

**Procedural Guidelines for Appointment, Renewal, Promotion and Tenure**  
at  
**Peabody College of Vanderbilt University**

(Approved by Peabody Faculty Council October 14, 2014)

CONTENTS

- 1. Initial appointments**
  - 1.1 Titles and terms of appointment
  - 1.2 Recruitment requirements
  - 1.3 Search committees
  - 1.4 Search procedure
  - 1.5 Position offers
  
- 2. Tenure and promotion procedures**
  - 2.1 Timing of reappointment and review
  - 2.2 Criteria for appointment to a tenured position and for promotion with tenure
  - 2.3 Tenure review process
  - 2.4 Promotion to professor (tenured)
  
- 3. Reappointment and promotion of practice and clinical faculty**
  - 3.1 Timing of reappointment and review
  - 3.2 Criteria for reappointment
  - 3.3 Reappointment reviews
  - 3.4 Promotion reviews
  
- 4. Reappointment and promotion of lecturers**
  - 4.1 Procedures for reappointment
  - 4.2 Criteria for reappointment
  - 4.3 Reappointment Reviews
  - 4.4 Promotion reviews
  
- 5. Reappointment and promotion of research faculty**
  - 5.1 Procedures for reappointment
  - 5.2 Promotion Reviews
  
- 6. Grievances arising from review, reappointment, and/or promotion procedures**

APPENDIXES

- A:** Voting Eligibility and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions
- B:** Tenure Review Checklist and Timeline
- C:** Contents of Tenure Dossier
- D:** Contents of Practice, Clinical, or Lecturer Faculty Dossier

The stature of Peabody College at Vanderbilt University rests upon the achievements of its outstanding faculty. The policies and procedures contained in this document are intended to sustain academic quality, to promote the professional development of Peabody's faculty, and to protect their individual rights.

The Faculty Manual (<http://vanderbilt.edu/faculty-manual/>) of Vanderbilt University contains rules and procedures for appointments, renewals, promotions, and tenure. It is authoritative. The guidelines that follow are intended to augment those standards by specifying rules and procedures, some of which are particular to Peabody College.

## **1. Initial appointments**

### **1.1 Titles and terms of appointment**

1.1.1 *Tenure-track positions.* The titles instructor and assistant professor designate non-tenured positions on the tenure track, unless specified as non-tenure-track at the time of appointment. Service in these positions is counted as part of the probationary period leading to a review for tenure. Instructors are appointed to a one-year term, renewable once or twice, or in extraordinary circumstances, three times. Assistant professors are appointed to an initial term of three years. An earned doctorate is required for appointment at the level of assistant professor. Those in the process of completing their doctoral work may be appointed as instructors.

1.1.2 *Appointment with tenure.* The titles associate professor of \_\_\_\_\_ and professor of \_\_\_\_\_ denote tenured positions unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment. Initial appointment as associate professor or professor is possible; promotion to the rank of associate carries tenure. Appointment to a tenured position requires that the candidate meet the conditions set forth in section 2.2 of this document.

1.1.3 *Named professorships,* created by the Board of Trust to honor a benefactor or someone important in Vanderbilt history, may be conferred on faculty members in recognition of accomplishments or contributions well beyond the normal expectations for their rank. Typically this is done for faculty who hold the rank of professor.

1.1.4 *Non-tenure-track positions.* These positions are reserved for faculty members whose main contribution is to the teaching and outreach missions of Peabody College, which lies at its core.

1.1.4.1 *Practice and clinical faculty.* Appointments to non-tenure-track positions with the titles instructor in the practice of \_\_\_\_\_ or clinical instructor in \_\_\_\_\_; assistant professor of the practice or assistant clinical professor; associate professor of the practice or associate clinical professor; professor of the practice or clinical professor require academic competence and achievement at the rank described in the position description and announcement. An earned doctorate is required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor or above. Initial appointments at the instructor rank may be for one year; at the assistant rank, for no more than three years; and at the associate and professor rank for no more than five years.

1.1.4.2 *Lecturers.* The titles Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Senior Lecturer designate teaching appointments and reflect the promotion sequence. These positions require academic competence and achievement at the rank described in the position description and announcement. Duties beyond teaching, such as student advisement and program development, may be required. Ordinarily, no administrative duties are required of Lecturers. Senior Lecturers and Principal Senior Lecturers may be required to carry out administrative duties. Lecturers may be part time or full time and are appointed for terms of no more than one year. An earned doctorate is preferred but not required. Senior and Principal Lecturers require a doctorate but may be part-time or full-time teaching positions. Senior Lecturers may be appointed for terms of no more than three years; Principal

Senior Lecturers may be appointed for terms of no more than five years.

- 1.1.5 *Research professor.* Appointees to the ranks of research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, which are non-tenured and reserved for individuals with major grant responsibilities (e.g., Principal Investigator, PI, or co-PI), are expected to have attained recognition for scholarly investigation consistent with the respective rank. Excellence in systematic analysis or creative expression is expected. An earned doctorate is required.

Appointments are made for fixed terms, the length of which may depend on the duration of research grants or contracts held by the University of which he/she is PI or co-PI and from which the financial support of the person's salary is obtained. Terms may be renewed without limitation.

#### 1.1.6 *Titles for persons based at other institutions*

- 1.1.6.1 *Adjunct (rank) professor* of \_\_\_\_\_ or adjunct instructor in \_\_\_\_\_ denotes part time faculty members who typically are practitioners in one of the professions and whose main base is at another institution. Appointment for no more than three years is possible.

- 1.1.6.2 *Adjoint (rank) professor* of \_\_\_\_\_ or adjoint instructor in \_\_\_\_\_ designates a person who is based at another institution and who contributes to Peabody's mission, usually in ways other than teaching. Appointment may be for no more than three years.

- 1.1.6.3 *Visiting (rank) professor* of \_\_\_\_\_ or visiting instructor in \_\_\_\_\_ is used for persons who typically are faculty members at other institutions and who temporarily transfer their main base to Vanderbilt. Such appointments may be full- or part-time and for no more than three years.

- 1.1.6.4 *Visiting scholar* is used for visitors to Vanderbilt who have faculty status at other institutions of higher education or are otherwise distinguished, and whose presence on the campus is formally recognized for periods of no more than one year. A visiting scholar normally does not have formal duties to perform at Vanderbilt and is not a member of the faculty.

## 1.2 Recruitment requirements

Affirmative action goals are central to all recruitment efforts.

- 1.2.1 Authorization to recruit at any rank other than adjunct, adjoint, or visiting requires prior approval of the dean and provost. (A one-year lectureship requires only dean's approval.)

- 1.2.2 Recruitment for tenure-track and non-tenure-track, multiple-year appointments requires a search committee, appointed by the dean in consultation with relevant department chair(s). This committee may include a person from outside the department making the appointment. While recruitment for a non-tenure-track, single-year appointments (lecturer appointment) does not require a search committee, it should be standard practice.

- 1.2.3 A proposed change to tenure-track status from a non-tenure-track position requires a full national search in which any currently employed faculty member may apply.

- 1.2.4 A proposed change in position from lecturer track to practice/clinical track does not require a full national search if the person holds a senior or principal lectureship. It is handled as if it were a promotion. However, such a change for a lecturer does require a full national search.

## 1.3 Search committees

- 1.3.1 Proposals for a faculty position are usually initiated by the department in which that appointment would be located.

1.3.2 The committee is charged with identifying qualified candidates by means of a national search that may include: preparing advertisements in appropriate publications; personal contacts; review of candidates' vitae, publications, and recommendations of knowledgeable persons at other institutions; participating in the interview stage; checking additional references; and preparing the formal written hiring recommendation presented to the faculty.

#### 1.4 Search procedure

1.4.1 The file for a candidate being recommended for an interview, which is compiled by the search committee, must include (a) the candidate's curriculum vitae, (b) the summarized recommendation of the committee, (c) at least three letters of reference (the number is increased to six to support a candidate being considered for a tenured position), and (d) appropriate evidence of teaching ability. The file may be presented to the chair of the department before all letters of reference have been received.

1.4.2 The search committee forwards to the chair of the department (a) the files of those identified as the top candidates (not more than three), (b) the files of the highest ranking female and highest ranking minority candidate (if not among the top candidates), and (c) its recommendation.

1.4.3 The chair of the department reviews the committee report. A preliminary, advisory faculty vote may then be held. The department chair adds her or his recommendation and forwards the complete set of files to the dean. Invitations to candidates to visit the campus may be extended only upon authorization of the dean.

#### 1.5 Position offers

1.5.1 Following the visits of all invited candidates, the chair of the search committee will forward to the department chair the committee's written recommendation and rationale. The chair will bring the recommendation to the department's eligible voting faculty, who then vote. Double-blind balloting is required (see Appendix A.)

1.5.1.1 Approval by a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty is required for all appointments. (See Appendix A.) Department chairs may appoint one-year lecturers without formal approval by department faculty in rare circumstances; however, chairs must seek the approval of the full faculty prior to reappointment.

1.5.1.2 Offers of appointment could be subject to a required second vote limited to those who are entitled to vote for the rank in question. (See Appendix A.) For example, appointment at the rank of professor requires a vote of all tenured departmental faculty (regarding whether to recommend appointment with tenure), followed by a vote of the department's tenured professors (regarding whether to recommend appointment at the rank of professor). The outcome of the vote is shared with the eligible voting faculty.

1.5.1.3 The recommendation of the department is reported by the chair to the dean. If the recommendation is accepted by the dean, the candidate's file and the dean's recommendation are forwarded to the provost. If the recommendation is not accepted by the dean, the recommendation does not move forward. With the approval of the provost, an offer of appointment with appropriate terms can be extended. The appointment itself must be approved by the provost and the chancellor. Appointments with tenure must be approved by the Vanderbilt Board of Trust.

## **2. Tenure and promotion procedures**

### 2.1 Timing of reappointment and review

- 2.1.1 The pre-tenure appointments of a tenure-track assistant professor typically consist of an initial three-year appointment, a two-year appointment, and a second three-year appointment, with reviews following the schedule noted below.
  - 2.1.1.1 A departmental review conducted in the second year of service will result in a positive or negative recommendation for a two-year extension of the initial three-year appointment. In the event that an extension is not granted, the candidate will have one year remaining in his or her initial three-year appointment.
  - 2.1.1.2 In the fourth year of service, a second review will be conducted and will lead to a positive or negative recommendation for a second three-year appointment. In the event that an extension is not granted, the candidate will have one year remaining in his or her two-year appointment.
  - 2.1.1.3 The candidate should provide a dossier with the same content as is required in the tenure review process. Except for external letters, which are not required, the review process is the same as in the tenure review process but stops at the provost level without involvement of the University's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee (see below).
  - 2.1.1.4 A **counseling letter** is sent to the faculty member after every reappointment review. The purpose of the chair's counseling letter, which reflects input from the dean and provost, is to provide realistic and detailed guidance, in an encouraging and supportive framework, to the reviewee regarding areas of strength to sustain, areas for improvement, and an evaluation of whether or not the faculty member is on track for promotion as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion.

Recommendations from the review report and the deliberations of the department faculty should be incorporated in a form that can help the faculty member being reviewed redirect effort (if appropriate), better understand productivity expectations, know specific steps to be taken to obtain help that may be needed to develop research or improve his or her teaching, and adjust involvement in service activities (if necessary). A copy of each counseling letter is included in the faculty member's file.

- 2.1.1.5 A complete tenure review will be undertaken for assistant professors no later than the seventh year of service unless an extension of the probationary period has been granted by the dean, with approval of the provost.
- 2.1.1.6 In the event that promotion and tenure are not granted, the candidate will have one year remaining in his or her second three-year appointment.
- 2.1.2 Any deviation from the standard appointment and review sequence described above must be clarified in the original letter of appointment or in a subsequent letter if the original time line is amended. Any amendments must be approved by the dean and provost.
- 2.1.3 Review for promotion and tenure may occur early at the request of the candidate. This is advisable only when the candidate's CV is exceptionally strong compared to the typical CV of a Peabody faculty member being considered for promotion and tenure.
- 2.1.4 During the spring semester prior to the tenure review year for the assistant professor (typically in spring of the 6<sup>th</sup> appointment year), the department chair initiates procedures that will lead to an appropriate evaluation of the candidate. Please see the checklist and target dates in Appendix B.

## 2.2 Criteria for appointment to a tenured position and for promotion with tenure

- 2.2.1 Tenured appointments at Peabody College require excellence in scholarship so as to gain favorable recognition in the faculty member's discipline at a national level; a high level of effectiveness in teaching; and satisfactory service to the University and the larger professional community.

- 2.2.2 While it is expected that the faculty of Peabody College will be involved in varying scholarly activities that produce different products, those products are evaluated by a set of common criteria to establish whether the candidate's scholarship embodies: (a) substantive contribution to new knowledge that may include contributions to theory, practice, and the development of analytical methods; (b) creative interpretation and use of ideas; (c) appropriate and logical rigor or methodology that is consistent with best practices in the conduct of research; (d) logical scope and progression of scholarship with a well-defined and sustained program of research; (e) integrity; and (f) importance as determined by professional peers. These products must be public--scholarship representing intellectual and creative work that is reviewed and validated by peers.

Standards of rigor, originality, and importance may vary from one field to another and are interpreted in the context of the candidate's discipline; however, in each case, Vanderbilt expects the level of quality and achievement to be equivalent to that required for tenure in leading departments of other major research universities.

- 2.2.3 Dissemination of knowledge through effective teaching has many manifestations, including classroom instruction and a broad range of faculty-student relationships (e.g., the faculty role of undergraduate and graduate advisor). An evaluation of each candidate's instructional activities will consider whether the:
- (a) candidate's courses have been developed according to appropriate teaching goals, theory, and methodology;
  - (b) content of the candidate's courses reflects current knowledge and practice of the field;
  - (c) candidate's students have gained and/or demonstrated use of appropriate and/or relevant knowledge, skills, abilities, and/or attitudes about the particular field of study;
  - (d) candidate has earned respect from students and colleagues for honesty, integrity, and the ability to facilitate learning and convey knowledge; and
  - (e) candidate has been attentive to and respectful of the individual needs of students with regard to intellectual and professional development.

Other evidence of effective teaching also is to be provided, e.g., colleague or peer review, teaching awards, and recognition of colleagues in the profession through invitations to conduct classes, in-service workshops, or seminars.

- 2.2.4 Tenure-track faculty members have an obligation to make contributions to the intellectual climate of Peabody College and the University as a whole. In addition, administrative activities of a more general nature are important to the overall functioning of the College and the University and are expected of all faculty members, including those in untenured positions. Service also may include, (a) undertaking to review and comment on manuscripts of colleagues or advanced students (including extraordinary service on student committees); (b) organizing seminars, conferences, or workshops; (c) assuming leadership roles in curriculum or program development or in academic personnel recruitment; (d) engaging in activities inside and outside the University that have major impact upon policy decisions affecting the fields of education and human development; (e) assuming leadership roles of professional stature; (f) engaging in consultation activities that enhance one's professional status and make significant contributions to the field; (g) participating on review panels for granting agencies or accrediting agencies and; (h) serving on editorial boards and as reviewers for refereed journals.

## 2.3 Tenure review process

At any time during the review process, the candidate may choose to withdraw from consideration.

- 2.3.1 Tenure dossier — The tenure dossier must contain an inclusive and complete CV, references from external peers, and sufficient documentation to support the criteria for scholarship, teaching, and

service as outlined above. Appendix C contains a summary of the tenure dossier.

2.3.1.1 The **candidate** is responsible for providing the departmental review committee with documentation to give an accurate perspective on his/her activities both within and outside of the College community. Such materials include:

- Two versions of the candidate's current CV, both of which should be dated:
  - External version. This CV, which is sent to external reviewers, should be in the same format used for the annual report of professional activities.
  - Internal version. This CV, which is used only within Vanderbilt, is identical to the external version but annotated with information about the roles of individual authors of any publications with multiple authors. This information should be provided in a sentence or two, perhaps including percentages, for each paper (or book) with multiple authors. For example, if the candidate produced a particular paper with two coauthors (Doe and Jones), the annotation might be something like the following: "I conceived this study, collected and analyzed the data, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript (80%). Doe (15%) helped refine the design of the study and commented on drafts, while Jones (5%) assisted with the data analysis and read the final draft." The use of percentages is optional, and the candidate will not be disadvantaged if s/he chooses to omit them. If a co-author is a student, that should be noted.
  
- Published scholarly writing. At least three representative publications of work completed at Vanderbilt should be provided, presumably the most impactful. They should meet at least the criteria listed in section 2.2.2, above. (It is the responsibility of the review committee to assess the significance and quality of this work, which could be accomplished by considering the reputation of the journals or press, peer evaluations, citation counts or indices, adoptions in the case of textbooks, copies of invitations requesting the candidate to write or present this work at seminars or conferences, etc.)
  
- Published scholarship that appears in academic journals, books, book chapters, government publications, and/or journals and aimed at practitioners also can be included in the dossier. While such publications cannot be the sole basis for which the scholarship criterion for promotion is met, they will be considered in assessing a person's contribution to knowledge. The content of the publication (see section 2.2.2 for evaluation standards), as well as the type of publication, should be the basis for the review committee to assess the degree to which it helps meet qualifications for tenure and promotion.
  
- A personal statement, no longer than ten double-spaced pages with 12 point type, 1 inch margins:
  - The **scholarship** section describes the candidate's programmatic line of research and indicates the candidate's past, current, and future scholarly goals and the methods used to accomplish these goals. The candidate may refer to unpublished manuscripts and work in progress as well as projected products. This section is sent to external reviewers.
  - The section regarding **teaching and service** provides a description of the candidate's teaching philosophy and objectives, including past and planned course/curriculum development, and service activities. This document is reviewed only within Vanderbilt.
  
- When preparing materials to document excellence in teaching, the candidate presents evidence that his or her teaching is highly effective. Since the judgment of teaching quality must be context dependent, it is the responsibility of the candidate to highlight the areas (e.g., classroom teaching, student supervision) where s/he determines the best performance is obtained. Evidence is not limited to, but should include (if appropriate), information about the following activities:

- Classroom instruction, with descriptive information that indicates the number of courses taught and their enrollments, the type (e.g., seminars, practica, large classes) and level of courses taught (Colleague observations are arranged by the review committee; the department provides the student evaluation data and their written comments as well as the overall GPA in each class taught.)
- Learning and accomplishments of students (e.g., conduct of research, implementation of school curriculum, publications) as evidenced through the candidate's self-report, student projects, reports and/or publications, and testimonials from past students.
- Research guidance, with statements that identify the nature of the candidate's interaction with and support for students completing advanced degrees. The candidate could indicate how s/he has supported the student's research or training projects and dissertation research. Examples of students' scholarly writing that have received professional recognition should be reported. Opinion statements from students and colleagues can be submitted to document the candidate's contributions.
- Instructional improvement and innovations, as possibly evidenced by textbooks or other publication or software used to enhance instruction, course materials, and grants to support instruction. Self-reports and student evaluations, in addition to peer review, can be included to support evidence of the candidate's contributions.
- Student advising, with statements that indicate how the candidate has assisted students in achieving educational goals and counseled students to be responsible members of the University and their chosen profession.

2.3.1.2 The **departmental review committee** is responsible for adding to this file at least six letters from referees external to the University. At least three letters are solicited from a list of referees proposed by the candidate. The remaining letters, but at least three, are solicited from a list of external reviewers proposed by the committee. All referees are to be approved by the dean before letters are sought. The referees should be selected not only on the basis of their credentials (generally, professors from top-25 universities) but also because their reviews would be expected to be unbiased. The referees should have no professional or personal interest in the candidate's promotion or tenure (e.g., not a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-investigator on a grant, co-author, classmate, former colleague).

Relationships between the candidate and any of the referees should be indicated in the biographical descriptions of the referees included in the candidate's dossier.

Letters from external reviewers are requested by the department chair.

Names of the final panel of reviewers and the letters submitted by the reviewers are not available to the candidate during either the Vanderbilt review or appeal process, absent any legal proceedings. Letters should contain evaluative information consistent with section 2.2 of this document and the *Faculty Manual*.

Using a letter template available from the Peabody Dean's Office, the department is to inform external reviewers of: (a) the procedure used to select reviewers, (b) the policy precluding the candidate's access to reviewers' letters, and (c) the policy limiting access to those College and University members involved in the actual review process.

2.3.1.3 The **departmental review committee** also arranges for the candidate's teaching to be observed by at least two faculty members on at least two different occasions, for a total of four observations, with reports (in the form of memoranda) sent to the committee. They also compile the student evaluation data made available by the department and provide comparisons of the candidate's ratings to the average of the department.

2.3.2 Evaluation of each candidate's professional qualifications for tenure occurs sequentially at six levels: the candidate's department of primary appointment; the dean of Peabody College, who is

advised by Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee; the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee; the provost of the University; the chancellor of the university; and the Board of Trust. Procedures for review at University-wide levels are spelled out in the *Faculty Manual*.

#### 2.3.2.1 Department-level review (see also Appendix B)

A departmental review committee is formed by the chair with the advice of his or her faculty and in consultation with the dean. In cases where the candidate's teaching and/or research transcends the department of primary appointment, one or more persons from other departments are asked to serve on the review committee.

Unsolicited letters from faculty members outside the department or school will be included in the candidate's file only if they are provided for review by the tenured faculty prior to the vote.

The review committee assembles the evidence and submits a report to the tenured faculty. After all members of the department who are eligible to vote on the matter (see Appendix A) have had the opportunity to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the candidate's file, a meeting of the eligible voting faculty is held, the case discussed, and a vote is taken with double-blind balloting (see Appendix A). (Abstentions are counted as a negative vote.) A positive recommendation by an absolute majority of those eligible to vote is required for an affirmative decision. The majority decision should be reported to the faculty; however, no specific vote tallies should be shared.

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 for inclusion in the candidate's file expressing his or her views on the deliberations by the faculty. These letters are made available to all faculty who are eligible to vote to review and comment upon.

The department must prepare minutes or a summary of the faculty deliberations, which will be added to the candidate's file after first being circulated to the eligible voting members of the faculty to verify accuracy. 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 before the end of the second working day after distribution of the minutes or summary. All such letters will be made available for review by the faculty eligible to vote and will be included in the candidate's file.

The department chair writes a letter of transmittal that reports his or her: (1) views of the full range of faculty deliberations, including the vote, (2) own analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the case, and (3) independent recommendation. Within ten business days of the vote, the department chair's letter and the candidate's file are forwarded to the dean, who shares them with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee.

In the event of a negative decision, the candidate must be notified in writing in a timely manner, ordinarily within one business day. If the candidate chooses to appeal the negative vote, s/he may then submit a statement for inclusion in the file to be transmitted to the dean. All negative decisions must be reviewed by the dean (see Faculty Manual).

#### 2.3.2.2 College-level review: Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee

Peabody's Promotion and Tenure Review Committee serves in an advisory role to the dean. The committee consists of five tenured professors, representing the five Peabody departments. (When a multi-year term faculty member is being considered for reappointment or promotion, a professor of the practice from any one of the five departments is added to the committee.) All committee members are appointed by the dean.

Any member of a candidate's department must recuse him- or herself from the discussion on that particular case unless it is a second- or fourth-year review.

Two committee members (one as primary, the other as secondary reviewer) review materials that are sent forward from the department and present both written and oral summaries, including a critical analysis of these materials, to the full committee and the dean. If the department, upon request by the dean, can supply additional information to rectify any problems that arise during the review process, the committee considers that new information. Eventually, the committee recommends or does not recommend, in an advisory capacity only, the candidate for tenure and promotion.

#### 2.3.2.3 The dean's review

If the department's recommendation is positive, the dean will consult with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee as detailed above. Following such consultation, the dean may recommend the candidate for promotion and tenure, or may decline to do so. If the dean decides to recommend promotion and tenure, the dean will prepare a letter to accompany the file explaining the reasons for the recommendation. The file is then forwarded to the provost's office.

Should the dean decide not to endorse the positive recommendation of the department, the dean should provide a written rationale to the eligible voting faculty in the department. They may appeal the dean's decision. This appeal requires an affirmative vote (with double-blind balloting; see Appendix A) of at least two-thirds of the faculty members eligible to vote on the original recommendation; it must be made within ten business days (not including vacation periods) after receiving the written report from the dean describing the rationale for the decision; and it must be directed to the University's Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. The appeals procedures limit the Committee's review to documentation included in the dossier at the time of the dean's decision.

Upon receipt of a negative departmental recommendation, the dean may either accept the departmental decision or return it to the department for reconsideration. With regard to the latter, the department can choose to either reaffirm or change its recommendation. The dean, however, may decide to accept a negative decision or recommend the candidate to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. For either scenario, the dean would consult with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee before rendering a decision.

#### 2.3.2.4 University-level review

When tenure is recommended by the dean, the University's Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) will evaluate the dossier on the basis of the statement of standards in the University's Faculty Manual and make an independent decision. The dean can choose to appeal a negative decision by the PTRC to the provost (see *Faculty Manual*). The provost and the chancellor also must approve promotion and tenure before the file goes to the Vanderbilt Board of Trust for its approval. A negative decision by the PTRC (unless appealed by the dean to the provost), provost, chancellor, or Board of Trust terminates the process, with promotion and tenure denied.

### 2.4 Promotion to professor (tenured)

2.4.1 Promotion to the rank of professor at Peabody College requires excellence in scholarship, teaching at a consistently high level of effectiveness, and satisfactory performance in service. The work that is evaluated for the scholarship criterion should be more completely developed than the work reviewed for the tenure decisions at the associate level. Consistent with University guidelines, the evidence of excellence in scholarship should indicate clearly that the candidate's research program is well-directed and recognized at a national or international level.

2.4.2 The procedures for review for promotion to professor are the same as those for awarding tenure, except that only tenured professors will vote on the departmental recommendation to be transmitted to the dean. Promotion to professor must be approved by the PTRC, provost, and chancellor (but not the Board of Trust).

### **3. Reappointment and promotion of practice and clinical faculty**

(Throughout this section, “practice faculty” should be understood to include clinical faculty.)

#### **3.1 Timing of reappointment and review**

The first review of practice faculty with multi-year appointments commences in the next to last appointment year. Subsequent reviews are conducted in the middle of the next to last year of the appointment term.

Those with appointments exceeding one year will be notified of non-renewal no later than June 1 before their last appointment year. A practice faculty member who is not renewed for an additional term will have one year remaining on their initial appointment, unless there are grounds for disciplinary action (Faculty Manual, Part IV, Chapter 1).

#### **3.2 Criteria for reappointment**

For reappointment and/or promotion of practice faculty, Peabody College requires that the review include assessment of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, service, and administrative duties as applicable. Practice faculty are expected to be excellent teachers who provide intellectual leadership in the education and preparation of students. They should develop and implement highly engaging, rigorous courses that reflect the conceptual framework, research, and knowledge base of their department and the college. Professors of the practice are expected to engage in scholarly activities and intellectual leadership that promote: the development of their fields, professional development, curricula, and so on, as appropriate to their job descriptions and responsibilities. Practice faculty are also expected to demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in service at the university, local, state and national, or international levels, as appropriate to their job descriptions.

Given the differentiated job descriptions that exist among practice faculty, however, it is expected that review criteria are individualized to fit the job descriptions of individual faculty members. Further, expectations for scholarship among practice faculty are not commensurate with expectations for scholarship for tenure-track faculty.

To be considered in a review for reappointment or promotion, the intellectual products of practice faculty must be accessible to the larger educational community and must have impact on the field. Products of scholarship among practice faculty will vary, depending upon their job descriptions and areas of emphasis. These products might include, but are not limited to:

- presentations at local, state, and national conferences;
- authored or co-authored articles in practitioner or research journals (peer-reviewed or invited);
- authored or co-authored chapters in texts; authored or co-authored textbooks or other books relevant to their job descriptions;
- publication or wide dissemination of materials, methods, or procedures relevant to their job descriptions;
- public policy briefs, institutional policy reports;
- video-based teaching and student learning cases to be used in teacher education (or other) classes;
- development of video-based, web-based, or other forms of professional development;
- assessments documenting the growth of pre-service teachers and the effects on their subsequent classroom practices.

When candidates participate in co-authored products of scholarship, it is their responsibility to provide a means for distinguishing their contributions from those of their co-authors. The candidate needs to provide an annotated CV in the same format as the internal CV used in a tenure review process. Both the quantity and quality of the products of scholarship will be considered in

determining whether the candidate is eligible for reappointment and/or promotion.

Because the scholarship criteria are more inclusive for practice faculty, department chairs and faculty in individual departments are expected to work with practice faculty to determine what forms or products of scholarship will be considered.

### 3.3 Reappointment reviews

Practice faculty may undergo a full review or an expedited review. Approval by a majority of faculty eligible to vote on the case (see Appendix A; double-blind balloting is mandatory) is required for any reappointment.

#### 3.3.1 A **full review**, which is conducted by a faculty committee, requires the preparation of a dossier that includes the following:

- a personal statement no longer than 10 double-spaced pages, 12 point font, 1 inch margins
- CV--annotated
- copies of annual job descriptions
- copies of some of the products of scholarship
- summary of teaching evaluations (including students' written comments)
- for each course taught, the overall GPA for grades awarded
- reports of observations of teaching (responsibility of review committee)
- letters from internal and external referees (as appropriate and/or required by the faculty committee)

Observations of teaching are arranged by the faculty review committee. For assistant professors of the practice, six teaching observations involving at least three observers and at least three different class sessions, some of which are for different courses, are required. For associate and full professors, four observations by at least two observers in two different classes are required. The department chair or the department faculty review committee can, however, determine that additional teaching observations are necessary.

#### 3.3.2 An **expedited review** is conducted by the faculty member's department chair, who considers teaching evaluations and the faculty member's current CV with highlighted items that have been added since the previous review. An expedited review can occur only at specific points, as described in the following sections on review procedures for assistant, associate, and professors of the practice. An expedited review does not suffice when a practice faculty member is being reviewed for promotion or is experiencing difficulty in fulfilling his/her role with competence.

#### 3.3.3 A **counseling letter** is sent to the faculty member after every reappointment review. The purpose of the chair's counseling letter, which is approved by the dean, is to provide realistic and detailed guidance, in an encouraging and supportive framework, to the reviewee regarding areas of strength to sustain, areas for improvement, and an evaluation of whether or not the faculty member is on track for promotion as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion.

Recommendations from the review report and the deliberations of the department faculty should be incorporated in a form that can help the reviewee redirect effort (if appropriate), better understand productivity expectations, know specific steps to be taken to further develop his/her scholarship or improve his/her teaching, and adjust involvement in service activities (if necessary). A copy of each counseling letter is included in the practice faculty member's file.

#### 3.3.4 A successful review at the assistant or associate level results in another appointment for not more than three or five years, respectively.

In consultation with the department chair, practice faculty initially renewed at the assistant or

associate level determine whether or not the next review will be for renewal only or for renewal and promotion to associate professor or professor, respectively. If the department chair and the practice faculty member determine that the next review will be for reappointment and promotion to associate professor or professor, then a full review will be required.

If the department chair and the practice faculty member determine that the next review will be for reappointment but not for promotion, the next review may be an expedited review if performance is strong.

Assistant professors of the practice must complete a full review at least every other review for reappointment. Associate professors of the practice must complete a full review at least every third term (and in their first term if their initial appointment was at the associate level). The department chair may require a full review for any renewal.

- 3.3.5 A successful initial review at the professor level results in another appointment for not more than five years. Professors of the practice must complete a full review at least every third term (and in their first term if their initial appointment was at that level). The department chair may require a full review for any renewal.

### 3.4 Promotion reviews

Approval by a majority of faculty eligible to vote on the case (see Appendix A; double-blind balloting is mandatory) is required for advancing the case for promotion.

#### 3.4.1 Promotion Reviews

Assistant and associate professors of the practice who will have completed a minimum of six and four years respectively, including experience at other institutions (if negotiated at the time of appointment as counting toward the minimum year requirement), can, with agreement of the department chair, request review for promotion. Review for promotion can occur in conjunction with a scheduled reappointment review or independently of a scheduled review (i.e. with the concurrence of the department chair, review for promotion may be requested prior to the time of the next scheduled review). As noted above, all promotion reviews must be full (committee conducted) reviews.

At any time during the review process, the candidate may choose to withdraw from consideration.

- 3.4.2 Promotion dossier — The promotion dossier must contain an inclusive and complete curriculum vitae, references from external peers, and sufficient documentation to support the criteria for scholarship, teaching and service as outlined above. Appendix D contains a summary of the dossier.

- 3.4.2.1 The **candidate** is responsible for providing the departmental review committee with documentation to give an accurate perspective on his/her activities both within and outside of the College community. Such materials should include:

- a personal statement no longer than 10 double-spaced pages, 12 point font, 1 inch margins
- CV
- copies of annual job descriptions
- copies of some of the products of scholarship

The department provides or verifies:

- summary of teaching evaluations (including students' written comments)
- for each course taught, the GPA of grades awarded

When preparing materials to document excellence in teaching, the candidate presents evidence that his or her teaching is highly effective. Since the judgment of teaching quality must be context

dependent, it is the responsibility of the candidate to highlight the areas (e.g., classroom teaching, student supervision) that best demonstrate his/her effectiveness in teaching. Evidence is not limited to, but should include, if appropriate, information about the following activities:

- Classroom instruction, with descriptive information that indicates the number of courses taught and their enrollments, the type (e.g., seminars, practica, large classes) and level of courses taught, and student evaluations. (Colleague observations are arranged by the review committee.)
  - Learning and accomplishments of students (e.g., conduct of research, implementation of school curriculum, publications) as evidenced through the candidate's self-report, student projects, reports and/or publications, and testimonials from past students.
  - Research guidance, with statements that identify the nature of the candidate's interaction with and support for students completing advanced degrees. The candidate could indicate how s/he has supported the student's research or training projects. Opinion statements from students and colleagues can be submitted to document the candidate's contributions.
  - Instructional improvement and innovations, including textbooks or other publication or software that are used to enhance instruction, course materials, and grants to support instruction.
  - Student advising, with statements that indicate how the candidate has assisted students in achieving educational goals and counseled students to be responsible members of the University and their chosen profession.

3.4.2.2 The **departmental review committee** is responsible for adding to this file at least six letters from referees external to the University. At least three letters are solicited from a list of referees proposed by the candidate. The remaining letters, but at least three, are solicited from a list of external reviewers proposed by the committee. All referees need to be approved by the dean before letters are sought. External referees should include well-regarded university faculty members with relevant scholarly interests and expertise as well as other persons who can attest to the quality of the candidate's programmatic and practice contributions. The referees should be selected not only on the basis of their credentials and relevance, but also because their reviews would be expected to be unbiased. The referees should have no professional or personal interest in the candidate's promotion (e.g., not a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-author, classmate, former colleague).

Relationships, if any, between the candidate and the referees should be indicated in the biographical descriptions of the referees included in the candidate's dossier.

Letters from external reviewers are requested by the department chair. Names of the final panel of reviewers and the letters submitted by the reviewers are not available to the candidate during either the Vanderbilt review or appeal process, absent any legal proceedings. Letters should contain evaluative information consistent with section 3.2 of this document and the *Faculty Manual*.

Using a letter template available from the Peabody Dean's Office, the department is to inform external reviewers of: (a) the procedure used to select reviewers, (b) the policy precluding the candidate's access to reviewers' letters, and (c) the policy limiting access to those College and University members involved in the actual review process.

3.4.2.3 The **departmental review committee** also arranges for the candidate's teaching to be observed. For assistant professors of the practice, six teaching observations involving at least three observers and at least three class sessions, some of which are for different courses, are required. For associate and full professors, four observations by at least two observers in two different classes are required. The department chair or the departmental faculty review committee can, however, determine that additional teaching observations are necessary. Reports from the observers (in the form of memoranda) are sent to the committee.

3.4.3 Evaluation of each candidate's professional qualifications for promotion occurs sequentially at three levels: the candidate's department of primary appointment; the dean of Peabody College, who is

advised by Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee; and the provost of the University.

#### 3.4.3.1 Department-level review (see also Appendix B)

A departmental review committee is formed by the chair with the advice of his or her faculty and in consultation with the dean. In cases where the candidate's teaching and/or research transcend the department of primary appointment, one or more persons from other departments are asked to serve on the review committee.

Unsolicited letters from faculty members outside the department or school will be included in the candidate's file only if they are provided for review by the eligible voting faculty prior to the vote.

The review committee assembles the evidence and submits a report to the eligible voting faculty. After all members of the department who are eligible to vote on the matter (see Appendix A) have had the opportunity to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the candidate's file, a meeting of the eligible voting faculty is held, the case discussed, and a vote is taken with double-blind balloting (see Appendix A). (Abstentions are counted as a negative vote.) A positive recommendation by an absolute majority of those eligible to vote is required for an affirmative decision. The majority decision should be reported to the faculty; however, no specific vote tallies should be shared.

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 for inclusion in the candidate's file expressing his or her views on the deliberations by the faculty. These letters are made available to all faculty members who are eligible to vote to review and comment upon.

The department must prepare minutes or a summary of the faculty deliberations that will be added to the candidate's file after first being circulated to the eligible voting members of the faculty for verification. 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 before the end of the second working day after distribution of the minutes or summary.

All such letters will be made available for review by the faculty eligible to vote and will be included in the candidate's file.

The department chair writes a letter of transmittal that reports his or her: (1) views of the full range of faculty deliberations, including the vote, (2) own analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the case, and (3) independent recommendation. Within ten business days of the vote, the department chair's letter and the candidate's file are forwarded to the dean, who shares them with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee.

In the event of a negative decision, the candidate must be notified in writing in a timely manner, ordinarily within one business day. If the candidate chooses to appeal the negative vote, s/he may then submit a statement for inclusion in the file to be transmitted to the dean.

#### 3.4.3.2 College-level review—Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee (see section 2.3.2.2)

#### 3.4.3.3 The dean's review

If the department's recommendation is positive, the dean will consult with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee as detailed above. Following such consultation, the dean may recommend the candidate for promotion, or may decline to do so. If the dean decides to recommend promotion, the dean will prepare a letter to accompany the file explaining the reasons for the recommendation and forward to the provost's office.

Should the dean decide not to endorse the positive recommendation of the department, the dean

should provide a written rationale to the eligible voting faculty in the department who may appeal this decision to the provost.

Upon receipt of a negative departmental recommendation, the dean may either accept the departmental decision or return it to the department for reconsideration. With regard to the latter, the department can choose to either reaffirm or change its recommendation. The dean, however, may decide to accept a negative decision or recommend the candidate to the provost. For either scenario, the dean would consult with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee before rendering a decision.

Practice faculty members who are promoted are reappointed for a term of no more than five years. A practice faculty member whose review for promotion is denied may be reappointed at his/her current rank.

#### **4. Reappointment and promotion of lecturers**

The term lecturer is used here to denote lecturer, senior lecturer, and principal senior lecturer except where criteria are different for each level.

##### **4.1 Procedures for reappointment**

The first review of lecturers with multi-year appointments commences in the next to last appointment year. Subsequent reviews are conducted in the middle of the next to last year of the appointment term.

Lecturers will be notified of renewal or non-renewal as early as possible, and in any case, prior to April 1st. Senior lecturers and principal senior lecturers will be notified of renewal or non-renewal prior to June 1 of the last year of their current appointment. A senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer who is not renewed for an additional term will have one year remaining in his/her current appointment.

##### **4.2 Criteria for reappointment**

The performance of lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal senior lecturers will be evaluated by criteria consistent with the summary of duties provided at the time of hire or during the most recent term of appointment or review. These factors may include, but are not limited to: (a) teaching, (b) student advisement, (c) program development, (d) service, and (e) administration.

Specific weighting of factors will be indicated at the time of appointment, reviewed annually in consultation with appointees, and confirmed in a letter from the department chair to the lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal senior lecturer not later than May 31st of each year.

A copy of each feedback letter must be included in the faculty member's file.

##### **4.3 Reappointment Reviews**

Lecturers may undergo a full review or an expedited review. Approval by a majority of faculty eligible to vote on the case (see Appendix A; double-blind balloting is mandatory) is required for reappointment.

- 4.3.1 Typically, a **lecturer's** contract renewal is based upon an expedited review (see section 3.3.2, above) conducted by the chair of the department followed by a faculty vote. The review should include consideration of teaching ratings, as well as comments of advisees and faculty colleagues. Each lecturer's performance evaluation must take into account the weighting of criteria specified in

the summary of duties mentioned above. Because the maximum length of a lecturer's appointment is one year, expedited reviews of performance occur annually, with a full (committee conducted) review every five years.

- 4.3.1.1 Lecturers appointed for more than half-time service will be subject to a committee-conducted reappointment review every five years (see section 3.3.1). The purposes of this review include reappointment, reconsideration of the lecturer's role in the department, and counseling with regard to the potential pursuit of promotion. A full review should be conducted every five years thereafter or at the time of application for promotion. Committee conducted reviews should include at least three letters from referees selected based on their relevance to the lecturer's duties. Referees may be from within or outside the lecturer's program or department. The committee should take into account examination of syllabi and a (maximum) five-page doubled spaced statement documenting the lecturer's contributions to the well-being of students, the life of the department, and to the university community. Observations of teaching are required, with the process being the same as for practice faculty.

The results of the performance evaluation and the department chair's recommendation are summarized in a letter to the dean, who decides whether to accept the recommendation as presented. Full reviews are forwarded to the College review committee.

All reappointments must be approved by the provost (or his or her designee).

- 4.3.2 A **senior lecturer** or **principal senior lecturer** must undergo a full review (see section 3.3.1) no later than the next to last year of his or her first appointment. This review is conducted by a faculty committee appointed by the department chair in consultation with the dean. Each performance evaluation must take into account the weighting of criteria specified in the summary of duties mentioned above and, at a minimum, must include consideration of teaching ratings, feedback from advisees, observations of teaching, and comments of faculty colleagues. If the faculty member's duties include administrative responsibilities, the performance evaluation also must take into account feedback from persons who are knowledgeable about performance in this role. The review committee presents its report to the faculty of the department who are eligible to vote on the reappointment.

Beginning after the first reappointment, expedited performance reviews (conducted by the department chair) alternate with full reviews. As with practice faculty, every third review should be a full review. Reappointment requires approval by a simple majority of the department's eligible voting faculty (See Appendix A for eligibility). Double-blind balloting (see Appendix A) is required.

The department chair forwards the review report (if a committee was involved), the results of the faculty vote, and his or her own recommendation and supporting rationale to the dean, who decides whether to accept the recommendation as presented. Full reviews are forwarded to the College review committee. The provost (or his or her designee) must approve all reappointments at the level of senior or principal senior lecturer.

- 4.3.3 Lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal senior lecturers who are reappointed after a committee conducted review must be provided (typically, by the department chair) a detailed counseling letter providing formative feedback that facilitates the faculty member's professional development. This counseling letter should identify areas of strength to sustain, areas for improvement, and, if applicable, an evaluation of whether or not the faculty member is on track for promotion and what the faculty member would need to accomplish in order to be a strong candidate for promotion. This letter needs to be approved by the dean.

#### 4.4 Procedures for promotion

The procedural steps for promotion to senior lecturer or principal senior lecturer follow the procedures for promotion of a practice faculty member described above in section 3.4.

- 4.4.1 A **candidate** for promotion to senior lecturer should have accumulated a record of excellent teaching, success in advising students, substantial contributions to academic program development, satisfactory service, and (if applicable) effective administration.

While positive professional impact beyond Vanderbilt University is not a prerequisite for promotion to senior lecturer, indications of such impact are regarded as further evidence of eligibility for promotion.

The promotion review is conducted by a faculty committee appointed by the department chair in consultation with the dean. The review must take into account the weighting of criteria specified in the summary of duties mentioned above.

A **full review**, which is conducted by a faculty committee, requires the preparation of a dossier that includes the following:

- a personal statement no longer than 5 double-spaced pages, 12 point, 1 inch margins
- CV
- copies of annual job descriptions
- copies of some of the products of scholarship
- summary of teaching evaluations (including students' written comments)
- for each course taught, the GPA of grades awarded
- feedback from advisees
- letters from internal reviewers regarding performance in administrative roles (if applicable), program development, and special assignments
- scholarly products directly related to duties as lecturer
- report of observations of teaching
- letters from internal and possibly external referees (as appropriate and/or required by the faculty committee, e.g., to confirm the faculty member's effectiveness in working with personnel in outside organizations or other professional impact outside Vanderbilt)

Six teaching observations involving at least three observers and at least three different classes are required. The department chair or the departmental faculty review committee can, however, determine that additional teaching observations are necessary.

The names of at least three prospective letter writers—internal and, if applicable, external—shall be determined by the review committee, some of whom can be based on the suggestions of the candidate, and should be submitted to the dean for approval. A standard template (supplied by the Dean's Office) must be used for the cover letter that accompanies materials (e.g., candidate's statement, CV, scholarly products, if applicable) distributed to reviewers.

The review committee presents its report to the departmental faculty who are eligible to vote on the promotion (see Appendix A). Double-blind balloting (see Appendix A) is required.

The department chair forwards the review committee report, the results of the faculty vote, and his or her own recommendation to the dean, who, after consultation with Peabody's Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee, decides whether to accept the recommendation as presented.

- 4.4.2 A **candidate** for promotion to principal senior lecturer must have accumulated an extensive record of teaching at the highest level of quality, success in advising students, substantial contributions to academic program development, satisfactory service, and (if applicable) effective administration. While positive professional impact beyond Vanderbilt University is not a prerequisite for promotion to principal senior lecturer, indications of such impact are regarded as further evidence of eligibility

for promotion.

The promotion review is conducted as described in the previous section except that six referee letters are required. Refer to Appendix A for who is eligible to vote.

## **5. Reappointment and promotion of research faculty**

### **5.1 Procedures for reappointment**

Persons holding research titles are expected to conduct research and publish at the same levels of excellence as are persons at equivalent stages of appointment and rank on the tenure track. Performance of research faculty in non-research roles may be considered in evaluating performance. However, significant responsibilities other than research should be approved by the dean. Reappointments will be based on the candidate's performance as a researcher and, when appropriate, satisfactory performance in his/her negotiated non-research role(s).

- 5.1.1 Notice of nonrenewal of the appointment will normally be given to the research (rank) professor at least six months before the end of the appointment. If renewal depends upon obtaining contract or grant funds still in doubt at that time, the notice may be that the University intends not to renew the appointment unless the funds are obtained.

### **5.2 Procedures for promotion**

Promotion reviews for research faculty follow the procedures, at the college level, for tenure-track faculty. Only the candidate's scholarship and service are examined unless consideration of other non-research roles (e.g., teaching, administration) has been agreed upon prior to the review. The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) is not involved in the review process for research faculty, and approval of the Board of Trust is not required.

6. **Grievances arising from review, reappointment, and/or promotion procedures** may be filed in accordance with the process described in the Vanderbilt University Faculty Manual (Part IV, Chapter 2, Section A). A faculty member who is considering filing a grievance should read Chapter 2 carefully and especially note the following requirements:

A grievance arising from a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion cannot be considered unless a written notice of intention to file a grievance is submitted within thirty days after a faculty member is notified in writing of the completion of the full review process for reappointment, tenure or promotion.

Such notices are filed with the Process Chair of the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Grievance Process of the Faculty Senate. The notice must identify the person or persons against whom the grievance will be directed, and must include a summary of the basis of the grievance. The complete grievance must be filed in writing with the Process Chair within sixty days of the written notification of the faculty member that the full review process for appointment, tenure, or promotion has been completed.

Prior to filing a grievance, a potential grievant may consult informally with the Process Chair concerning the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Grievance Process and possible alternative approaches to the resolution of the matter giving rise to the grievance. Some disputes may be resolved satisfactorily at this informal consultation stage. The informal consultation process, however, does not relieve a potential grievant from the time requirements for filing a grievance.

## **Appendix A**

### **Voting Eligibility and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions**

(Proposed by Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council, Spring 2014;  
Approved by Peabody Faculty Council, January 26, 2015)

Few, if any, actions shape the future of Peabody College more than decisions about faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions. The composition of our community of scholars defines our capabilities, strongly influences collective priorities, and ultimately determines our trajectory. Accordingly, it is essential to make these decisions as carefully as possible, basing them upon the judgment of faculty members who are in a position to evaluate the professional accomplishments of colleagues under consideration. Several principles guide the determination of eligibility to vote and procedures for voting:

1. In general, eligibility to vote on *appointment* is vested in faculty members *at or above* the rank to which the person hired is to be appointed. Eligibility to vote on reappointment or promotion is vested in faculty members *above* the present rank of the person to be reappointed or promoted. For example, only associate professors and professors are eligible to vote on the reappointment or tenure decision of an assistant professor; however, assistant professors may vote on the new appointment of an assistant professor.
2. If there is no rank above the rank that is the subject of the vote, then those at the subject rank are eligible to vote. For example, professors of the practice are eligible to vote on the reappointment of a professor of the practice.
3. Because personnel decisions have long-term ramifications, those who vote should have a long-range perspective by virtue of the type of faculty position they occupy. Accordingly, persons with faculty titles limited to one-year or temporary appointments (e.g., Lecturer, Visiting Professor), in the last year of a terminal (non-renewed) contract, or with part-time appointments (less than 50%) do not vote on faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions. This restriction does not apply to persons with full-status partial-load appointments, as defined in the Vanderbilt Faculty Manual.
4. If a positive reappointment vote would imply satisfactory progress toward the accumulation of a record that is likely to lead to a successful tenure review, then only those who will be eligible to vote on tenure are eligible to vote on the reappointment. Thus, only tenured faculty members are eligible to vote on the reappointment of a non-tenured tenure-track assistant professor.
5. Faculty members must be free to cast their independent votes without fear of retribution.

#### Position Offers (Appointments)

All multi-year position offers require the approval of a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty of the department(s) in which the prospective faculty member will be appointed. Voting members of the Peabody College faculty are those persons holding at least half-time, multi-year appointments in Peabody College with the titles of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor; Instructor in the Practice, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the

Practice, and Professor of the Practice; Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor; Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor; and Senior Lecturer and Principal Senior Lecturer; but without the prefixes Adjoint, Adjunct, or Visiting. Eligibility for voting is defined in the table below. The eligible voting faculty (EVF) varies depending upon the rank and track of the faculty member under consideration.

Depending upon the rank and tenure status of the offer to be recommended to the dean, one or more votes may be required.

Tenure-track and tenured positions. Approval by a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty (see below) is required to recommend appointment to the dean. Depending upon the rank to be recommended, the following votes are required:

1. An offer at the rank of instructor or assistant professor (tenure-track, without tenure) requires approval by a simple majority of the tenure-stream faculty. An advisory vote can be taken by all faculty on multi-year appointments before the tenure-stream faculty vote.
2. An offer at the rank of associate professor with tenure requires approval by a simple majority of the tenured faculty following an optional and advisory only vote of all faculty on multi-year appointments.
3. An offer at the rank of professor with tenure requires approval by a simple majority of two groups following an optional and advisory vote of all faculty on multi-year appointments:
  - a. The tenured faculty (including associate professors)
  - b. The tenured professors

Multi-year non-tenure-track positions. Approval by a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty is required to recommend appointment to the dean.

Figure 1 summarizes which faculty members, by title, are eligible to participate in the votes required for various position offers. As noted above, single-year appointments (e.g., Lecturer, Visiting Professor for one year only) may be recommended to the dean without a faculty vote.

Figure 1. Voting Eligibility for Position Offers

Position Offered	Title of Potential Voter											
	Tenure Track			Practice/Clinical			Research			Snr		Pr Snr
	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Lect	Lect	Lect
NT TT Instructor	X	X	X									
NT TT Assistant	X	X	X									
Tenured Associate		X	X									
Tenured Professor*			X									
Distinguished Professor*			X									
P/C Instructor	X	X	X	X	X	X						
P/C Assistant	X	X	X	X	X	X						
P/C Associate		X	X		X	X						
P/C Professor			X			X						
Research Assistant	X	X	X				X	X	X			
Research Associate		X	X					X	X			
Research Professor			X						X			
Lecturer	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X
Senior Lecturer	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
Principal	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
Senior Lec. Visiting	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Assistant Visiting		X	X		X	X		X	X			
Associate Visiting			X			X			X			
Professor												

NT = Nontenured

TT = Tenure Track

P/C = Practice/Clinical

\*Vote to offer this rank follows vote to offer tenure, with tenured associate professors participating.

## Reappointments

Approval by a simple majority of eligible voters is required for reappointment. Figure 2 summarizes voting eligibility for reappointment decisions.

Figure 2. Voting Eligibility for Reappointment Decisions

Reappointment of:	Title of Potential Voter											
	Tenure Track			Practice/Clinical			Research			Snr Pr Snr		
	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Lect	Lect	Lect
NT TT Assistant		X	X									
P/C Instructor		X	X	X	X	X						
P/C Assistant		X	X		X	X						
P/C Associate		X	X			X						
P/C Professor		X	X			X						
Research Assistant		X	X					X	X			
Research Associate			X						X			
Research Professor			X						X			
Lecturer	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
Senior Lecturer	X	X	X	X	X	X						X
Pr. Senior Lecturer	X	X	X	X	X	X						X

NT = Nontenured  
 TT = Tenure Track  
 P/C = Practice/Clinical

Promotions

Approval by a simple majority of eligible voters is required for candidacy for promotion to go forward to the dean. Figure 3 indicates which titles are eligible to vote on various promotions. Promotions from instructor have been excluded because they usually are automatic upon completion of the doctorate by those few individuals appointed to tenure-track, clinical, or practice faculty positions prior to completion of their doctoral programs.

Figure 3. Voting Eligibility for Promotion Decisions

Promotion Subject to Vote	Title of Potential Voter											
	Tenure Track			Practice/Clinical			Research			Snr Pr Snr		
	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Asst	Assoc	Prof	Lect	Lect	Lect
TT Assistant to Associate		X	X									
Tenured Associate to Professor			X									
Tenured Professor to Distinguished			X									
P/C Assistant to Associate		X	X		X	X						
P/C Associate to Professor		X	X			X						
Research Assistant to Associate		X	X				X	X	X			
Research Associate to Professor			X						X			
Lecturer to Senior Lec.	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
Senior Lec to Principal SL	X	X	X	X	X	X						X

NT = Nontenured  
 TT = Tenure Track  
 P/C = Practice/Clinical  
 SL = Senior Lecturer

### Voting Procedures

Votes on appointment, reappointment, or promotion have great impact on the future of the department, college, and university as well as faculty members' careers. Decisions regarding faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions should be informed by the independent judgment of eligible voters expressed without fear of retribution. Faculty members should feel free to vote on a particular case as dictated by their best judgment rather than concerns about how others may react. Accordingly, votes on these high-stakes decisions must be conducted with double blind balloting to ensure preservation of anonymity.

An example of an acceptable double-blind balloting procedure is the following:

1. Ballots are printed and inserted in small, blank envelopes.
2. Each small envelope containing the ballot is inserted in a larger envelope on which the faculty member's name and a signature line appear.
3. The envelopes are distributed at the end of the meeting in which the case is discussed or are placed in faculty boxes.
4. Each faculty member marks his or her ballot in privacy, seals it in the smaller envelope, seals the smaller envelope in the outer envelope, signs the outer envelope, and returns the set to the departmental office. A submission deadline at the close of business at least one day following the meeting allows time for reflection on the discussion.
5. A staff person logs in the set, opens the outer envelope, and places the sealed inner envelope in a box.
6. A second staff person opens the inner envelopes and tallies the ballots. Abstentions are counted as a "no" vote.

Each department is asked to develop and consistently apply its own rules regarding the permissibility of absentee voting. Some departments may conclude that it is essential for each voter to be present for the discussion of a particular case in order to be eligible to vote. Others may choose to allow voting on the basis of a careful reading of the case documentation without hearing the discussion at the meeting. Whatever the procedure, it must be documented.

## Appendix B Review Checklist and Timeline

(Approximate Target Dates for Completion in Parentheses)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Departmental review committee established. (April of preceding academic year; earlier if the promotion is to tenured full professor)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Candidate supplies names, titles, brief biosketches, and contact information for six prospective external reviewers. Lecture-stream faculty can rely on internal reviewers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Review committee identifies at least six potential external reviewers and prepares brief biosketch for each. (For lecturers, internal faculty reviews may be sought.) The candidate's list and the committee's list must not overlap.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Candidate's list, the committee's list, and all biosketches submitted to Peabody Dean in a hardcopy memorandum in which the source (candidate or committee) of each name is identified. (June 1, March 1 for tenured professor promotion)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Written approval of reviewers received from Peabody Dean. (one week after submission)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Four candidate-nominated and four committee-nominated external reviewers agree to help with review. (Including one extra reviewer in each category is *strongly* recommended to help assure that the minimum of three letters from each will be achieved.) Only three letters are needed for lecture-stream faculty. Department chair makes initial contact by email or telephone; messages and/or notes of telephone conversations (including those with persons who decline to serve as reviewers) must be included in Dossier. (July 1, March 15 for tenured professor promotion)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Candidate's statement and unannotated CV received by review committee. The personal statement should be no longer than ten double-spaced pages (12-point type, 1 inch margins). (August 1, April 1 for tenured professor promotion)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Template from Dean's Office used to prepare cover letters to external reviewers (or internal reviewers in the case of lecture-stream faculty).
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Cover letters, candidate's statement, candidate's CV (unannotated version), and copies of representative publications sent to external reviewers with mid-October response deadline. For tenured professorships the response deadline needs to be August 15. (August 15 for promotion to associate professor or April 15 for professor promotions)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Additional external/internal reviewers are contacted and sent materials as may be required by failures to supply useable letters. (All received letters must, however, be included in Dossier.) *At least three, and preferably four, of the letters must be from persons selected by the review committee (2 for lectureships).*
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Candidate's statement and candidate's unannotated CV posted on Web for review by faculty. (September 15 or July 15 for tenured professor promotions)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Typewritten student comments from course evaluation forms assembled. (October 1, August 15 for tenured professor promotions)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Means and standard deviations of teaching evaluations summarized (using Excel template supplied by the assistant to the dean) and compared to departmental norms.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Candidate's teaching observed on two different occasions (new observations since previous

review needed) by two faculty members for tenure-stream faculty and three faculty members for practice and lecture-stream faculty (mid-October, mid-August for tenured professor promotions)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Review committee completes its report. (October 30, September 15 for tenured professor promotions)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Tenure dossier—excluding table of contents, chair’s memo, summary of tenured faculty’s discussion, and page numbers—assembled according to Appendix C, “Contents of Tenure Dossier”. (November 15, September 15 for tenured professor promotions)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Unsolicited letters (if any) placed in the dossier prior to its review by the faculty of the department. Only those eligible to vote may review the contents of the dossier.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Dossier (excluding the items noted above) made available for review by the eligible voting faculty 10 days prior to their meeting to consider the case.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Arrangements made for staff person or eligible voting faculty member to take minutes of the discussion of the faculty.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. Faculty meet to discuss the case.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. At the meeting, those present reminded that “By the end of the second business day after the vote, any faculty member eligible to vote may write a letter 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.” (Vanderbilt *Faculty Manual*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. Double-blind vote completed no earlier than one business day after the meeting and results tallied. The chair will inform the candidate if the vote was positive and whether the review is moving to the next stage.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. Letters (if any) from faculty regarding the deliberations placed in the Dossier.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. Minutes (narrative summary) of the faculty deliberations prepared and circulated to the faculty. Accompanying the minutes is a reminder that “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 ... before the end of the second working day after distribution of the minutes or summary. All such letters will be made available for review by the faculty eligible to vote and will be included in the dossier.” (*Faculty Manual*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Department chair writes a letter of transmittal [‘chair’s memo’] that reports his or her views of the full range of faculty deliberations. This is included in the tenure dossier. See p. 9.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. A table of contents is added.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. Tenure dossier delivered to Peabody Dean’s Office by **December 1** (firm deadline) for tenure cases, October 1 for tenured professor promotions, all others by January 1.

## **Appendix C Tenure Dossier Checklist**

(Provided by the Vice-Provost for Faculty, November 2014; Please check if it is the latest version.)

1. Dean's recommendation to the Provost: Please provide a candid and objective analysis of the strengths and the weaknesses of the candidate, as well as an explicit recommendation.
2. Candidate's appointment history: hire date, reappointment dates, and any extensions of the probationary period
3. Summary of school advisory committee's advice and counsel to the Dean (if applicable)
4. Recommendation from Department Chair to Dean (if applicable)
5. Recommendation of the Tenured Faculty
  - a. Include any report from a departmental or school evaluation committee to the tenured faculty.
  - b. Include a summary of the tenured faculty's discussion of the candidate's accomplishments and promise in research, teaching, and service.
  - c. Report the date of the meeting of the tenured faculty, the vote (in favor, against, abstaining), and the number of eligible voters (not just those present).
6. Curriculum vitae in appropriate format (e.g., scholarly work presented in clearly identified categories, full citations with published order of authorship, narrative description of the nature and the level of the candidate's contributions to each co-authored piece)
7. Teaching evaluations
  - a. Students' written comments (typed or printed from on-line evaluations)
  - b. Mean numerical ratings for all questions on the standard evaluation form
  - c. Measures of how the candidate's numerical ratings compare to other faculty members teaching the same or similar courses (e.g., means and standard deviations across faculty)
  - d. Tenure dossiers should include data for all courses taught since hire date.
8. Candidate's statement on accomplishments and plans for research, teaching, and service
9. One sample letter to external reviewers. Please do not include a copy of each such letter.
10. Names of external reviewers nominated by candidate, list of those contacted, and letters from those responding: Candidates may submit names of up to six qualified external reviewers. Not all have to be solicited for letters, but at least three letters from the candidate's list must be in the file. Although the University is obligated to use names from the candidate's list, candidates should be advised in advance about the characteristics of reviewers that will make them most credible to those who assess the file.
11. Names of external reviewers selected by department or school and letters from those responding: The dossier must contain at least three letters—and preferably more than three letters—from reviewers identified by the department or school. Reviewers selected by the department or school cannot also appear on the candidate's list. These reviewers must be leading scholars in their fields, with minimal connection to the candidate. It is expected that reviewers will have appointments at the rank of Professor, except on rare occasions. Normally, they will be selected from distinguished universities or other institutions with exemplary programs or faculty in the relevant field, preferably from those in the top twenty-five in that discipline. If exceptions to this guideline are proposed, they must be justified in the initial request to the Dean. The Dean must approve in advance all reviewers on the department's or school's list, and his or her approval must be included along with other information relevant to the selection of the reviewers.

12. Biographical information on reviewers. To keep the size of electronic files to a minimum, please do not submit the reviewer c.v.'s; rather, submit a brief paragraph or biosketch on each.
13. All correspondence with reviewers, including emails.
14. Curriculum vitae and counseling advice. Tenure files should include c.v.'s (dated) and counseling memoranda from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews.
15. Additional materials. To keep the size of electronic files to a minimum, please prepare a separate PDF for appendices (i.e., publications). These materials should be listed in the Table of Contents.

**Appendix D**  
**Contents of Practice, Clinical, or Lecture Faculty Dossier**

(Proposed by Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council, Spring 2014;  
Approved by Peabody Faculty Council October 14, 2014)

The dossier for any practice or clinical faculty member who is subject to a full (committee conducted) review for reappointment or promotion should include in a format as similar to a tenure dossier as possible:

- **Review report** (prepared by committee) and including: the faculty member's terminal degree, year earned, institution, and area(s) of study; postdoctoral study/employment history prior to joining the Vanderbilt faculty; year and semester of initial appointment to Vanderbilt faculty; beginning and ending dates of current appointment; details of any leaves (e.g., due to illness or pregnancy) during current appointment; summary of duties; evaluation of teaching and program contributions; evaluation of service to the program, department, university and practice community; scholarly and professional foci as well as quality and significance of scholarly production during current appointment, and recommendations for reappointment and/or promotion.
- **Summary report of faculty discussion** and vote by faculty eligible to vote on the case. (See Appendix A of Procedural Guidelines for Appointment, Renewal, Promotion and Tenure available on-line at <http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/admin-offices/deans-office/college-policies/index.php> )
- **Chair's memorandum**, including the results of the vote, the chair's independent analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the case, and a recommendation regarding term of reappointment (a three year term is standard for assistant professors of the practice; a five year term is standard for associates and professors).
- **Draft of chair's counseling letter**
- **Supporting documentation:**
  1. Faculty member's statement (10 maximum pages, double-spaced, 12 point font, 1 inch margins)
  2. Faculty member's Curriculum Vitae
  3. Faculty member's duties (extracted from appointment letter or other source). It is NOT appropriate to include the entire appointment letter and salary information in the file reviewed by eligible voting faculty.
  4. Copies of publications and manuscripts (if any) completed at Vanderbilt during current term of appointment only.
  5. Summary of teaching evaluations, including students' written comments (typewritten)
  6. Reports from faculty members who have observed the faculty member's teaching
  7. Other evaluation(s) of teaching (optional)
  8. Letters from internal and external referees. *For reappointment*, optional letters from internal and (if applicable) external referees may be included to document the faculty member's work but are not required and do not need prior approval.

N.B. *For promotion*, six letters from external referees must be obtained *by the committee* (three for lecture-stream faculty and they may be from internal faculty reviewers). The names and a biosketch of each prospective reviewer must be submitted to the dean before letters from them are requested, and a standard template (supplied by the Dean's Office) must be used for the cover letter that accompanies materials (candidate's statement and CV; scholarly products, if applicable) distributed to reviewers.

9. Additional materials. To keep the size of electronic files to a minimum, please prepare a separate PDF for appendices (i.e., publications). These materials should be listed in the Table of Contents.

**Notes to guide candidate's and committee's preparation of materials:**

*Teaching evaluations.* For each course taught during the current appointment, means and standard deviations of all course evaluation questionnaire items must be reported along with students' written comments (typewritten). Please use the Excel template available from the assistant to the dean. The review report should focus on items 4, 7, and 9. Please clarify any anomalous results and supplement questionnaire data with appropriate additional information, including evaluations of the faculty member's syllabi.

*Teaching observations.* As stipulated by the *Guidelines for Appointment, Review, and Promotion*, six observations of the teaching of assistant level practice and clinical faculty are required. For associate and full practice and clinical faculty, four observations of teaching are required. Observations should be made by 3(2) faculty on 3(2) different occasions. The department chair or departmental review committee can, however, determine that additional teaching observations are necessary.

*Referees (optional for reappointment).* Neither internal nor external letters are required for reappointment but may be included. Internal referees might, for example, include persons who have carefully reviewed a manuscript produced by the faculty member, who have collaborated with the faculty member, or who have experienced the faculty member as a mentor or teacher. External referees might, for example, include relevant school personnel or other persons who have worked with the faculty member. However, the dossier of candidates for promotion must include at least six letters from external referees approved by the dean and solicited by the committee or three internal letters in the case of lectureships.

*Summary of discussion in meeting where vote was taken.* This should include the issues that were raised and the strengths and weaknesses of the case that were noted. Attribution of remarks to individual persons at the meeting should not be made.

*Counseling letter.* The purpose of the chair's counseling letter is to provide detailed and formative feedback that assists the practice or clinical faculty member in his/her professional development. This shall include areas of strength to sustain, areas for improvement, and an evaluation of whether or not the practice or clinical faculty member is on track for promotion, as well as guidelines for achievements necessary for promotion. Copies of formative feedback letters must be included in faculty members' files.

*Revised 1-29-16*