- **Letters of Recommendation**
 - None are required for appointment to the rank of lecturer
 - 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)
- **Record of faculty vote**
 - 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. NON-TEACHING APPOINTMENTS

Non-teaching appointments include research faculty, secondary appointments, adjuncts/adjoints, visiting scholars, etc.

- DEADLINES:
 - Recommendations for renewal should be in our office at least *two months prior to the expiration* of the appointment.
- 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 deliberations or votes concerning appointments or renewals of family members.*
- Requests for secondary appointments and reappointments should use the Secondary Appointments Form, available at <https://as.vanderbilt.edu/docs/CAS%20Secondary%20Appointment%20Form.pdf>
- All other non-teaching appointments and reappointments should be:
 - addressed to the appropriate dean
 - submitted via the appropriate link
 - Research: [Request for Additional Instructional Staff and Reappointments](#) (insert NA for any teaching questions)—Dean Wright
 - Visiting Scholars: [A&S Visiting Scholar Request—Dean Dow](#)
 - Interns and Observers: [A&S Interns and Observers Application—Dean Wright](#)
 - Postdoctoral Scholars are now handled through the [Office of Postdoctoral Affairs](#) in the Graduate School. Details can be found here: <https://gradschool.vanderbilt.edu/postdoctoral/index.php> --Dean Wright
 - include the following:
 - a chair's or program director's memorandum requesting the appointment.
 - the start and end dates.
 - proposed salary, if applicable, with indication of source of funds
 - a current c.v.
 - a faculty vote, as appropriate.
 - letters of reference, if applicable (see below).
 - Research faculty:
 - Procedures for promotion of research faculty should mirror the requirements for promotion for the appropriate rank as stated in section I of this document.
 - 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.
 - The *initial* appointments for all research faculty require 3 letters of reference for a research assistant professor and at least 6 letters of reference for appointments to the rank of research associate and research professor.
 - Reappointments do not require letters.

Jane Doe
Department of Academic Studies
311 Kirkland Hall
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37235
jane.s.doe@vanderbilt.edu
615-555-5555

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, 2017.

Jeffrey Nordhaus Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching in the Humanities, College of Arts and Science, Vanderbilt University, 2019.

Phi Beta Kappa, Academic University, 2012.

RESEARCH

Books

Academic Book. New York: Academic University Press, 2019.

- Review: John Doe, *Historical Journal of Academic Studies*, 32.3 (2019): 459-462.
- Review: Jane Doe, *Contemporary Academic Journal*, 16.4 (2019): 795-798.

Articles in refereed journals

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

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

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

Book chapters

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

Book Reviews

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

Working Papers and Books

“Title of Current Unpublished Project.” Explanation of project.

“Title of Another Current Unpublished Project.” Explanation of project.

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

With John Doe, “Title of Presentation,” Academic Society of Academics, New York, NY, June 2019.

“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 the subject of 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.

