**Departmental Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

The mission of the Department of Rehabilitation Science faculty is to ameliorate the effects of chronic illness and disability through research, teaching and education, and service. Members of the Departmental faculty are foremost expected to carry on a vigorous and significant program of research with a high degree of excellence. The research agenda of the Department centers on better understanding the human condition, identifying etiologies of chronic illnesses and disabling conditions, and effecting clinical interventions. Assistant professors and individuals hired as associate professors on the tenure track must provide evidence of a novel and unique program of research based on criteria that ensure its overall impact on the parent discipline and within the Rehabilitation Science field of study at large and within the time frame allotted (6-years) for achieving promotion and tenure. In addition, those faculty members seeking appointment without term must contribute with excellence to the overall educational process by offering and teaching courses that promote the theoretical, analytical, and investigational aspects of the field. Service to one’s parent discipline and Rehabilitation Science, and operations of the University, College, and Department are also expected. Faculty meeting the Departmental requirements for promotion to Associate Professor without term will enrich the George Mason University and College of Health and Human Services community of scholars by displaying the attributes of intellectual rigor, independent scholarship, teaching excellence, and community service. Those achieving tenure in the Department of Rehabilitation Science will personify excellence in professional academics in an emerging research extensive environment.

Candidates must demonstrate high excellence in research, excellence in teaching, and adequate provision of service to the University, parent fields of study, and professions. The deciding criterion for promotion from assistant or associate professor on tenure track to associate professor without term is the undertaking and establishment of a significant and sustainable program of independent research (as opposed to unrelated research projects or a number of projects completed in collaboration with the candidate’s doctoral or post-doctoral mentor).

An individual’s scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated by the following criteria:

- **Is the research programmatic and progressive?**
  - Do the hypotheses of individual projects address a central theoretical framework or hypothesis?
  - Are the projects sequential or interrelated addressing common subthemes?
- **Is the theme of the research program important to the discipline?**
  - How does the theoretical framework, if established through the research program, influence human biology or behavior, improve the understanding of etiology of the chronic illness or disability, and potentially effect treatment?
  - Is the theme of research detectable in a series of published, peer-reviewed articles in journals pertinent to the individual’s parent discipline or Rehabilitation Science at large and research grant applications
submitted to funding agencies or private foundations related to the individual’s field of study?

- Are the goals of the research program well-defined?
  - Will the outcomes of the projects included in the program of research clearly contribute to understanding the construct validity of the theoretical framework?
  - Have the theoretical constructs been established through an extensive overview of the field of study and how will the candidate’s work aid in understanding them?

- Are publications and grant writing activities focused on a specific theme so that the individual has laid claim to a defined area of expertise?
  - How does the applicant apply previous education and training in the parent discipline, the specific aims of research grant applications, and findings presented in research manuscripts to the theoretical framework in the larger sense?
  - Overall, what is the potential importance of the publication and research efforts of the individual, and is the work sufficient to support an ongoing and significant increase in the individual’s expertise in the specific area of study?

- Is the work sufficient in quantity and quality to ensure impact beyond the University as judged by peer review?
  - If not funded, are comments on grant applications encouraging and addressable within the candidate’s environment, collaborative resources, and level of understanding and ability?
  - How well does the candidate adopt a collaborative and negotiable position when interpreting and addressing the comments of reviewers on scored and streamlined grants not funded?
  - Does the candidate have a sufficient number of publications in peer-reviewed journal articles that support credibility as an investigator?

- Is the body of work to be derived from the program of research likely to be work of consequence to the discipline?
  - Can the individual articulate objectives for the overall impact of the research program as well as each of the individual manuscripts published and grant applications submitted?
  - Is there evidence that these objectives are being met?
  - Is there evidence that accomplishing the objectives will indeed influence the field of study?

- Is the individual fully prepared to be an independent investigator, including sufficient separation from doctoral or post-doctoral mentors?
  - Does the candidate have a substantial number of manuscripts as first author, on which mentors have not been listed in the by-lines or affiliated with the work?
  - When examining the candidate’s work with her/his mentors, is there a significant departure or bifurcation of interest?
  - Is the candidate’s work substantially different from the research line of mentors?
Are the candidate’s research grant applications exclusive of the mentor’s: if not is the mentor’s participation adequately justified relative to other potential collaborators?

- Is there evidence that the individual is regarded as a collaborator sought by colleagues for specific expertise?
  - What is the nature of the secondary research roles filled by the candidate?
    - Is the candidate a co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on grant applications and if so, who are the principal investigators?
  - How frequently is the candidate called upon to participate in manuscript reviews, study sections and panels, and doctoral dissertation committees?

The major departmental criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor without term on the basis of excellence in teaching is the evidence that the individual has made a significant and sustainable contribution at the curricular or programmatic level to the overall academic preparation of students (as opposed to within-course activities).

An individual’s pedagogical achievement will be evaluated with respect to the following criteria as applicable:

- Has the individual developed specific curricular or programmatic innovations to meet current and emerging student needs?
- Does the individual’s course syllabus and materials reflect appropriate effort?
- Is the knowledge imparted to students at the current boundaries of the discipline with respect to its academic level (i.e. entry-level vs upper level undergraduate, graduate and advanced graduate) and specific course objectives?
- Do students respond positively to the learning environment created by the individual?
- Does the individual inspire students to excel?
- Is the individual regarded as mentor?

The major departmental criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor without term on the basis of service is the evidence that the individual is committed to the departmental, University, and discipline-specific communities.

An individual’s service contributions will be evaluated with respect to the following criteria:

- Are they sufficient to support the needs of the department and the University?
- Does the individual accept responsibility for the well-being of the parent discipline and community?
- Does the individual demonstrate effort in meeting parent discipline and community needs?
- Does the individual work effectively and constructively with others?
- Do service activities promote the department within and beyond the University?

**Third Year and Sixth Year Reviews**

The process for the Third Year and Sixth Year Review are identical with the exception that the Third Year Review does not mandate external review of candidates. Dossiers are overall structured the same for both reviews. It is important to remember that the dossier is submitted at the beginning of third year and then at the beginning of the sixth year. Therefore, the work evaluated is from the first two years on tenure-track and subsequently the first five years. Once the dossier is submitted, it cannot be amended except under the rarest of circumstances.

The primary difference in how the criteria are interpreted at third and sixth year reviews is the difference between promise and fulfillment. The third year review should establish that the individual’s performance to date is sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that the individual’s career trajectory is on target for earning promotion to associate professor without term by the Sixth Year Review based on the criteria above.

There are generally three possible outcomes to third year review: 1) Recommendation for re-appointment: The individual’s progress to date is likely to result in a positive promotion and tenure decision in another three years such that re-appointment is recommended; 2) Recommendation for re-appointment with reservation: The individual’s progress to date is deficient in some areas, but potentially remediable by a trajectory correction that will improve the likelihood of a promotion and tenure in three years; or 3) Recommendation for dismissal with a terminal year: The individual’s progress to date is substantially deficient in some areas and likely irreparable within the remaining three years.

There are only two outcomes to a sixth year review: 1) promotion to associate professor without term; or 2) dismissal with a terminal one-year appointment.