

# TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

## CEHD Portfolio Guidelines

*College of Education and Human Development*  
*Mark R. Ginsberg, Dean*

This document provides guidelines for completing the CEHD Portfolio that is used (1) for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal evaluations, and (2) for annual evaluations of tenure-track faculty (aka “developmental portfolio”).

### CEHD Portfolio Guidelines

All CEHD full-time instructional faculty will use the online submission system to summarize work for each academic year (this is the basic annual evaluation process). The summary information submitted in this system is aligned with—but more abbreviated in content and format than—the information required for the portfolio described in this document.

In addition to submitting annual evaluation summary information (one-year “snapshot”), tenure-track faculty must also submit a developmental portfolio to the CEHD Tenure-Track Annual Review Committee (TTARC) that will grow and evolve each year over the course of the tenure-track period. The purpose of the developmental portfolio is to provide reviewers with a cumulative look at the evidence relevant to a future tenure decision, with narrative material that highlights connections and synergy among teaching, research, and service activities and accomplishments.

Faculty seeking contract renewal for a multi-year period (i.e., tenure-track contract renewal; renewal of a term faculty contract for a multi-year period) submit a portfolio to the CEHD Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee.

Faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate or full professor submit a portfolio to an appointed first-tier committee (which is analogous to a departmental review committee) and to the CEHD P&T Committee.

### ***Basic Guidelines for Those Required to Submit a Full Portfolio***

- Files will be submitted electronically. The Dean’s Office will provide instructions with regard to how to submit files.
- Reporting of data must be fully accurate and internally consistent throughout all sections of the portfolio. Please carefully check to ensure that information in the CV, online evaluation site, and narratives are verbally and numerically in 100% agreement.

- Submitted materials must comply with CEHD and Provost content and format guidelines, as detailed below and in the other documents included under the heading of “Tenure/Promotion/Contract Renewal Guidelines” on the CEHD website.
- Narratives must use 12-point font, have 1-inch margins, and be single spaced.
- Acronyms should be defined in the narratives, as TTARC and first-tier/P&T committee members are often unfamiliar with terms from specialized content domains.
- Faculty should be able to provide additional supporting material beyond the elements specified in this document to TTARC and first-tier/P&T committee members upon request.
- TTARC and first-tier/P&T committee members may reject portfolios that do not meet the guidelines.
- TTARC and first-tier/P&T committee members may request further clarification or documentation of evidence in the portfolio.

### ***Portfolio Components***

**Part 1: Complete, Updated Vita** – Citations must conform to APA guidelines.

**Part 2: Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary for the Reporting Period:**

<b>Year</b>	<b>GSE Faculty Submit</b>	<b>RHT Faculty Submit</b>
AY 2007–2008 (and prior)	1. Copy of Faculty Evaluation Self-Reporting Form (FESRF) 2. Copy of GSE FEC Evaluation Letter	1. Copy of the RHT Director’s Annual Review
AY 2008–2009	1. Copy of Self-Reporting Format Submission 2. Copy of GSE FEC Evaluation Letter	1. Copy of the RHT Director’s Annual Review
AY 2009–2010 (and forward)	1. PDF of the CEHD Annual Evaluation Online Submission 2. Copy of GSE FEC or TTARC Evaluation Letter	1. PDF of the CEHD Annual Evaluation Online Submission 2. Copy of RHT FEC or TTARC Evaluation Letter
<b><u>Faculty on the Tenure-Track who have completed their third-year review also include in Tab 2</u></b>	<b>A copy of your third-year letter from the CEHD P&amp;T Committee</b>	<b>A copy of your third-year letter from the CEHD P&amp;T Committee</b>

**Part 3: Narratives** – The narratives are a critical part of the evaluation process, as they both summarize and frame the evidence that is in the overall portfolio. Faculty must point as explicitly as possible to material provided elsewhere in the portfolio that supports the assertions made in the narratives. The Provost’s guidelines state that the combined Teaching + Research and Scholarship narrative may not be longer than eight pages (i.e., approximately 4 pages for each topic) – **No Exceptions**, and must include future plans for both teaching and research and scholarship. The Service narrative (which may also include supplementary information on any topic) may not be longer than eight pages – **No Exceptions**.

Appended to this document is a list of suggestions related to the teaching, research and scholarship, and service narratives. These suggestions briefly outline the topics that faculty typically include in their narratives. Note, however, that a specific faculty member’s narratives would not necessarily touch on all of the topics listed in this document, nor are these suggestions designed to inhibit the inclusion of other relevant topics.

**Part 4: Reflective Practice** – In this section faculty present a separate narrative reflecting on the evaluative process – for example, responses to prior feedback, what was attended to and how, what concerns were addressed and how, what was accomplished and how. The Reflective Practice document has no page limit.

#### **Part 5: Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness**

- a. Provide a table that summarizes all teaching evaluation data, cumulative over the evaluation period. A sample spreadsheet and a template are available on the faculty website at <http://cehd.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/>
- b. Copies of all course evaluation summaries for the review period
- c. Representative syllabi (maximum three)
- d. Samples of student work (optional; maximum of three)
- e. Peer reviews of teaching, which may include outside as well as internal letters
  - TTARC developmental portfolios: Peer reviews of teaching are optional, but inclusion of at least two letters—one of which may be from someone with whom you have co-taught—is strongly recommended;
  - Tenure-track contract renewal cases: At least two peer reviews of teaching are mandatory;
  - Term contract renewal cases: At least two peer reviews of teaching are mandatory;
  - Promotion and/or tenure cases (including term promotion to associate cases): At least three peer reviews of teaching are mandatory.
- f. Summary of student and/or alumni comments, ideally from the whole population, not selected samples (optional - maximum four pages)

- g. Sample teaching publications (maximum of two)
- h. Examples of teaching innovations (maximum three pages)
- i. Awards and honors
- j. When applicable, theses and dissertations supervised
- k. Summary of advising responsibilities and their fulfillment

**Part 6: Evidence of Research and Scholarship**

- a. Selected works for review period (full text) (maximum of five)
- b. Abstracts for additional publications, presentations, and grants (optional)
- c. Evidence of quality and impact – e.g., summary of citations, quality of journals, peer review process for journals (maximum two pages)
- d. Awards and honors

**Part 7: Evidence of Service Contributions**

- a. Especially notable examples of high-impact service activities and how your participation made a difference (maximum of five)
- b. Letters of appreciation – sent or solicited (maximum of five)
- c. Awards and honors