INTRODUCTION

The processes of granting promotion and tenure and reappointing faculty are essential mechanisms of ensuring quality and allocating rewards in the university. They are intended to be both rigorous and fair. Great care is taken to insure accurate assessments and proper outcomes. It is not our intention in this manual to enumerate every step necessary for promotion, tenure, and reappointment. Rather, this document is an expression of the philosophy that will guide the evaluators and is intended to provide candidates a clear statement of expectations as well as a clear description of the processes that will be followed in the college. Candidates for promotion and tenure are directed to the George Mason University Faculty Handbook (revised January 1, 2009), sections 2.4 and 2.5, the university’s Promotion and Tenure Casebook Template (Appendix A in this manual), and their departmental manual for guidance about preparing and submitting a dossier in application for tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment and for details of the university and unit expectations. Candidates for reappointment are directed to the Faculty Handbook, section 2.6, and their departmental manual.

The College of Health and Human Services will evaluate all candidates in three areas of professional life: teaching, research and scholarship, and service. As will be described later in this manual, the college values all of these areas highly and has established specific expectations for performance by its faculty in each one.

TENURE AND PROMOTION

The university policy on tenure and promotion, found in the Faculty Handbook, states that, for all candidates, “genuine excellence must be exhibited in the areas of
teaching or research and scholarship and high competence must be exhibited in both."

The College of Health and Human Services, however, is strongly committed to research and scholarship and requires all candidates for tenure and promotion to demonstrate genuine excellence in research and scholarship, at least high competence in teaching, and at least satisfactory performance in service.

The *Faculty Handbook* also states that a recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor requires that candidates “. . . must provide evidence that their contributions in their area(s) of genuine excellence have had some significant impact beyond the boundaries of this University. If the primary strength is . . . in theoretical or applied research and scholarship, there should be evidence that the candidate’s contributions have significant influence on colleagues at other institutions in this country, and where applicable, abroad.” Finally, the *Handbook* also specifies that candidates for promotion to the rank of professor “. . . must maintain high competence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service while also maintaining genuine excellence in teaching and/or research and scholarship. In addition, evidence of significant impact beyond the boundaries of the University must be much more substantial than in cases involving tenure or promotion to the rank of associate professor.” Reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations are based upon an evaluation of performance over the faculty member’s total period of service at George Mason University. Scholarly achievements prior to joining the George Mason University faculty weigh less heavily in these evaluations, but are also considered. The following
guidelines are intended to give specific expression to these broad requirements and to provide details about the evaluation process.

**Research and Scholarship**

**Philosophy**

The College of Health and Human Services views research and scholarship as encompassing any activity that advances our disciplines or professions by creating or extending knowledge and modes of inquiry. While the essential core is research and publication of findings, it also includes all other activities that support or enhance research. The college recognizes that scholarship comes in many forms and employs a variety of methods. We view debates over the relative merits of basic vs. applied research, theoretical vs. empirical work, scholarship of discovery vs. scholarship of integration, qualitative vs. quantitative methods, and primary vs. secondary analyses as misguided. Each research topic, method, approach, and technique should be judged only on whether it is appropriate to the stated research goal and whether it produces a valuable product. We believe, therefore, that success in research and scholarship can be achieved in many ways and that no one approach or technique is inherently superior to another. For example, a person who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful with another who publishes his/her work in books whose publication process has comparable peer review scrutiny. Candidates who pursue a mixture of publication media (e.g., articles, books [authored or edited], and chapters in books) will be evaluated on the whole body of work, just as those who specialize in one form of scholarly expression.
Since peer review is one of the fundamental principles of scholarship, we will rely heavily on that process, in all its forms, and will give little or no credit to published work that was not peer reviewed. By “peer reviewed” we mean that other scholars have evaluated the quality of the work and judged it suitable for publication. This process can include refereed journal articles, chapters in books edited by others, invited papers appearing in edited volumes or conference proceedings, books and monographs which are refereed by editorial boards and outside reviewers, emerging forms of electronic publication that are peer reviewed, and even invited book reviews where the reviewer is solicited because of his or her reputation in the field. In general, textbooks will be considered as a contribution to scholarship if it can be shown to make significant or seminal contributions to the scholarship of the field.

Obtaining extramural grant support for one’s research is a highly valued scholarly activity, especially for tenured faculty, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh heavily as evidence of scholarly reputation. However, while grant support will inform the judgment of reputation, it is only one of the categories that make up the overall assessment of research and scholarship. Assistant professors seeking promotion to the next higher rank are expected to begin a focused line of research, which is likely to involve seeking and receiving internal grant support and may involve seeking extramural grants, though success in this area is not required for promotion and tenure at this level. Grant support, however valuable, is only a means to an end and is no substitute for the products of research.

Other scholarly activities, such as organizing sessions for professional meetings
and reviewing, refereeing, and editing the work of others also are valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no specific type or amount of such activities is required for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles.

The college recognizes that a loose prestige hierarchy of scholarly journals does exist within our various fields. However, many scholars disagree about such rankings, and some view the attempt to assign status value to journals as potentially misleading. The difficulty of ranking journals is most apparent with “specialty” journals, where specialists in one sub-field are technically unable to draw comparisons between their own journals and those of another sub-field. In fact, very valuable work using innovative approaches or presenting new ideas or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may be published in lesser-known journals. We further recognize that important contributions to scholarship may appear in non-traditional forms of refereed media such as CD-ROMs, internet journals, and edited databases. Nevertheless, the goal of the College is to foster production of high-quality scholarship, and we will expect every candidate to meet that standard. It will be the candidate’s responsibility to demonstrate the value and importance of his or her work. Quality of publications will be assessed on several factors: 1) the work’s impact on the field, shown through reviews, citations, or other evidence; 2) the prestige or standing of the journal in which an article appears (if apparent or demonstrable) or the publisher of a book or book chapter; 3) the candidate’s explanation of the importance of the work; 4) opinions of outside reviewers; and 5) the evaluating faculty committee’s independent assessment of the work.

The college recognizes the value of both individual and cooperative scholarship.
While we acknowledge the importance (and sometimes the difficulty) of determining the relative contributions of several co-authors, research in health and human services is increasingly a team enterprise, and interdisciplinary research—which we strongly support—by definition, results in publications with multiple authors. We cannot, therefore, assign higher intrinsic value to either single-authored or jointly-authored works. Candidates who choose to collaborate may be able to publish a greater number of items than one working alone. Also, the order of authorship does not necessarily convey information about relative contribution to the work. We will accord credit proportional to the candidate’s contribution to a multiple-authored work, if that contribution can be established, and it will be the candidate’s responsibility to explain her or his contribution to the work. Again, the quality of the work will be assessed independently.

As a result of interdisciplinary collaborations, some of a candidate’s publications may appear in the scholarly outlets of other disciplines (a nurse, for example, may publish in an education or economics journal). While our primary focus remains the development of research on health and human services, we do recognize that our faculty can and do regularly make contributions to the knowledge base of other disciplines, and we will not disadvantage such work appearing in publications outside the health and human services professions if its fundamental quality and importance can be established.

Finally, perhaps the issue of most concern to candidates is the number of publications required for promotion and tenure. The College of Health and Human Services strongly resists the idea that qualitative evaluations (e.g., “genuine excellence”
and “high competence” can be defined solely by numbers of publications or other scholarly activities. In other words, there is no magic number. We expect candidates to demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their publications and other research activities. For example, it is possible that a smaller number of works of outstanding quality will be evaluated as equal or superior to a much greater number of publications of lesser quality. However, all things being equal, it will be easier to make a strong case for promotion and tenure if the number of publications is high.

**Categories of Research and Scholarship**

The candidate for promotion and tenure should submit written evidence of research and scholarship organized in the following categories: 1) scholarly writings in journals, books, monographs, and reviews; 2) presentations at professional meetings; 3) research awards and grants; 4) scholarly services to the profession; 5) recognition by national, scholarly, and professional associations; 6) general recognition within their discipline or profession; 7) specialized professional activities in their discipline. In addition to the lists described below, the candidate must provide copies of all publications listed. For multiple-authored works and collaborative projects, the candidate should provide the names of all authors as they appear in print and explain in detail the nature and degree of his/her own contribution to the work. Clear documentation must be provided for works accepted for publication but not yet published. Work in progress and work submitted but not yet accepted for publication may not be included. Candidates will select the subset (3-5) of published works to be distributed to external reviewers.
1. Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews

A. Published Articles

The candidate should provide a list of published articles and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each article the title, the journal, volume, date (or projected date) of publication, and a brief description of the article and its contribution to the candidate’s field.

B. Chapters in Books

The candidate should provide a list of chapters that have been published in edited books and those accepted for publication. This list should include for each entry the title of the chapter, the title of the book, the book’s editor(s), the publisher, the date (or projected date) of publication, and a brief description of the chapter and its contribution to the candidate’s field.

C. Books and Monographs

The candidate should provide a list of books or monographs published or accepted for publication. This list should include the title, publisher, date (or projected date) of publication, and a brief description of the work and its contribution to the candidate’s field. For works only accepted for publication, clear indication should be given of whether the item is a completed book manuscript in press and scheduled for publication at a definite date, or a book project for which a contract has been awarded for a manuscript to be submitted to the publisher in the future.
D. Book Reviews

The candidate should provide a list of book reviews published or accepted for publication, including the author and title of the book reviewed, the place of appearance, and the date (or projected date) or publication.

2. Presentations at Professional Meetings

The candidate should provide a list of presentations at professional meetings. This list should include the title of the presentation, the type of presentation (paper, poster, invited paper or speech, symposium presentation, or roundtable discussion), the name, location, and date of the meeting, and an abstract of the presentation.

3. Awards and Grants

The candidate should provide a list of all research proposals submitted, research grants and contracts received, and all scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, and personal development awards that supported the candidate’s scholarly research and professional development. This list should include the title of each project supported or submitted, the agency to which it was submitted, and, if awarded, the amount and period of the award and the precise role of the investigator and any other co-investigators on the project. The candidate also must provide an abstract of each proposal submitted and copies of official letters of award for funded projects.

4. Significant Scholarly or Professional Services

Significant scholarly or professional services include serving as a journal editor or associate editor, member of an editorial board, referee for scholarly journals or granting agencies, member of a proposal review panel or study section, consultant for
professional organizations and public agencies, and other types of significant service to
the research community. The candidate should provide a list that includes the activity,
organization, and dates of service.

5. **Recognition by Scholarly and Professional Associations**

Honors, such as fellow status and awards from scholarly and professional
associations that result from the candidate’s research contributions will be viewed as
evidence of scholarly reputation.

6. **General Recognition within the Discipline or Profession**

Invitations received for colloquium presentations or workshops at professional
associations or other universities and reviews and citations of published work will be
viewed as further evidence of scholarly reputation. The candidate should provide a list
of titles, locations, and dates for invited presentations and, for reviews and citations, a
complete bibliographic citation of the work in which they appear.

7. **Specialized Professional Activities in the Discipline or Profession**

Included here are materials for which descriptions are not presented in any other
category. These materials may not include work in progress or work submitted but not
yet accepted for publication.

**Evaluation of Research and Scholarship**

Based on the evidence submitted, the College Committee on Promotion, Tenure,
and Reappointment will evaluate the candidate’s research and scholarship according to
three categories: genuine **excellence, high competence, and unsatisfactory.** For the
service category, an additional category of **satisfactory** will be used.
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure requires that a faculty member be evaluated as building a strong, competitive program of research; show evidence of both quantity and quality of publication; and be recognized by scholars outside George Mason University as a person who has contributed to the advancement and development of his/her field and seems likely to continue doing so. The College of Health and Human Services recruits and hires tenure track faculty with the expectation that they will demonstrate genuine excellence in research and scholarship, at least high competence in teaching, and at least satisfactory performance in service.

The candidate will be judged genuinely excellent in research and scholarship if the committee judges the candidate’s work as excellent in both quantity and quality. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of excellent quality; or a larger number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of both excellent and very good quality; or a book of excellent quality and a significant number of articles and chapters, all of very good quality. To qualify as genuinely excellent, a candidate also should have been very active in other research roles, such as intramural research grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged highly competent in research and scholarship if the committee judges the candidate’s work as very good in both quantity and quality. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of very good quality; or a larger number of articles and/or
chapters of mixed (e.g., excellent, very good, and good) quality; or a smaller number of
articles and/or chapters of excellent quality; or a book and a small number of articles
and chapters of very good quality. To qualify as highly competent, a candidate also
should have performed several additional research roles, such as conference session
organizer or participant, journal referee, book reviewer, or grant reviewer.

The candidate will be judged unsatisfactory in research and scholarship if the
committee judges the candidate’s work as weak in either quantity or quality. For
example, such a candidate might have published a small number of refereed articles
and/or chapters of good quality; or a book and one or two articles, all of moderate
quality. A candidate also may have performed one or two additional research activities,
such as conference session organizer or participant, journal referee or book reviewer.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor is a recognition by the college that a faculty
member’s scholarship is of such high quality and importance that she or he has
achieved a national reputation as a leading scholar in his/her field. Promotion to this
level is available only to those whose research and scholarship is judged as having
achieved genuine excellence.

The candidate will be judged genuinely excellent in research and scholarship if
the committee judges the candidate’s scholarly work as excellent in both quantity and
quality and of unquestioned importance. Such a candidate, for example, might have
published a large number of important and influential refereed articles and/or book
chapters of excellent quality; or a book and a significant number of articles and
chapters, all of excellent quality; or two or more books of excellent quality and a large number of articles and chapters of excellent and very good quality. [For those seeking the rank of professor, the numbers corresponding to “significant” and “large” cannot be specified.] A candidate also must have secured extramural funding to support his/her research and should have been highly active in additional research roles, such as conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, grant reviewer, or book reviewer.

The candidate will be judged highly competent in research and scholarship if the committee judges the candidate’s scholarly work to be very good in both quantity and quality. Such a candidate, for example, might have published a significant number of refereed articles and/or book chapters of very good quality; or a large number of articles or chapters of good quality; or a book and a smaller number of articles and chapters of excellent quality. To qualify as highly competent, a candidate also should have performed several additional research roles, such as extramural research grant recipient, conference session organizer or participant, journal referee, book reviewer, or grant reviewer.

The evaluation category, unsatisfactory, is reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for high competence.

Teaching

Categories of Teaching
The quality of teaching of faculty members is of paramount importance to the College of Health and Human Services and to the university; indeed, it is the heart of what we do. Accordingly, tenure and promotion to the ranks of both associate professor and professor are available only to those who are judged at least highly competent in teaching.

Candidates for promotion and tenure must submit written evidence of effective teaching, organized according to the following categories: 1) syllabi and list of courses taught; 2) student evaluations; 3) peer evaluations of teaching; 4) honors for outstanding teaching or instructional activities; 5) evidence of instructional service beyond the classroom; 6) published materials; and 7) other materials. The candidate may not solicit letters to include in any of these categories.

1. **Syllabi and List of Courses Taught**

The candidate must include the most recent syllabus for each course taught during the previous 8 semesters. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. The candidate may include supplementary materials to document the quality of course content. (See 6. Other Materials, below.) In keeping with university and college policy on assessment of teaching effectiveness, the candidate's syllabi will be assessed for conformity with university guidelines, appropriate learning outcomes, differentiation of graduate and undergraduate expectations, and readings and assignments appropriate to course level and catalog description.

2. **Student Course Evaluations**

The candidate must include standardized course evaluations for every course
she/he has taught during the previous 8 semesters. All student comments must be included, not just a sampling.

3. **Peer Evaluations**

The candidate should include results of peer evaluations of their teaching, if available.

4. **Honors and Instructional Grants**

Honors or other special recognition of the quality of the candidate’s teaching should be listed in tabular form. The candidate also should submit evidence of honors his/her students have achieved that are directly connected with the candidate’s teaching or mentorship (such as papers presented, accepted for publication, or published, fellowships or other rewards received, and acceptance to graduate programs). Finally, the candidate should submit evidence of grant awards to support the instructional mission of the college or department.

5. **Evidence of Instructional Service beyond the Classroom**

The candidate should provide lists of the following types of instructional service: organizing or presenting in departmental seminars on pedagogy; supervision of directed reading or independent study courses; membership on completed master’s thesis committees and/or direction of completed master’s theses; membership on completed dissertation committees and/or direction of completed dissertations; involvement in preparation and/or grading of master’s or doctoral examinations; references written on behalf of students; supervision of internships; advisement of students; and evidence of students’ successful endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship, including
6. **Published Materials.**

The candidate should provide a list of textbooks and other published materials she/he has authored or co-authored related to instruction. The candidate should provide a one- or two-sentence description of the contribution of each item to the instructional mission of the department or college.

7. **Other Materials**

The candidate may include materials that demonstrate teaching preparation, effectiveness of pedagogical methodology, and pedagogical creativity, such as: course handouts and assignments; descriptions of learning exercises; tests; outstanding student papers or other written or visual evidence of course-generated student projects, and significant contributions to their department’s curriculum. Such course and curricular materials will be assessed for 1) their appropriateness in relation to the current state of knowledge in the candidate’s field; 2) how they enhance student creativity and independent critical thinking; and 3) how they cultivate curiosity, creativity, and critical acumen in students. Supplementary materials should demonstrate the range and variety of levels of courses the candidate has taught.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

The quality of teaching will be evaluated similarly for candidates at all ranks, in keeping with the categories stated above for evaluating research: genuine excellence, high competence, and unsatisfactory. We are mindful of the vagaries inherent in
student evaluations and will view them as useful rather than definitive data.

The candidate will be judged to be **genuinely excellent** in teaching if, in all of the categories above, the committee judges the candidate’s overall teaching performance as superb. For instance, the student evaluation scores must suggest inspirational performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show impressive preparation; and the candidate must demonstrate extensive and highly effective mentoring of students, including direction of theses and/or dissertations. The candidate also may have published a textbook or received awards for teaching, but these achievements are not necessary and will not compensate for sub-standard performance in the other areas.

The candidate will be judged to be **highly competent** in instruction if the committee judges the candidate’s teaching performance as very good. For instance, the applicant’s student evaluation scores must be well above average, suggesting very effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented must show diligent preparation; and the candidate must have mentored a significant number of students, including direction of individual student work and service on thesis and dissertation committees.

The candidate will be judged to be **unsatisfactory** in instruction if the general impression is that the candidate’s teaching performance is merely competent. For instance, the student evaluation scores may suggest adequate performance in the classroom; the course material presented suggests diligent preparation; and the candidate demonstrates minimal mentoring of students.
Service to one’s colleagues, to the department, to the college, and to the university are important elements in judging faculty contributions and performance. Faculty also owe service to their academic discipline, usually by participating in the operation of professional associations as officers or committee or board members. In addition, since the health and human services professions are concerned with individual and societal health and well-being and, therefore, are quite conducive to useful, professionally relevant forms of community service, efforts at applying one’s scholarly expertise to address community concerns are highly valued in our college. However, service activities, no matter how valuable, without excellence in research and high competence in teaching will not be sufficient to warrant tenure and promotion.

The college does not ask the same quantity and quality of service contributions from faculty in junior and senior ranks. The information given below indicates the important forms of service for junior and senior faculty and provides some guidelines for judging different levels of quality in the area of service.

Categories of Service

The candidate must submit written evidence of service activity related to his/her areas of professional competence. The general categories of service to be listed and documented in the dossier are:

1. Assistance to Colleagues

Assistance to colleagues includes consulting about educational and teaching
issues (e.g., curriculum development, mode of presentation, or assistance with new
teaching technology); guest-lecturing in colleagues’ courses; advice about or reviews of
manuscripts or grant applications; and help or collaboration on research projects.

2. **Contributions to the Department or School**

Contributions to the candidate’s department or school includes memberships on or
chairing unit committees; planning or development of programs or unit activities; other
assistance not part of committee duties; serving as undergraduate or graduate director.

3. **Contributions to the College, University, or SCHEV**

Contributions to the college, university, or SCHEV include membership on or
chairing committees at these levels and representing the college, university, or SCHEV
at outside functions.

4. **Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations**

Involvement with and work for other organizations includes employing one’s
scholarly expertise in service as a member, officer, or consultant for a nonprofit or
business organization.

5. **Significant Community Participation**

Community activities include lectures, speeches, presentations, or workshops for
community groups and media interviews and articles in newspapers or other media
outlets.

6. **Meritorious Public Service**

Public service includes professional assistance to government agencies or public
officials, serving on or consulting for government task forces or advisory committees, and helping to develop or enhance community, state, or national resources.

7. **Offices Held in Professional Associations**

Offices held in professional associations include serving as an officer or as a board or committee member. These include leadership or administrative positions only; serving as member of an association’s scholarly award committee, as an editor, associate editor, or referee for a journal, or as a program session organizer or discussant at a meeting should be listed in the *Significant Scholarly or Professional Services* section of *Research and Scholarship*.

**Evaluation of Service**

Based on the evidence submitted, the candidate’s service will be evaluated as:

genuine excellence, high competence, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

For tenure and promotion to the rank of **Associate Professor** the candidate must be evaluated as at least **satisfactory** in service.

A candidate will be judged **genuinely excellent** in service if she or he has: 1) been very active in assistance to colleagues; 2) willingly and responsibly served on major departmental committees; 3) served on college, university or SCHEV committees; and 4) shown significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations (e.g., consultancies, advisory board memberships, speeches) or made significant contribution to public awareness of scholarly or professional issues through media interviews, television appearances, or provision of
internet content.

A candidate will be judged **highly competent** in service if she or he has **either** 1) been very active in assistance to colleagues and has willingly and responsibly performed several departmental service tasks, **or** 2) is active in departmental service tasks and serves on a college, university, or SCHEV committee, **or** 3) is active in departmental service tasks and has had significant service to community, governmental, or professional organizations (e.g., consultancies, advisory board memberships, speeches) or made significant contribution to public awareness of scholarly or professional issues through media activities.

A candidate will be judged **satisfactory** in service if she or he has been active in assistance to colleagues and responsibly carries out the departmental service tasks that are assigned to him or her.

The evaluation category, **unsatisfactory**, is reserved for candidates for associate professor who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for satisfactory performance.

**Promotion to Professor**

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure the candidate must be evaluated as at least **highly competent** in service.

A candidate will be judged **genuinely excellent** in service if she or he has: 1) been active in assistance to colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in departmental service by serving as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad hoc committee; 3) served effectively in one or more of the following
roles: graduate director, undergraduate director, chair of the recruitment committee, or
other major ad hoc committee; 4) done extensive and/or influential work on college or
university committees; 5) given significant service to community, governmental, or
professional organizations (e.g., consultancies, advisory board memberships,
speeches) or made significant contribution to public awareness of scholarly or
professional issues through media interviews, television appearances, or provision of
internet content; and 6) served frequently as an officer or board or committee member
of a regional or national professional association.

A candidate will be judged highly competent in service if she or he has: 1)
been active in assistance to colleagues; 2) effectively taken a leading role in
departmental service by serving as the chairperson of at least one departmental
standing or ad hoc committee; 3) served effectively in one or more of the following
roles: graduate director, undergraduate director, chair of a faculty recruitment
committee, or other major ad hoc committee; and 4) given significant service on college
or university committees.

A candidate will be judged satisfactory in service if she or he has: 1) been
active in assistance to colleagues; and 2) taken a leading role in departmental service
by serving as the chairperson of at least one departmental standing or ad hoc
committee.

The evaluation category, unsatisfactory, is reserved for candidates for
professor who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for satisfactory
performance.
Evaluation Process

The process and schedule for applying for promotion and tenure in the College of Health and Human Services is governed by this *Manual*, the University Policy on Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment, found in the *Faculty Handbook*, and the unit manual. The detailed schedule is found in Appendix B of this document.

Normally, the evaluation process for tenure and promotion will begin for an assistant professor in the spring of the fifth year of service at George Mason University, when the candidate informs the unit administrator of his or her intention to apply for tenure and promotion. An important part of the evaluation for tenure and promotion at all ranks is the assessment of the candidate’s credentials in research and scholarship by scholars outside George Mason University. As the first step in the process, the candidate must submit to the unit administrator a list of 6 scholars in her or his specialty area who are qualified to evaluate her or his performance and reputation within the discipline or profession. The candidate also may submit to the unit administrator the names of 3 persons who should not be solicited as external reviewers. Then, without further consultation with the candidate, the unit administrator will prepare a list of 6 additional scholars who could perform the assessment role. Both lists will be submitted to the Office of the Dean by April 15, where at least five persons will be selected, according to university guidelines, to perform a review.

By June 15, after the unit administrator has checked the candidate’s research dossier for completeness and conformity to university guidelines, the candidate then will
submit the dossier, including the CV, narrative research and teaching statement, and reprints of all refereed publications, to the Dean’s Office, so it can be sent to the outside reviewers. Reviewers’ letters will be due August 15, when they will become part of the dossier and be considered at all levels of review in the university. If the candidate has signed a waiver of his/her right to see the letters, they will remain confidential and will not be shared with the candidate at any time. Candidates who have not signed a waiver will be entitled to view the letters.

The first level of internal review is performed by the department or school’s Committee on Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PT&R Committee), based on the materials supplied by the candidate and the opinions of the outside reviewers. For tenure decisions, units may choose to elect a PT&R committee OR deem all tenured faculty (except the unit administrator) as a committee of the whole. In either case, only tenured faculty members may participate in the decision, serve on the committee, and vote. For decisions about promotion to full professor, the committee will consist only of tenured full professors. During the fall semester the unit PT&R Committee will review the candidate’s file and the outside letters and decide whether to recommend for or against tenure and promotion, informing the unit administrator in a letter including the division of the vote and detailing the reasons for their recommendation. Then the unit administrator will write an independent letter of recommendation, which, along with the unit committee letter, outside reviewers’ letters, and the candidate’s dossier, will be forwarded to the CHHS PT&R Committee by November 1.

The second level of review within the college will be conducted by the CHHS Committee on Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment, which is composed of one
representative from each academic unit. Each unit’s PT&R Committee will elect its own representative from among its members for one two-year term. The unit representative to the college committee shall not vote on candidates from his or her department when they are considered by the college committee. If the college committee wishes additional materials, it may request them from the Dean, who will arrange for them to be furnished after the candidate has been informed of the request. The college committee will evaluate the file and render its own letter of recommendation to the Dean of the College by December 10. The Dean shall submit her or his own letter of recommendation, along with all supporting materials, to the Provost by January 15. A final decision on tenure and promotion will normally be made by the university’s Board of Visitors in early May.

To help inform the candidate and unit head as soon as possible of the progress of the candidate’s application, and to protect the confidentiality of that process, the following procedures will be followed. Notification of recommendations generated at the level of the local academic unit and accompanying justifications are sent to members of the faculty who participated in the preceding deliberations and to the candidate. The candidate is evaluated in like manner by the promotion and tenure committee of the College, which forwards its recommendation along with all preceding reports and recommendations to the Dean. Notification of the recommendation of the College committee is sent to each member of the department who participated in making the departmental recommendation. Copies of the statement of justification are sent to the candidate and the department chair.

All materials are reviewed by the Dean, who then forwards them along with
his/her recommendation to the Provost. Notification of the Dean’s recommendation is sent to the faculty who participated in deliberations at the local level and a copy of the accompanying justification is sent to the candidate, the local unit administrator (the latter copy to be retained in the candidate’s permanent file), and the Chair of the College PTR Committee.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved in the decision. E-mail will not be used for either deliberation or sharing drafts of letters. At the conclusion of the review process, the original dossier materials will be returned to the candidate.

**Promotion of Term Faculty**

Guidelines for promotion of term faculty are found in each unit’s manual for promotion, tenure, and reappointment.

**Reappointment of Faculty**

Guidelines for faculty reappointment are included in the GMU Faculty Handbook, but reappointment is always dependent on the strategic goals of the College and the specific needs of each academic program.
APPENDIX A: Promotion and Tenure Casebook Template

(Supplementary books should be submitted, only if requested.)

1. Letter of recommendation from the Dean or Director.

2. Letters of recommendation from earlier committees evaluating the case, and from department chairs (where relevant).

3. Candidate’s employment chronology, particularly at GMU to include: date of hire, date when appointed to a tenure track position and tenure and promotion dates, prior to full professorship.

4. Candidate’s vita, including clear evidence about research – publications, grant and contract awards, conferences and invited talks, patent applications and awards, etc. Evidence of relevant entrepreneurial activities may also be provided for consideration toward promotion or tenure.

5. Candidate’s statement about teaching and research, including future plans (not to exceed 8 pages).

6. Outside letters:
   a. Minimum of 5
   b. No more than 40% chosen by candidate (candidate may also name a few individuals to exclude, but should not see the final list)
   c. This section should also contain the letter sent to the referees, and evidence of referee credentials.

7. Evidence of teaching quality:
   a. Student course evaluations
   b. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as:
      (1) Class visits by peers
      (2) Random sample letters
      (3) Student comments based on the whole population, not selected samples
      (4) Alumni letters
      (5) Student focus groups
   c. When applicable, evidence of educational work with students outside the classroom
   d. Advising: When advising functions have been fulfilled, these may be used as evidence for overall teaching contributions
   e. When applicable, theses and dissertations supervised.

8. Other supporting evaluative materials (testimony about service or outreach, evidence of academic entrepreneurship, etc.) -- not to exceed 8 pages.

9. Procedural checklist for Promotion and Tenure Cases (available on the Provost Office website)
### APPENDIX B: Schedule for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Year Reviews</th>
<th>Tenure and Promotion</th>
<th>Term Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By April 15 of the AY before review unit administrator meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines and timeline</td>
<td>By April 15 of the AY before review unit administrator meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines and timeline; candidate's and chair's lists of possible peer reviewers submitted to Dean's office</td>
<td>By April 15 of the AY before review unit administrator meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines &amp; timeline; candidate's and chair's lists of possible peer reviewers submitted to Dean's office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 15 selection and confirmation of external peer reviewers is complete</td>
<td>By June 15 candidate submits research dossier to Dean's office</td>
<td>By May 15 selection and confirmation of external peer reviewers is complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 15 candidate submits research dossier to Dean's office</td>
<td>By July 1 research dossier has been sent to external peer reviewers</td>
<td>By June 15 candidate submits dossier to Dean's office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 15 letters have been received from external peer reviewers; candidate presents full dossier to unit administrator</td>
<td>By September 1 first level review begins by unit PT&amp;R committee</td>
<td>By July 1 all required material has been sent to external peer reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 1 first level review begins by unit PT&amp;R committee</td>
<td>By October 15 unit committee forwards recommendation letter and dossier to unit chair</td>
<td>By August 15 letters have been received from external peer reviewers; candidate presents updated dossier to unit administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By October 15 unit committee forwards recommendation letter and dossier to unit chair</td>
<td>By November 1 first level reviews and dossier presented to the college committee</td>
<td>By September 1 first level review begins by unit PT&amp;R committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By November 1 first level reviews and dossier presented to the college committee</td>
<td>By December 10 chair of college committee presents dossier and all supporting material to Dean</td>
<td>By October 15 unit committee forwards recommendation letter and dossier to unit chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 10 chair of college committee presents dossier and all supporting material to Dean</td>
<td>By January 15 Dean presents dossier and all supporting material to Dean</td>
<td>By October 15 unit administrator adds his/her recommendation to the candidate's dossier and presents dossier and all supporting material to the Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 15 Dean presents dossier and all supporting material to Dean</td>
<td>By March 1 Dean presents all required material to the Provost</td>
<td>By November 1 Dean presents dossiers and all supporting material to Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Timeline will need to be modified if CHHS faculty opt for a second level review for term promotions*