

9. FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

For reappointment, promotion and tenure processes, Thayer generally follows the Faculty Handbook of the Arts and Sciences, with modest exceptions, given the differing organizational and operational structures of Thayer. Thayer's processes are detailed in subsequent sections herein, and candidates additionally are encouraged to read the Faculty Handbook of the Arts and Sciences.

The following performance and evaluation criteria will be used for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, and the awarding of tenure for all categories of appointments at all ranks, as applicable, with notable exceptions or additions explained in the subsequent sections.

A. Expectations of Performance

This subsection supplements the "Expectations of Performance" subsections in the A&S Faculty Handbook. These "expectations of performance" or relevant sub-sections will be provided to any reviewers and the Committee Advisory to the President (CAP), as applicable.

Reappointment, promotion and tenure recommendations are based on demonstrated achievements and the reliable indication of future contributions of the faculty member in research, teaching, and service, as applicable, depending on the category of the appointment and rank. These contributions are evaluated according to the criteria described in the sections below. The decision to reappoint, promote and/or tenure a faculty member involves judgment based on an individual's record at the time of the decision. Candidates for reappointment on the tenure-track or for promotion to Associate or Full Professor with tenure must demonstrate capacity to continue to be a productive and contributing member of the faculty as a teacher-scholar for the duration of their career. Additionally, these candidates should demonstrate a commitment to service within the Thayer and Dartmouth community through committee work and/or special assignments, and by distinguished service to the profession. Candidates for reappointment on the research-track or promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Full Professor must demonstrate capacity to be a productive and contributing member of the faculty and the profession as a research scholar for the duration of their career. Other activities such as teaching or service may be considered in the promotion of research faculty although not as heavily emphasized. Candidates for reappointment on the instructional-track or promotion to Instructional Associate Professor or Instructional Full Professor must demonstrate capacity to be a productive and contributing member of the faculty as an educator in the classroom and which likely includes participation in service activities. Scholarly research or other activities may be considered for the promotion of instructional faculty, as appropriate. As applicable, candidates for promotion and/or tenure should demonstrate progress that has resulted in recognition by faculty outside of Dartmouth within academia and/or by other professionals in their field of equivalent status to that of an accomplished faculty member.

Evaluation of research and scholarship

Research excellence is demonstrated through quality scholarship (e.g. publications), growth of and sustained levels of productivity, success in recruiting and mentoring graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows, and success in building an externally-funded research program.

Scholarship criteria may include the following:

- Creativity of ideas, methodologies, and discoveries;
- Innovative/quality contributions or approaches to important new or existing problems;
- Reputation, expertise, and recognition in a field;
- Evidence of impact by (a) the translation of scientific discoveries or engineering creations into patents, licenses, and startups; and/or (b) influence on the field such as through the creation of products, including devices, systems, databases, software, and models.

Evaluation of scholarship and impact is largely based on the testimony and judgment of professionals outside of the College, as well as that of Dartmouth colleagues. While the qualitative assessment of scholarship holds more weight than the quantity of work, the quantity of scholarly work must indicate significant progress since joining the faculty and must demonstrate a sustained professional trajectory. External referees in the candidate's field include arms-length individuals nominated by the candidate, and arms-length referees nominated by the review committee, as described below. Generally, these external referees are academic peers at the senior level, including chaired professors, although in some instances other equivalent professionals, such as leaders in national laboratories, or medical researchers may be appropriate. Thayer faculty recognize that each field differs in the "quantity" of publications and publication venues, with some fields favoring journal publications, and others placing high value on rigorously peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Thayer faculty therefore considers each candidate as an individual. Nonetheless, the expectation is that candidates will seek to publish and be recognized in the highest quality journals and conference proceedings.

Evaluation of teaching and mentoring/advising

As leaders in education, candidates for tenure and/or promotion with a requirement to teach must be effective teachers and mentors. Teaching and mentoring may comprise classroom instruction, engagement with undergraduate students through mentored research opportunities, participating in capstone project advising, and/or student advising. All candidates who teach in the classroom must consistently demonstrate strong teaching skills and/or marked improvement from offering to offering.

Tenure line faculty are expected to contribute to teaching and mentoring both at the undergraduate and graduate level, and at the time of tenure review, they are expected to have taught at least one undergraduate core course several times. Additionally, tenure line candidates should be teaching upper-level undergraduate and/or graduate courses within their specialty. In some cases, a candidate may develop new courses or new laboratories for specific courses as part of their teaching, all of which are considered in the teaching evaluation.

Tenure line and research faculty candidates are expected to serve as primary advisor (or have served as primary advisor) to Ph.D. candidates, M.S. candidates, and postdoctoral fellows. While no "formula" applies, it is expected that the candidate is building a research group whose composition and size is consistent with the research funding attracted and similar to their peers in overlapping fields. By the tenure year, generally candidates have graduated at least one Ph.D. student.

Teaching and mentoring/advising criteria may include, but are not limited to:

- Ability to design, organize, and deliver courses that contribute to the learning objectives of the course and the overall goals of the degree program;
- Indicators of ongoing efforts to make teaching decisions based on evidence and to improve teaching and instruction.
- Ability to develop new courses and course materials within an area of specialization;
- Demonstration of innovation in the classroom;
- A demonstrated commitment to all students' learning;
- Ability to engender enthusiasm for the subject;
- Effectiveness as a teacher, mentor, and advisor to students at all levels and from all backgrounds;
- For core courses with multiple sections, ability to coordinate, cooperate, and provide general consistency between offerings.

Teaching and mentoring evaluation is partially based on student testimony derived from both course evaluations and anonymous letters solicited from students (undergraduate, BE, MEM, and graduate students as applicable given courses taught), graduate advisees, and postdoctoral fellow advisees at the promotion/tenure decision time. Additionally, evaluation should include classroom observation, review of self-assessments, course syllabi, and other published course materials. The candidate may also provide an exposition of resources used, e.g., use of DCAL resources, attendance in DCAL workshops, attendance in national workshops, such as NETI, and other professional development in teaching.

Service to Thayer, Dartmouth College, and the profession

The Thayer School of Engineering and Dartmouth College rely on a shared governance model described in Section 5. Every tenure line and instructional faculty member is expected to serve on Thayer committees and working groups (or the equivalent), and college committees and councils when called upon, with a level of effort consistent with rank and in consideration for their responsibilities to teaching and research. Service assignments for assistant professors are made to engage their talents while not placing an overwhelming burden on their time. As faculty members move through the ranks, service expectations increase over time.

In weighing the performance of a candidate beyond scholarship and teaching in what is traditionally termed service, emphasis will be placed on the nature and quality of the contributions. Service may include but is not limited to: Thayer and Dartmouth committees, program administration, mentoring roles, participation in shared governance, initiatives with students or student groups beyond instructional obligations, and assistance to other colleagues in research and teaching. Meaningful engagement that adheres to high professional standards of behavior and conduct is expected. In addition, a candidate's service to the wider profession is considered, e.g., as a member of and contributor to professional science and engineering societies, acting as journal editor, serving on editorial boards, organizing conferences, and serving as a reviewer for funding agencies.

B. Extension and postponement of reappointment, promotion, or tenure

This subsection supplements the “Extension and postponement” subsections in the A&S Faculty Handbook.

Faculty members with an approved maternity or paternity leave are allowed an extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock. Specifically, for each child associated with an approved maternity or paternity leave, a faculty member is automatically granted an extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock by one year. Additionally, Thayer’s practice has been to allow an extension for faculty members who forego official maternity or paternity leave, although such requests must be approved by the Provost (for tenure-track faculty only). Faculty members who opt to forego an automatic extension should notify the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development in writing.

Faculty members with an approved medical leave are allowed an extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock in a given academic year. For example, a faculty member with an approved one-term medical leave will be granted a one-year extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock. A faculty member with two approved terms of medical leave in a given academic year (July 1 to June 30) will also be granted a one-year extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock. A faculty member with approved medical leaves in two different academic years will be granted a two-year extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock. Like maternity or paternity leave, this extension is automatically granted unless the faculty member requests in writing to forego the extension.

Faculty members with approved maternity or paternity and medical leaves in the same academic year will be granted a one-year extension of the reappointment/promotion/tenure clock but may request an additional extension by writing to the Dean who will consult with the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development on the request. The Provost grants final approval (for tenure-track faculty only).

Individuals with extenuating circumstances due to health, personal or family matters, or professional exigencies that impose special and arduous burdens or impediments may request a postponement of the tenure review, with a concomitant extension of the existing contract. The individual should present the request to the Dean, in writing. The Dean may elect to consult with the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development or other faculty members in deciding to grant the request. For tenure-track faculty, the request must be approved by the CAP. (In contrast to Arts and Sciences, all tenured members do not vote on the request.)

Should an extension be automatically granted or granted by request, the extension can be taken any time prior to the year in which the tenure decision is scheduled. For example, a faculty member with an approved maternity leave prior to reappointment may use the one-year extension to delay the reappointment review year, followed by a typical period of three years prior to tenure review. Alternatively, a faculty member may choose to defer the one-year extension to the period following reappointment but prior to the tenure review, or may opt for no extension of the reappointment/tenure clock.

An extension is effectively a postponement of the review process. If after an extension is granted, the candidate decides to be considered early for reappointment/promotion/tenure, the candidate is then effectively relinquishing the extension such that it cannot be used at a later time.

C. General reappointment, promotion, and tenure process guidelines

While these general process guidelines align closely with those outlined in the A&S Faculty Handbook, these guidelines should be considered as a substitute given changes in process except where noted otherwise.

The processes for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure are outlined in the following sections, beginning with an explanation of relevant nomenclature. Administrative support for these processes is provided by staff within the Dean's Office.

Nomenclature:

- Review committee: two faculty (defined below in each sub-section) responsible for collecting information pertaining to a reappointment, tenure, or promotion case. The review committee does not make recommendations to the faculty nor the Dean but simply presents the materials at the relevant faculty meeting. The review committee is responsible for assuring that the information in the package is complete and that ambiguities are minimized. For example, if a CV does not include the dates of research awards, the review committee should bring this to the attention of the candidate and request a revised CV. This communication (e.g., email exchanges) should be documented and included in the package reviewed by the faculty.
- Reappointment committee: The eligible faculty who discuss and vote on a reappointment decision and make a recommendation to the Dean.
- Promotion committee: The eligible faculty who discuss and vote on a promotion decision and make a recommendation to the Dean.
- Tenure committee: The eligible faculty who discuss and vote on a tenure decision and make a recommendation to the Dean.
- CAP: The Committee Advisory to the President. Only promotion and tenure decisions on tenure line faculty are considered by the CAP.

External reviewers

For processes that require external reviewers, proposed reviewers should be qualified to review the candidate's scholarly work (for tenure line and research faculty) and/or educational achievements (for instructional faculty) as described in Section 9A "Expectations of Performance." Normally, the reviewers hold an appointment at the rank of Professor, or its equivalent, at a peer institution or are a recognized leader in the candidate's field. For a tenure-track/tenured case, the reviewer should hold a tenured appointment. For instructional faculty, external reviewers may have a particular focus on engineering education in higher education; for example, they may hold the equivalent of an instructional professor rank at a college or university.

External reviewers should receive:

Category and rank	Key items
Tenure-line	CV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A separate list of research awards and proposals under review • A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students 5-10 published papers of significance (identified by the candidate) Research statement Teaching statement (optional at discretion of the candidate) Summary of Expectations of Performance in research and scholarship (Section 9A)
Research	CV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate list of research awards and proposals under review A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students 5-10 published papers of significance (identified by the candidate) Research statement Summary of Expectations of Performance in research and scholarship (Section 9A)
Instructional	CV Teaching statement Service statement (if applicable) Summary of Expectations of Performance in teaching (Section 9A)

Lists provided by the candidate or review committees should include the prospective reviewers' email addresses, their fields of specialization, and a brief description of why they are particularly qualified to evaluate the dossier. The candidate should consider only arms-length reviewers and avoid recommending reviewers with a real or perceived conflict of interest, e.g., a frequent co-author or former mentor, although for research faculty, up to three letters from collaborators are allowed. Candidates should explicitly identify any potential reviewers with such real or perceived conflicts of interest. The candidate may also indicate one or two individuals whom they prefer not be considered with a brief explanation of why they should be excluded. The candidate may contact each reviewer to be sure they are available prior to finalizing their list. Subsequent to submitting the list of reviewers, the candidate should refrain from contacting external reviewers regarding any aspect of their case.

The chair of the review committee, in consultation with the other members of the committee, additionally will provide a list of arms-length reviewers, some of whom will be selected for the final list. Members of the faculty holding the rank of Professor may be consulted to generate this list. The chair of the review committee should contact arms-length reviewers to be sure they are available prior to finalizing their list.

The names of all reviewers from whom letters are requested from among the lists provided by the candidate and committee, and their evaluations, are confidential and will not be made known to

the candidate. Maintaining confidentiality is critical to the process, and the obligation to protect this confidentiality is required of all participants. Note that letters sent to external reviewers, as required by any process, should be constructed using set [templates](#).

Student letters

For tenure line and instructional faculty, when letters from students are required as part of the review process, letters should be solicited from students who enrolled in and completed one or more courses taught by the candidate. To generate this list, students are drawn randomly from rosters for classes that the candidate has taught over the past 3-5 years after excluding those who were part of an Honor Code violation, and those whose course grade was below a C+. After drawing a total of 30-50 names randomly from among all class rosters, the list is examined and adjusted for gender balance relative to enrollment and grade balance relative to grade distributions. A candidate may indicate one or two students whom they prefer not be considered with a brief explanation of why they should be excluded. The total number of excluded individuals (students or external reviewers) may not exceed two.

Any candidate may identify students who they have specially advised or interacted with professionally, e.g., as part of an undergraduate research experience, a summer internship, honor's thesis, or students selected as a Presidential Scholar, or the committee may choose to solicit letters from these students if not named by the candidate. For tenure-line and research faculty, student letters should be solicited from current and former Ph.D., M.S., and postdoctoral scholars for whom the candidate has served as primary advisor. Any student or postdoctoral scholar who has been accused by the candidate of Honor Code or research misconduct violations will be excluded from this solicitation. A candidate may indicate one or two students whom they prefer not be considered with a brief explanation of why they should be excluded as long as the total number of excluded individuals (students or external reviewers) is no more than two.

Typically, a total of 10-20 (instructional and tenure line faculty) letters from students who have taken a class from the candidate should be included in the package, but the number is highly dependent on rank, courses taught, number of students enrolled, availability of students, etc. Similarly, the number of student letters associated with research advising may vary from ~2-10 (research and tenure line faculty), largely depending on rank and appointment category. The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development should work with the review committee to ensure a sufficient number of student letters are solicited and included. Student names are redacted from letters.

The candidate will not be informed of the names of any students who are identified as part of the normal sampling process. Two different [template](#) letters should be used to solicit letters. One letter is designated for students who attended a class offered by the candidate and a second letter is designated for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars for whom the candidate has served as primary research advisor. A different letter may also be used for undergraduates whose association with the candidate is primarily as a research advisor.

Voting

Discussion on a particular reappointment, promotion and/or tenure case and associated voting eligibility are dependent on a faculty member's type of appointment and rank as described:

- Any reappointment, promotion, or tenure case associated with a tenure-track or tenured faculty member can only be voted on by members of the tenured faculty at and above the elevated rank under consideration and after a review of the reappointment, promotion, or tenure dossier.
- Any reappointment or promotion case associated with a research or instructional faculty member can only be voted on by members of the core (tenure line, research, instructional) faculty at and above the rank of the candidate under consideration, after a review of the reappointment or promotion dossier.

Discussion/Voting eligibility guidelines for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure cases

Category/rank	Track/rank eligible for discussion and vote
Reappointment as Tenure-track Assistant Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors
Reappointment as Tenure-track Associate Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors
Reappointment as Tenure-track Full Professor	Tenured Full Professors
Promotion to and tenure at rank of Associate Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors
Tenure at rank of Associate Professor	Tenured Associate and Full Professors
Tenure at rank of Full Professor	Tenured Full Professors
Promotion to rank of Full Professor (previously tenured)	Tenured Full Professors
Reappointment as Instructional/ Research Assistant Professor	Tenured and *post-in-depth review/promotion instructional and research Associate and Full Professors
In-depth review and reappointment of faculty whose initial appointment is Instructional/ Research Associate Professor	Tenured and *post-in-depth review/promotion instructional and research Associate and Full Professors
In-depth review and reappointment of faculty whose initial appointment is Instructional/ Research Full Professor	Tenured and *post-in-depth review/promotion instructional and research Full Professors

Category/rank	Track/rank eligible for discussion and vote
Promotion to Instructional/ Research Associate Professor	Tenured and *post-in-depth review/promotion instructional and research Associate and Full Professors
Promotion to Instructional/ Research Full Professor	Tenured and *post-in-depth review/promotion, instructional and research Full Professors

Note: “post-in-depth review/promotion” refers to those instructional/research faculty who have been through an in-depth review subsequent to their initial appointment and are now on a rolling appointment or those instructional/research faculty who have been promoted at Thayer.

For tenure line cases, the materials and voting outcome are then presented to the CAP following the normal tenure and promotion processes.

Faculty should vote only if they have: 1) completed a thorough review of the candidate’s file and 2) participated in the faculty discussion when materials are presented. All faculty are strongly encouraged to additionally attend the candidate’s seminar presentation or review a recording (as applicable). All reappointment, promotion, and tenure voting is conducted using an anonymous, closed-ballot (yes/no/abstain). A tie vote is effectively a vote against recommending tenure and/or promotion. The vote tally will be revealed to any voting eligible faculty member who inquires, and the Dean may choose to reveal the vote tally at a subsequent meeting of the voting eligible faculty (although the tally will not be detailed in the meeting minutes). To help preserve confidentiality, the vote tally will not be shared electronically in an email.

A vote must include no fewer than four and at least 50% of the eligible voting members who are in-residence. The Faculty Handbook of the Arts and Science guidelines apply when the voting committee consists of fewer members.

Confidentiality

The integrity and the fairness of the assessment for reappointment, promotion, and tenure depends on confidentiality. Every participant in the assessment of a candidate agrees to practice and uphold this core principle. Participants must never disclose or discuss the contents of any confidential written evaluation of a candidate with the candidate or with anyone else not authorized to access that evaluation. Similarly, participants in committee deliberations about a candidate may not disclose or discuss the contents of those deliberations with the candidate or with anyone else not authorized to receive a report of those deliberations. The practice of confidentiality is crucial to maintain professionalism, collegiality, and intellectual community at Dartmouth, as well as our reputation in the wider world.

Appeals

Thayer follows the appeal process set forth in the Faculty Handbook of the Arts and Sciences and the Organization of the General Faculty of Dartmouth College.

Overlapping process guidelines

Many of the processes used to conduct reviews for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are similar. Here, we outline the general process for all cases. Specific details about each type of review are provided in subsequent sections. Administrative support for this process is provided by staff in the Dean's Office.

1. Several months prior to the initiation of the reappointment, promotion and/or tenure process, the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development will meet with the candidate to review the procedures.
2. The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development and the Dean will assemble a review committee. The review committee is composed of two faculty members (specific qualifications are described in the following sections). Generally, the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development will ask the candidate for a short list of preferred eligible faculty to serve on the review committee. Both members should have knowledge of the candidate's research and/or teaching area, as applicable and if feasible. One member of the committee serves as the chair.
3. The Dean's Office will provide the candidate with a letter detailing the materials required to be included in the package and the timeline of expected due dates of the materials and associated actions. These materials are identified in a [template letter](#) sent electronically and copied to the review committee. Although the intent is to distribute materials electronically, certain materials (e.g., published books) may be provided in hardcopy. If the candidate is unsure what to include, they should consult with the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development.
4. Following the submission deadline, the candidate should make the review committee and the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development aware of any significant updates to the portfolio, such as publications, contracts, grants, or awards.
5. For tenure-line and instructional faculty, the Chair of the review committee will arrange visits by at least one Thayer Faculty member to the individual's classes to conduct a more in-depth assessment of the quality of the individual's teaching. The Chair of the review committee should use accepted and fair processes to help evaluate teaching effectiveness. Course evaluations also will be included for consideration in the review, as applicable.
6. For tenure-line and research faculty, the review committee obtains a citation count from the library and online sources.
7. The research statement should describe the candidate's research program with reference to their most important projects, awards, publications, translational work, and/or other products. The statement should emphasize how research outcomes have had (or are expected to have) impact on the candidate's field and on society. The research statement should contain at least one paragraph that is targeted to non-specialists. More detailed guidance can be found in the template letters.
8. The teaching statement should include a chronological list and summary description of all courses taught since becoming a professor and should describe teaching philosophies and approaches. Additionally, the teaching statement should include a description of teaching materials, laboratories, projects, and/or other innovative pedagogical methods developed and implemented by the candidate. If the candidate has been active in engineering education research and scholarship, activities and outcomes should be presented. The

statement also may detail any professional development activities focused on teaching excellence and pedagogy.

9. For promotion and/or tenure cases and at the request of the candidate, the chair of the review committee will solicit confidential letters of evaluation from any department or program Chair; or Director of a Dartmouth center, institute, or organization who could provide information about significant teaching, mentoring, collaborative research, or service by the candidate outside of Thayer. Should the candidate wish to include these letters, names of letter writers should be provided by the due date indicated in their letter. Note that these letters do not take the place of letters from external reviewers.
10. By the due date indicated, the review committee will provide a copy of the candidate's portfolio along with the committee's report (without a specific recommendation) to the Senior Associate Dean of Faculty Development. These materials will be made available to the eligible faculty members for review at least one week prior to the faculty meeting at which the case will be discussed.
11. When more than one case at a given rank and in a given category is being considered in the same year, they will normally be considered at the same faculty meeting (i.e., they share the same reappointment/promotion/tenure committee), and when possible, all same rank cases will come before the CAP at the same time. Each case, however, receives consideration on its own merits; candidates are not competing for a limited number of positions.
12. The eligible faculty members of Thayer (see voting eligibility in Section 9C) meet to discuss the candidate's record. Those eligible professors who cannot, or choose not to, participate in person (remote participation is allowed) in the committee's deliberations may not vote on the case. At the Dean's discretion, the eligible faculty members who are not present may discuss the case with the Dean, after reviewing materials, and present their vote directly to the Dean; these votes will be considered independently from the votes that follow from the discussion. The Dean also may consider seeking input from non-eligible faculty at this stage. For tenure line faculty, the vote of those present in person (including those participating remotely) and those not present are generally conveyed to the CAP in separate tallies within the Dean's report. The vote tally is confidential as are all individual opinions and statements made at any time during the deliberations.
13. When the review process at Thayer has completed, the candidate will then meet with the Dean to discuss the outcome (positive or negative). The Dean also may choose to inform the faculty of the outcome.
14. Once the faculty candidate submits their materials to the Dean's Office, the process has been formally initiated. Candidates who are submitting their package early or those voluntarily seeking promotion to Full Professor can no longer withdraw their package or stop the process after this time (even if previously granted a tenure/promotion date extension). The Dean, however, may choose to delay or halt the process (if feasible) up until the time when the case is being considered at the relevant Thayer faculty meeting.
15. To aid in their review of candidates for promotion and tenure, eligible faculty, administrators, and external referees may consult and consider any information that is directly relevant to specific aspects of the candidacy or file under consideration, even if that information is not included in the candidate's file, provided that the access to and consideration of such information does not violate applicable law or College policy. External sources should be cited, as applicable.

16. If, at any time, the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development or the Dean determines that a procedural error that materially affected the review process has occurred, the CAP and/or review committee will delay deliberation until the issues have been resolved.

The summary tables and additional details below provide an overview of key materials and actions required as the review processes proceed. Note that the letters sent to the candidates and the review committee provide a greater level of detail than what is outlined here.

D. Reappointment of Assistant Professors (tenure-track, instructional, research) and pre-tenure Associate Professors

This subsection aligns closely with the “Reappointment of Assistant Professor” subsection in the A&S Faculty Handbook with some minor variation to address Thayer’s differences in organizational structure.

Faculty with initial appointments as tenure-track, research, or instructional Assistant Professors are normally considered for reappointment in their third year. Faculty with initial appointments as tenure-track Associate Professors may require a reappointment review prior to a tenure review; indication of a reappointment review should be made in the faculty member’s signed offer letter or may be requested by the Dean.

The recommendation for reappointment must provide evidence of performance that demonstrates excellence in research, teaching, and/or service, as applicable, and shows promise of future distinction. Reappointment of tenure-track, instructional, and research faculty to a second three-year term is in the current rank and is contingent upon satisfactory performance (see Section 9A) and the needs of the school.

The key materials and actions required for the reappointment process include:

Category and rank	Key items
Tenure-track Assistant or Associate Professor	<p>Submitted by the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV • A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals • A separate table or list of all proposals submitted, indicating status • A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows <p>Published papers Teaching statement Research statement Service statement Future work statement</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Copies of email communications regarding any package updates

Category and rank	Key items
	<p>Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment letter</p>
<p>Instructional Assistant Professor</p>	<p>Submitted by the candidate: CV Teaching statement Service statement (if applicable) Future work statement</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment Letter</p>
<p>Research Assistant Professor</p>	<p>Submitted by the candidate: CV A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals A separate table or list of all proposals submitted, indicating status A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows Published papers Research statement Future work statement</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment Letter</p>

The reappointment process follows the general process outlined in Section 9C with further detail provided here, including that:

1. The assembled review committee is composed of two faculty members with appointments at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, with at least one holding the rank of Full Professor. For tenure-track candidates, faculty members on the review committee must be tenured and one member oversees gathering of information related to the candidate's scholarship, and the second oversees gathering of information related to teaching.
2. For tenure-track Assistant and Associate Professors, and research and instructional Assistant Professors:
 - Following the review by the faculty, a reappointment letter is prepared by the Dean and provided to the candidate. Final decision on reappointment rests with the Dean, except that conversion to a terminal appointment requires a majority vote by the eligible faculty.
 - The reappointment letter will be included in the package submitted for review when the candidate is considered for promotion, if applicable.
3. The reappointment letter presented to the candidate must recommend either a reappointment of a specified period (typically three years for candidates at the rank of Assistant Professor) or a one-year terminal appointment at the same rank. The reappointment recommendation letter must provide evidence of performance that demonstrates excellence in research, teaching, and/or service (as applicable) and that shows promise of future distinction. Expectations of performance (Section 9A) should be referenced, and any specific methods used for evaluation should be stated in the letter. If reappointment proceeds but the case is not strong, the reappointment letter should describe activities, actions, and resources for intervention and identify additional career development resources available to the candidate beyond those provided.
4. The candidate will then meet with the Dean. The purpose of this meeting is to provide constructive recommendations to the candidate to guide their efforts toward promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate.

E. In-depth review of Research/Instructional Associate or Full Professors

These guidelines are exclusively applied at Thayer.

When the *initial* appointment occurs for Research or Instructional faculty at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, an in-depth review after a period of four years is required. The in-depth review must provide evidence of performance that demonstrates excellence in research, teaching, and/or service, as applicable, and shows promise of future distinction. Reappointment as a result of the in-depth review is in the current rank and is contingent upon satisfactory performance (see “Expectations of Performance” in Section 9A) and the needs of the school.

If reappointment is recommended, then the individual is thereafter typically appointed on a rolling basis (see Section 6B and 6C).

The key materials and actions required for the in-depth review process include:

Version for public dissemination, August 4, 2023. For updates, please contact the Thayer School of Engineering Dean's Office.

Category and rank	Key items
Instructional Associate Professor	<p>Submitted by the candidate: CV Teaching statement Service statement (if applicable) Future work statement</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Student letters Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to the candidate • Letter to the review committee • Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment letter
Instructional Full Professor	<p>Submitted/delivered by the candidate: CV Teaching statement Service statement (if applicable) Future work statement Reviewer names: 3-6 by candidate Seminar</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: Reviewer names: 3-6 by review committee 6+ external letters In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Student letters Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment letter
Research Associate Professor	<p>Submitted/delivered by the candidate: CV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals • A separate table or list of all proposals submitted, indicating status • A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows 5-10 published papers of significance

Category and rank	Key items
	<p>Research statement Future work statement Reviewer names: 3-6 by candidate Research seminar</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: Reviewer names: 3-6 by review committee 6+ external letters Student letters (research) Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean’s Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment letter</p>
<p>Research Full Professor</p>	<p>Submitted by the candidate: CV A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals A separate table or list of all proposals submitted in the prior 4-6 years, indicating status A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows 5-10 published papers of significance Research statement Future work statement Reviewer names: 3-6 by candidate Research seminar</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: Reviewer names: 3-6 by review committee 6+ external letters Student letters (research) Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean’s Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Reappointment letter</p>

The in-depth review process follows the general process outlined in Section 9C with further detail provided here, including that:

1. The review committee is composed of two faculty members with appointments at the rank of the candidate or higher, with at least one holding the rank of Full Professor (either tenured or of the same appointment type as the candidate).
2. Following the review by the faculty, a reappointment letter is prepared by the Dean and provided to the candidate. Final decision on reappointment rests with the Dean, except that conversion to a terminal appointment requires a majority vote by the eligible faculty. The reappointment letter presented to the candidate must recommend either a rolling reappointment (see Section 6B or 6C), reappointment of a specified period, or a one-year terminal appointment at the same rank. The reappointment recommendation letter must provide evidence of performance that demonstrates excellence in research, teaching, and/or service (as applicable) and that shows promise of future distinction. Expectations of performance (Section 9A) should be referenced, and any specific methods used for evaluation should be stated in the letter. If the reappointment case is not strong, the reappointment letter should describe activities, actions, and resources for intervention and identify additional career development resources available to the candidate beyond those provided.
3. The reappointment letter prepared by the Dean will be included in the package submitted for review when the candidate is considered for promotion, if applicable.
4. The candidate will then meet with the Dean. The purpose of this meeting is to provide constructive recommendations to the candidate to guide their efforts toward future career progression and promotion, as applicable.

F. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure

This subsection aligns closely with the “Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor” subsection in the A&S Faculty Handbook with some minor variation and clarification in the specific Expectations of Performance and the role of the Thayer Dean.

This section applies to both pre-tenure Assistant and Associate Professors, who typically are required to be considered for tenure in their sixth year. In exceptional cases, a pre-tenure Assistant or Associate Professor may request consideration for promotion/tenure prior to the sixth year; permission will be granted on the recommendation of the Dean. The Dean may consult with the Thayer Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development and other tenured faculty members in considering such a request.

The “Expectations of Performance” section described above (section 9A) provides guidance to faculty members regarding evaluation of research, teaching, and service. Additionally as per the Faculty Handbook of the Arts and Sciences:

“Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, when accompanied by a tenure commitment, is the most critical personnel decision made by the faculty and must be handled with the strictest confidentiality. Tenured members of the department or program normally consider promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor in the sixth year in rank for those holding a full-time, or the ninth year for an individual with less than a full-time appointment.

Specific evidence of outstanding performance in scholarship and teaching is essential. Other contributions to the College and the profession also will be considered. Although the Trustee Executive Committee approves most personnel actions, a summary of the achievements of the candidate and of the evaluation reached by the CAP are presented to the full Board of Trustees. Implied in such appointments is the common interest of the individual and the College in a long-term association. In the final analysis, the tenured members of the [school], the [Dean], the CAP, the President, and the Board of Trustees must exercise judgment in tenure decisions to provide Dartmouth with the most distinguished faculty possible.²”

The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the President after consultation with the Committee Advisory to the President (CAP), makes all tenure appointments.

While Thayer generally follows the guidelines for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor with tenure as described in the Handbook of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Thayer’s practice is distinct largely in the timing of the process and the means by which materials are gathered. Additionally, the “Expectations of Performance” (section 9A) provides specific guidelines that are relevant for engineering professors. The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development bears primary responsibility for ensuring that the tenure review process conforms to College policies and is the primary conduit of information about the process to the candidate. Generally, the process will begin in the candidate’s sixth year.

The key materials and actions required for the review process include:

Category and rank	Key items
Associate Professor with tenure	<p>Submitted/delivered by the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals A separate table or list of all proposals submitted, indicating status A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows 5-10 published papers of significance Teaching statement Research statement Service statement Future work statement Reviewer names: 6-10 by candidate Research seminar <p>Assembled/Arranged by the review committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewer names: 6-10 by review committee 9+ external letters In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Student letters (research and teaching) Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report

² The language was altered slightly, as indicated, to reflect the process of Thayer rather than Arts and Sciences.

Category and rank	Key items
	<p>Dean's Office responsibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote Dean's Letter Prior reappointment letter, as applicable CAP binder Letter to the Provost for approval Promotion/tenure letter

The review process follows the general process outlined in Section 9C with further detail provided here, including that:

1. The review committee is composed of two tenured faculty members with appointments at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, with at least one holding the rank of Full Professor.
2. The review committee presents a summary report and materials to the tenured Thayer faculty, deemed the tenure committee, during a regularly-scheduled or special faculty meeting at least three weeks prior to the CAP meeting during which the case is heard.
3. After the tenure committee has submitted its recommendation, the Dean will discuss the faculty's recommendation with the candidate (positive or negative). At this time the candidate should raise any procedural questions or concerns.
4. The Dean then will draft a recommendation letter to the CAP that reports the vote and presents in detail the faculty's reasoning based on the evidence of the candidate's scholarship, teaching and mentoring, service, and other contributions. Expectations of performance (see Section 9A) should be referenced, and any specific methods used for evaluation should be stated in the letter. The letter, even as it explains the reasoning of the majority, should ideally reflect all points of view. The Dean will submit the faculty's recommendation, along with the Dean's own assessment, to the CAP. The Dean's recommendation letter to the CAP should report the anonymous vote tally, indicating who was present and who was not present together with a brief explanation of their absence. The vote of those present in person and those not present are generally conveyed to the CAP in separate tallies within the Dean's report to the CAP, as applicable. The Dean's letter must recommend either promotion with tenure (or simply tenure if already at the Associate Professor level) or a one-year terminal appointment at the current rank. The Dean's letter is submitted to the CAP along with the other requisite materials.
5. During CAP deliberations, the Thayer Dean presents background and answers questions, but will not be present during the CAP discussion and vote.
6. After the CAP and the Provost and President have communicated their recommendation for promotion/tenure, the Dean will inform the candidate of the recommendation (positive or negative). The Dean also may choose to inform the faculty of the outcome.

G. Promotion to Research Associate Professor or Instructional Associate Professor

Approved by Thayer faculty March 5, 2015; edits made August 2020 to ready for vote

Research/Instructional Assistant Professors typically are required to be considered for promotion to Research/Instructional Associate Professor in their sixth year. In exceptional cases, a Research/Instructional Assistant Professor may request consideration for promotion prior to the sixth year; permission will be granted on the recommendation of the Dean. The Dean may consult with the Thayer School Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development and other faculty members in considering such a request.

An individual promoted to the rank of Research or Instructional Associate Professor is thereafter typically appointed on a rolling basis (see Section 6B or 6C).

The “Expectations of Performance” described in Section 9A provide guidance to faculty members regarding evaluation of research, teaching, and/or service, as applicable. The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development bears primary responsibility for ensuring that the promotion review process conforms to College policies and is the primary conduit of information about the process to the candidate.

The key materials and actions required for the review process include:

Category and rank	Key items
Instructional Associate Professor	<p>Submitted by the candidate: CV Teaching statement Service statement (if applicable) Future work statement</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by the review committee: In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Student letters Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean’s Office responsibility: Letter to candidate Letter to review committee Prior reappointment letter, as applicable Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Promotion letter</p>
Research Associate Professor	<p>Submitted/delivered by the candidate: CV A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals A separate table or list of all proposals submitted, indicating status</p>

Category and rank	Key items
	<p>A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows</p> <p>5-10 published papers of significance</p> <p>Research statement</p> <p>Future work statement</p> <p>Reviewer names: 3-6 by candidate</p> <p>Research seminar</p> <p>Assembled/Arranged by review committee:</p> <p>Reviewer names: 3-6 by review committee</p> <p>6+ external letters</p> <p>Student letters (research)</p> <p>Course evaluations summary (if applicable)</p> <p>Copies of email communications regarding any package updates</p> <p>Review committee report</p> <p>Dean’s Office responsibility:</p> <p>Letter to candidate</p> <p>Letter to review committee</p> <p>Prior reappointment letter, as applicable</p> <p>Thayer faculty vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter to the Provost for approval <p>Promotion letter</p>

The review process follows the general process outlined in Section 9C with further detail provided here, including that:

1. The review committee is composed of two faculty members with appointments at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, with at least one holding the rank of Full Professor.
2. The outcome of the review process is either promotion or a one-year terminal appointment at the current rank. Final decisions on promotion rests with the Dean, except that the conversion to a terminal appointment must be approved by a majority of the faculty eligible to vote.

H. Promotion to Full Professor (tenured, research, or instructional appointments)

Associate Professors may present themselves for promotion to Professor in or after their sixth year in the rank of Associate Professor. In exceptional cases, an Associate Professor may request consideration for promotion earlier; permission will be granted on the recommendation of the Dean. The Dean may consult with the Thayer School Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development and other tenured faculty members in considering such a request. The decision about when to seek promotion is ultimately the decision of the candidate.

The “Expectations of Performance” described above (section 9A) provides guidance to faculty members regarding evaluation of research, teaching, and/or service, as applicable. Candidates for appointment to the rank of Professor must present an outstanding record since promotion/tenure

characterized by continued excellence in scholarship, maintenance of high standards in the classroom, and continued institutional service or other forms of leadership, as applicable. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the President after consultation with the Committee Advisory to the President (CAP), approves all tenure-line full professor appointments.

Following promotion, Research and Instructional Full Professors are thereafter typically appointed on a rolling basis (see Section 6B or 6C).

The key materials and actions required for the review process include:

Category and rank	Key items
<p>Full Professor with tenure</p>	<p>Submitted/delivered by the candidate: CV A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals A separate table or list of all proposals submitted since last promotion, indicating status A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows 5-10 published papers of significance since last promotion Teaching statement Research statement Service statement Future work statement Reviewer names: 6-10 by candidate Research seminar</p> <p>Assembled/Arranged by review committee: Reviewer names: 6-10 by review committee 9+ external letters In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Student letters (research and teaching) Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote Dean's Letter CAP binder Letter to the Provost for approval Promotion letter</p>
<p>Instructional Full Professor</p>	<p>Submitted/delivered by candidate: CV Teaching statement Service statement (if applicable) Future work statement Reviewer names: 3-6 by candidate Seminar</p>

Category and rank	Key items
	<p>Assembled/Arranged by review committee: Reviewer letters: 3-6 by review committee 6+ external letters In-person classroom assessment(s) Course evaluations summary Student letters Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Promotion letter</p>
<p>Research Full Professor</p>	<p>Submitted/delivered by candidate: CV A separate summary description of funding awards in-progress and completed as well as any pending proposals A separate table or list of all proposals submitted since last promotion, indicating status A separate list of theses/dissertations directed, including names of graduated or in-progress students and postdoctoral fellows 5-10 published papers of significance since last promotion Research statement Future work statement Reviewer names: 3-6 by candidate Research seminar</p> <p>Arranged/Assembled by review committee: Reviewer names: 3-6 by review committee 6+ external letters Student letters (research) Copies of email communications regarding any package updates Review committee report</p> <p>Dean's Office responsibility: Letter to the candidate Letter to the review committee Thayer faculty vote • Letter to the Provost for approval Promotion letter</p>

The review process follows the general process outlined in Section 9C with further detail provided here, including that:

1. Faculty members should notify the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development of their intention to be considered for promotion at least 3 months prior to the expected launch date of the review committee. The Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Development then will meet with the candidate to review the procedures. For tenure line faculty, cases that

begin prior to October 15 will be considered by the CAP in the spring of the same academic year. Cases that begin after October 15, may need to be considered by the CAP in the fall of the subsequent academic year.

2. The review committee is composed of two Full Professors. For previously tenured candidates, both review committee members must be tenured.
3. For research faculty, student letters associated with teaching will not be solicited.
4. The review committee presents a summary report to the eligible Thayer faculty, deemed the promotion committee, during a regularly-scheduled or special faculty meeting. For tenure-line faculty, the faculty meeting must occur at least three weeks prior to the CAP meeting during which the case will be heard.
 - For tenure line faculty:
 - After the promotion committee has submitted its recommendation, the Dean will discuss the faculty's recommendation with the candidate (positive or negative). At this time the candidate should raise any procedural questions or concerns.
 - The Dean then will draft a recommendation letter to the CAP that reports the vote and presents in detail the faculty's reasoning based on the evidence of the candidate's scholarship, teaching and mentoring, service, and other contributions. Expectations of performance (see Section 9A) should be referenced, and any specific methods used for evaluation should be stated in the letter. The letter, even as it explains the reasoning of the majority, should ideally reflect all points of view. The Dean will submit the faculty's recommendation, along with the Dean's own assessment, to the CAP. The Dean's recommendation letter to the CAP should report the anonymous vote tally, indicating who was present and who was not present together with a brief explanation of their absence. The vote of those present in person and those not present are generally conveyed to the CAP in separate tallies within the Dean's report to the CAP, as applicable. The Dean's letter must recommend for or against promotion (and tenure, if applicable). The Dean's letter is submitted to the CAP along with the other requisite materials described in the checklist.
 - During CAP deliberations, the Thayer Dean presents background and answers questions, but will not be present during the CAP discussion and vote.
 - After the CAP and the Provost and President have communicated their recommendation for promotion, the Dean will inform the candidate of the recommendation (positive or negative).
 - For Research/Instructional faculty:
 - The Dean will consider the recommendation of the promotion committee. Final decisions on promotion rests with the Dean, except that the decision not to promote must be approved by a majority of the faculty eligible to vote. After the Thayer faculty has submitted its vote and a decision regarding promotion has been made, the Dean will inform the candidate of the outcome.