

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES:

General Guidelines for Conducting Tenure and Promotion Evaluations

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

This document provides an overview of the guidelines used to evaluate candidates seeking tenure (i.e., tenure-track faculty) or promotion in rank (whether in a term or tenure-line position).

NOTE: For brevity, the phrase “Tenure and Promotion Guidelines” is used for each of the 6 documents organized under this general heading. However, many of the guidelines and explanations in these documents are also relevant to tenure-track faculty seeking renewal of their initial 3-year tenure-track contract, as well as cases in which term faculty are seeking to renew (or establish) a multi-year term faculty contract (whether in conjunction with a promotion review or seeking contract renewal at the same academic rank).

How Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal Evaluations Differ from Annual Evaluations

The primary purpose of the annual evaluation process is to provide ongoing feedback to support continuous improvements in faculty performance as it relates to the University’s mission (with a primary focus on teaching, research and scholarship, and service, including faculty leadership roles related to each of these areas of performance). Annual evaluation results also provide a primary (though not the only) basis for salary increase recommendations when such increases are authorized.

Although tenure, promotion, and multi-year contract renewal evaluations also focus on teaching, research and scholarship, and service, the primary purpose of these evaluations is contractual (i.e., should the faculty member’s employment contract be extended in time for a specified term—or without term—and/or escalated to a higher academic rank).

Consistent with these different purposes, the relevant evidence for the annual evaluation process, and for multi-year contract renewal evaluations, includes activities and accomplishments for a specified evaluation time period. However, for tenure and promotion evaluations, actual accomplishments are the primary evidence of interest. As stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, “While tenure-track appointments will, to some extent, recognize perceived potential rather than achievement, appointment without term or promotion in rank will be based on achievement rather than potential.”

College-Level Criteria and Procedures Related to Tenure and Promotion Can Supplement and Clarify University-Level Criteria and Procedures, but They Cannot Substantively Alter or Negate Those Criteria and Procedures

Each full-time instructional faculty member’s employment contract invokes and requires compliance with the statements in the *Faculty Handbook*, including several sections specifically focused on criteria

and procedures for conducting tenure, promotion, and contract renewal evaluations. Consequently, nothing in the series of 6 documents detailing Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for faculty appointed within the College of Education and Human Development should be construed as replacing, nullifying, or otherwise circumventing the guidelines spelled out in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Peer Faculty Within the College, with Input and Guidance from Peer Faculty Serving as External Reviewers, Have Primary Responsibility for Operationalizing the Concepts of “Genuine Excellence” and “High Competence”

The Mason *Faculty Handbook* provides faculty with the high-level concepts of “genuine excellence” and “high competence” to guide their tenure and promotion recommendations. Specifically:

Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University which are teaching; research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied; and service... Peer review plays a central role in the evaluation of individual achievement in each of these areas. Although candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in each of these areas, high competence is expected. Genuine excellence must be exhibited either in teaching or in research/scholarship. High competence must be exhibited in both areas. The primary consideration in the evaluation of the candidate’s achievements will be the extent to which these continue to improve the academic quality of the University.

The concepts of genuine excellence and high competence are necessarily abstract because they must be applied to faculty working across a wide array of disciplines and sub-disciplines. However, these concepts provide an effective and flexible method for maintaining high standards over time and across many different circumstances. The key to ensuring that these essential criteria are appropriately and equitably applied is to ensure that concepts and methods for operationalizing these criteria at the level of a local academic unit, and within the context of a particular discipline, are clearly communicated and frequently discussed by peer faculty and relevant administrators. In a university that continues to grow with regard to its aspirations, expectations, and stature, the operational definition of these concepts must be continuously reviewed and recalibrated to ensure their reliability (i.e., all of the evaluators are on “the same page”) and validity (i.e., the outcome aligns with the *Faculty Handbook’s* “primary consideration” that the candidate’s achievements must continue to improve the academic quality of the University).

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments that equate to “genuine excellence” or “high competence” in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). This *equifinality* principle (i.e.,

the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

Consistent with this principle, George Mason University and the College of Education and Human Development are committed to actively promoting and encouraging multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary research and education. In the context of tenure and promotion decisions, this means that multidisciplinary/transdisciplinary accomplishments should be regarded as an amplifier (“plus factor”) rather than as a vulnerability when faculty and administrators are assessing the appropriateness and value of a faculty member’s contributions. This is a particularly important principle to make explicit in written and verbal communications about tenure and promotion as the structure of the review process tends to encourage evaluators to think in terms of traditional discipline-based concepts and images of success.

The Criteria Guiding Contractual Decisions about Tenure and Promotion Must Appropriately Vary Based on Academic Rank and the Length of the Contract

Consistent with this principle, and based primarily on the contractual statements in the Mason *Faculty Handbook*, CEHD has the following expectations with respect to tenure and promotion decisions:

Term Faculty Promotion in Rank from Assistant to Associate Professor: High Competence in the candidate’s focus area (teaching or research) is required, as is High Competence in service.

Term Faculty Promotion in Rank from Associate to Full Professor: Genuine Excellence in the candidate’s focus area (teaching or research) is required, as is High Competence in service.

Tenure and Promotion from the Assistant to Associate Rank (or Tenure within the Associate Rank): Genuine Excellence is required in teaching or research, with at least High Competence in each of the other areas.

Promotion to Full Professor for Tenured Faculty: The *Faculty Handbook* states that “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” [with impact beyond the boundaries of the University being the *sine qua non* of the Genuine Excellence concept]. In that spirit, full professors are expected to manifest either:

1. Substantially greater breadth with respect to Genuine Excellence than would be required for promotion to the associate rank (i.e., Genuine Excellence in at least 2 of the 3 areas of evaluation, with at least High Competence in the remaining area), *or*
2. Substantially greater depth with respect to Genuine Excellence than would be required for promotion to the associate rank (i.e., Genuine Excellence in research or teaching at a level that is far beyond the threshold required for this designation, with at least High Competence in the remaining areas).

Another way in which the criteria guiding tenure and promotion decisions must appropriately vary based on academic rank relates to the concept of *leadership*. This is a “meta-criterion” cutting across all three areas of faculty work that is particularly relevant to decisions regarding the appropriateness of promoting a faculty member (whether in a term or tenured position) from the associate rank to the full professor rank. For example, whereas promotion to the associate rank might focus on evidence regarding whether one is teaching courses well and having an impact on students, full professor evaluations might also be attuned to evidence that the faculty member is playing a leadership role in program development, in facilitating the program’s resource base and reputational strength, and in mentoring the next generation of faculty leaders. Similarly, whereas tenure-track faculty might earn promotion by publishing with increasing frequency in well-regarded venues, full professor candidates would be expected to have widely cited signature scholarly products and already established recognition for their research contributions that demonstrate their leadership role in the field.

Tenure and Promotion Evaluations for Faculty with Substantial Administrative Assignments*

Consistent with the idea that leadership is a highly valued quality of a faculty member’s contributions, administrative assignments that are carried out effectively can strengthen a bid for tenure or promotion. However, if the administrative assignment is so large that it has a significant negative impact on research and scholarship production and impact, the ability of the candidate to meet the basic tenure and/or promotion criteria outlined above may be impeded.

To clarify, because teaching effectiveness is generally calibrated based on how *well* one teaches (rather than how often), administrative assignments that have an appropriate teaching load reduction (in terms of time compensation) typically do not have a significant negative impact on a candidate’s ability to meet either teaching-related or research-related tenure and promotion criteria. When problems arise, it is typically because there is diminished time available to commit to research and scholarship endeavors (i.e., any teaching load reduction is insufficient to compensate for the administrative time commitment, or the administrative assignment is so large that there is no teaching load reduction that could compensate for the reallocated time).

Thus, faculty who aspire to a tenured appointment and/or promotion in rank should be aware that, while an administrative assignment can escalate their candidacy up to a point (because effectiveness in leadership roles is generally a plus factor in tenure and promotion decisions), the costs are likely to outweigh the benefits if the assignment significantly detracts from their research and scholarship time over an extended period of time.

**At present, George Mason University has no policies or procedures designed for administrative/professional faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion in rank (i.e., they can only pursue tenure or promotion through the criteria and procedures specified in the Faculty Handbook designed for instructional/research faculty).*

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

CEHD Portfolio and Mason Casebook 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”). It also explains how the CEHD Dean’s Office extracts materials from the CEHD Portfolio to form the casebook of selected materials that is submitted to the Provost’s Office for university-level tenure, promotion, and contract renewal evaluations.

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:

Year	SOED Faculty Submit	SOK Faculty Submit	SRTM Faculty Submit
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	1. Copy of the RHT Director’s Annual Review
AY 2009–2010 through 2018-2019	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	1. PDF of the CEHD Annual Evaluation Online Submission 2. Copy of RHT FEC or TTARC Evaluation Letter
AY 2019–2020 and forward	1. PDF of the CEHD Annual Evaluation Online Submission 2. Copy of the SOED FEC or TTARC Evaluation Letter	1. PDF of the CEHD Annual Evaluation Online Submission 2. Copy of the SOK FEC or TTARC Evaluation Letter	1. PDF of the CEHD Annual Evaluation Online Submission 2. Copy of the SRTM FEC or TTARC Evaluation Letter
<u>Faculty on the Tenure-Track who have completed their third-year review also include in Tab 2</u>	A copy of your third-year letter from the CEHD P&T Committee	A copy of your third-year letter from the CEHD P&T Committee	A copy of your third-year letter from the CEHD P&T Committee

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 four 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

Include:

- a. 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. 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.
- d. Include at least two of the following (create a subfolder for each item):
 - i. Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - ii. Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - iii. Design, implementation, and assessment of teaching innovations

- iv. Engagement in curricular initiatives, including—but not limited to—participation in Mason’s strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
- v. Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment

Include, if applicable:

- e. List of student projects, theses, and dissertations completed and in progress (graduate and undergraduate, as chair and committee member)
- f. List of professional development activities that support student learning and teaching innovation (within and outside of Mason)
- g. Unsolicited letters from students, colleagues (within and outside of Mason), and alumni
- h. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities, e.g., teaching publications and presentations. These can be included here or in the research section, depending on the nature of the contribution.
- i. Awards and honors

Optional:

- j. Samples of student work (maximum of three)
- k. Summary of student and/or alumni comments, ideally from a defined total population, not selected samples (maximum four pages)

Part 6: Evidence of Research and Scholarship (for those being evaluated in this domain)

Include:

- a. Examples of grants, published works, and/or presentations at professional meetings and conferences.
- b. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities, e.g., teaching publications and presentations. These can be included here or in the teaching section, depending on the nature of the contribution.
- c. Selected works for review period (full text) (maximum of five)

- d. Evidence of quality and impact – e.g., summary of citations, quality of journals, peer review process for journals (maximum two pages)
- e. Awards and honors

Optional:

- f. Abstracts for additional publications, presentations, and grants

Part 7: Evidence of Service Contributions

Include:

- 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

Note for term promotion candidates only: Three letters of support from outside Mason are also required. Thus, the CEHD Portfolio is slightly different **only for term promotion faculty candidates**. An extra tab (Tab 4) has been added for the three outside letters of support. The tabs for this portfolio are:

1. Vita
2. Annual Evaluations
3. Narratives (Teaching and Research, and Service)
4. Outside Letters of Support
5. Reflective Practice
6. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
7. Evidence of Research and Scholarship
8. Evidence of Service Contributions

CEHD Portfolio Materials Used for the Provost's Casebook

TTARC developmental portfolios do not progress to the Provost's Office for further review; they are only used for the annual evaluation process, which ends at the college level.

Portfolios constructed for the purpose of evaluating candidates for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal form the basis of the Provost's Casebook used at the next level of review; however, only a subset of materials from the CEHD Portfolio are included in the Provost's Casebook (because the central administration is affirming/verifying the work from lower levels of review rather than conducting yet another comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's accomplishments).

There are four variations on the Provost's Casebook depending on whether the faculty member is a candidate for (1) tenure and/or promotion within a tenured position, (2) term promotion, (3) tenure-track contract renewal, and (4) term multi-year contract renewal.

Tenure/Promotion Casebook for Tenure-Line Faculty

The Provost's Casebook for tenure and/or promotion includes the following elements:

Part 1: Letter of recommendation from Dean will include summaries of prior reports, evaluations of performance in research, teaching, service, and evaluation of probable future trajectory. Letters should clearly indicate candidate's intention to be considered for "Genuine Excellence" in scholarship, teaching, or both.

Part 2: Letters of recommendation from first- and second-level committees evaluating the case, and from school directors/departments chairs (where relevant). Letter should include a roster of committee members at each level. Letters should clearly indicate candidate's intention to be considered for "Genuine Excellence" in scholarship, teaching, or both.

NOTE: Dean and committee letters should normally NOT quote directly from outside letters or cite referees by name, as opposed to summarizing content. Brief quotes (though not be named) can be included when important for the case.

Part 3: External Review (Outside) Letters (minimum of 5):

- a. This section should also contain the letter sent to the referees, and evidence of referee credentials.
- b. Units may allow candidate to suggest up to 40% of the outside referees; they may also allow candidate to name one or two individuals to exclude; candidates in no case will see the final list of referees.

Part 4: Candidate's statement(s) about teaching/mentoring and research, including future plans (not to exceed 8 pages).

Part 5: 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.

Part 6: Candidate's vita, to include clear evidence about research and scholarship.

- a. Publications (peer and non-peer reviewed), including journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, etc.
- b. Sponsored research activity and grant and contract awards in support of research, creative activity, and professional practice.
- c. Conference and other scholarly presentations (peer-reviewed and invited).
- d. Artistic and professional performances and exhibits.
- e. Intellectual property, patents, and evidence of relevant entrepreneurial activities may also be provided for consideration toward promotion or tenure.
- f. Other evidence indicating scholarly recognition and reputation.

Part 7: The range of the candidate's teaching, learning, and mentoring should be highlighted. Evidentiary material for teaching effectiveness should include:

- a. Summary of student course evaluations (can include student comments, if reflective of the entire population of comments).
- b. Peer evaluations and/or LAU head evaluations of course materials and/or classroom teaching.
- c. When applicable, list of student projects, theses and dissertations supervised, completed and in progress (graduate and undergraduate, as chair and committee member).
- d. Other evidence of teaching quality (select at least two):
 - i. Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - ii. Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - iii. Design, implementation and assessment of teaching innovations
 - iv. Engagement in curricular initiatives, including—but not limited to—participation in Mason's strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
 - v. Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment

- e. The casebook may also include (if applicable)
 - i. List of student projects, theses, and dissertations completed and in progress (graduate and undergraduate, as chair and committee member)
 - ii. List of professional development activities that support student learning and teaching innovation (within and outside of Mason)
 - iii. Unsolicited letters from students, colleagues (within and outside of Mason), and alumni
 - iv. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities (can be included here or in the research section, depending on the nature of the contribution)

Part 8: Other supporting evaluative materials (testimony about service or outreach, evidence of academic entrepreneurship, etc.)—not to exceed 4 pages.

Part 9: Valid Certificate of Completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training.

Promotion Casebook for Term Faculty Promotion

In the case of Term Faculty, evaluations are to focus on the portfolio of position responsibilities, primarily teaching, research, or clinical, with evidence provided for any additional responsibilities, whether leadership, administrative, or service.

Part 1: Letter of recommendation from the Dean (Attachment #2 template).

Part 2: Letters of recommendation from committee(s) evaluating the case to include a roster of committee members at each level, and from department chairs/school directors (where relevant).

Part 3: Candidate's employment chronology, particularly at GMU, to include: date of hire, date of initial appointment to a term faculty position, and ensuing additional appointments.

Part 4: Candidate's vita, including clear representation of all position responsibilities.

Part 5: Candidate's professional statement, including future plans (not to exceed 8 pages).

- a. The candidate's statement should reflect the primary area of focus (i.e., teaching, research, or clinical).
- b. The candidate's professional statement should include commentary on additional leadership, administrative, and service activities.

Part 6: For candidates undergoing evaluation of performance in teaching, the casebook must include evidence of highly competent classroom teaching. The range of the candidate's teaching, learning, and mentoring should be highlighted. Evidentiary material for teaching effectiveness should include:

- a. Summary of student course evaluations for at least the past 4 years (can include student comments, if reflective of the entire population of comments).
- b. Peer evaluations and/or LAU head evaluations of course materials and/or classroom teaching.
- c. Evidence and examples of (select at least two):
 - i. Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - ii. Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - iii. Design, implementation and assessment of teaching innovations
 - iv. Engagement in curricular initiatives, including—but not limited to— participation in Mason's strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
 - v. Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment
- d. The casebook may include (if applicable):
 - i. List of student projects, theses, and dissertations completed and in progress (graduate and undergraduate, as chair and committee member)
 - ii. List of professional development activities that support student learning and teaching innovation (within and outside of Mason)
 - iii. Unsolicited letters from students, colleagues (within and outside of Mason), and alumni
 - iv. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities (can be included here or in the research section, depending on the nature of the contribution).

Part 7. For candidates undergoing evaluation of performance in research, the casebook should include:

- a. Examples of grants, published works, and/or presentations at professional meetings and conferences.
- b. For term faculty whose *primary focus is research*, it should also include peer evaluations from outside the university, in the form of external letters of evaluation.
- c. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities (can be included here or in the teaching section, depending on the nature of the contribution).

Part 8: In the case of term faculty with significant administrative responsibilities, evidence of administrative service should be included. Such evidence may include:

- a. Examples of administrative initiatives and/or impacts
- b. Past performance evaluations
- c. Letters of support from relevant stakeholders

Part 9: Valid Certificate of Completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training.

Tenure-Track Contract Renewal Casebook

The Provost's Casebook for tenure-track contract renewal includes the following elements:

Part 1: Dean's recommendation memo (Attachment #2 template):

- a. Include a one-paragraph commentary for each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. In your commentary, be sure to identify any areas of concern that need to be addressed before future renewal or tenure considerations.
- b. Recommend the specific dates and term for the renewal recommendation.
- c. Sign and date your recommendation.

Part 2: Recommendation from local academic unit head (where relevant).

Part 3: Committee reports to include a roster of committee members at each level.

Part 4: Candidate's statement(s) about teaching/mentoring and research statement, including future plans (not to exceed 8 pages).

Part 5: Candidate's vita should include GMU employment history and clear evidence about research and scholarship.

- a. Publications (peer and non-peer reviewed), including journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, etc.
- b. Sponsored research activity and grant and contract awards in support of research, creative activity, and professional practice.
- c. Conference and other scholarly presentations (peer-reviewed and invited).

- d. Artistic and professional performances and exhibits.
- e. Intellectual property, patents, and evidence of relevant entrepreneurial activities may also be provided for consideration toward promotion or tenure.
- f. Other evidence indicating scholarly recognition and reputation.

Part 6: The range of the candidate's teaching, learning, and mentoring should be highlighted. Evidentiary material for teaching effectiveness should include:

- a. Summary of student course evaluations (can include student comments, if reflective of the entire population of comments).
- b. Peer evaluations and/or LAU head evaluations of course materials and/or classroom teaching.
- c. When applicable, list of student projects, theses, and dissertations supervised, completed and in progress (graduate and undergraduate, as chair and committee member).
- d. Other evidence of teaching quality (select at least two):
 - i. Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - ii. Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - iii. Design, implementation and assessment of teaching innovations
 - iv. Engagement in curricular initiatives, including—but not limited to—participation in Mason's strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
 - v. Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment

Part 7: Valid Certificate of Completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training.

Term Faculty Multi-Year Contract Renewal Casebook

In the case of Term Faculty who are being appointed for a multi-year contract of three or more years, documentation supporting the appointment should be provided to the Office of the Provost. This documentation should focus on the portfolio of position responsibilities, primarily teaching, research, or clinical, with evidence provided for any additional responsibilities, whether leadership, administrative, or service.

Part 1: Candidate's employment chronology, particularly at GMU, to include: date of hire, date of initial appointment to a term faculty position, and ensuing additional appointments.

Part 2: Candidate's vita, including clear representation of all position responsibilities.

Part 3: For candidates whose primary area of focus is teaching, the documentation must include evidence of effective teaching. The range of the candidate's teaching, learning, and mentoring should be highlighted. Evidentiary material for teaching effectiveness should include:

- a. Summary of student course evaluations for at least the period of the prior contract (can include student comments, if reflective of the entire population of comments).
- b. Peer and/or LAU head evaluations of course materials and/or classroom teaching.
- c. Sample teaching material, such as (select at least two):
 - i. Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - ii. Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - iii. Design, implementation, and assessment of teaching innovations
 - iv. Engagement in curricular initiatives, including—but not limited to— participation in Mason's strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
 - v. Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment
- d. The documentation may also include (if applicable):
 - i. List of student projects, theses, and dissertations completed and in progress (graduate and undergraduate, as chair and committee member)
 - ii. List of professional development activities that support student learning and teaching innovation (within and outside of Mason)
 - iii. Unsolicited letters from students, colleagues (within and outside of Mason), and alumni
 - iv. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities (can be included here or in the research section, depending on the nature of the contribution).

Part 4: For candidates whose primary area of focus is research, documentation should include:

- e. Examples of grants, published works, and/or presentations at professional meetings and conferences.
- f. Examples of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities (can be included here or in the teaching section, depending on the nature of the contribution).

Part 5: In the case of term faculty with significant administrative and/or leadership responsibilities, a statement of accomplishments should be included (no more than 2 pages).

Part 6: Valid Certificate of Completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training.

How the Dean's Office Extracts Materials from CEHD Portfolios for Inclusion in Provost Office Casebooks

Tenure/Promotion Casebook for Tenure-Line Faculty

The Provost's Casebook for tenure and/or promotion includes the following elements:

Part 1: Letter of recommendation from the Dean

The Dean's letter of recommendation is placed into #1.

Part 2: Letters of recommendation from first- and second-level committees and department chairs (where relevant) evaluating the case

The First-Tier Committee and CEHD P&T Committee letters are placed in #2. (CEHD does not have department chairs.)

Part 3: External review letters

The sample letter sent to reviewers is placed in #3a.

The letters received from external reviewers are placed in #3b.

The file of bios for the external reviewers is placed in #3b.

Part 4: Candidate's statement about teaching and research

The teaching and research statement is copied from #3 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #4.

Part 5: Candidate's employment chronology

Each chronology is copied from an Excel file maintained by the CEHD Dean's Office that contains the history of each tenure-track faculty member and placed into #5. Chronologies are created for candidates who are up for consideration for full professor and placed in #5.

Part 6: Candidate's vita

The vita is copied from #1 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #6.

Part 7: Evidence of teaching quality

Separate folders (e.g., student course evaluations, student/alumni comments, sample teaching publications, sample teaching innovations, awards and honors, theses and dissertations supervised, advising responsibilities) are copied from #5 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #7.

Part 8: Other supporting evaluative materials

The candidate's service narrative is copied from #3 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into folder #8. Other supporting evidence may be included (up to a total of 4 pages).

Part 9: Valid certificate of completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training

The certificate provided by the candidate is placed into #9.

Promotion Casebook for Term Faculty Promotion

The Provost's Casebook for term promotion includes the following elements:

In the case of Term Faculty, evaluations are to focus on either Teaching OR Research.

Part 1: Letter of recommendation from the Dean (Attachment #2 template)

The Dean's letter of recommendation is placed into #1.

Part 2: Letters of recommendation from committees

The First-Tier Committee and the CEHD P&T Committee letters are placed into #2.

Part 3: Candidate's employment chronology

The employment chronology is copied from an Excel file maintained by the CEHD Dean's Office that contains the histories of each full-time term faculty member and is placed into #3.

Part 4: Candidate's vita

The vita is copied from #1 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #4.

Part 5: Candidate's professional statement, including future plans

The teaching and research statement is copied from #3 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #5.

Part 6: The evaluation of performance in teaching

Separate folders (e.g., student course evaluations, student/alumni comments, sample teaching publications, sample teaching innovations, awards and honors, theses and dissertations supervised, advising responsibilities) are copied from #5 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #6.

Part 7: The evaluation of performance in research

If applicable, separate folders (examples of grants, published works, and Scholarship of Teaching) are copied from #6 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #7.

Part 8: Evidence of significant administrative responsibilities

If applicable, separate folders of examples of administrative initiatives/impacts, past performance evaluations, and letters of support from stakeholders are copied from the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #8.

Part 9: Valid certificate of completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training

The certificate provided by the candidate is placed into #9.

Tenure-Track Contract Renewal Casebook

The Provost's Casebook for tenure-track contract renewal includes the following elements:

Part 1: Dean's recommendation memo (Attachment #2 template)

The Dean's letter of recommendation is placed into #1.

Part 2: Recommendation from local academic unit head (where relevant)

CEHD does not have local academic unit heads.

Part 3: Committee reports to include a roster of committee members at each level

The First-Tier Committee and CEHD P&T Committee letters are placed into #3.

Part 4: Candidate's statements about teaching/mentoring and research, including future plans

The teaching and research statement is copied from #3 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #4.

Part 5: Candidate's vita, including employment history

The vita is copied from #1 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #5.

Part 6: Evidence of candidate's teaching, learning, and mentoring

Separate folders (e.g., student course evaluations, peer evaluations, sample teaching publications, sample teaching innovations, awards and honors, theses and dissertations supervised, advising responsibilities) are copied from #5 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #6.

Part 7: Valid certificate of completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training

The certificate provided by the candidate is placed into #7.

Term Faculty Multi-Year Contract Renewal Casebook

The Provost's Casebook for term multi-year contract renewal includes the following elements:

Part 1: Candidate's employment chronology

The employment chronology is copied from an Excel file maintained by the CEHD Dean's Office that contains the histories of each full-time term faculty member and is placed into #1.

Part 2: Candidate's vita

The vita is copied from #1 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio into #2.

Part 3: The evaluation of performance in teaching

Separate folders (e.g., student course evaluations, student/alumni comments, sample teaching publications, sample teaching innovations, awards and honors, theses, and dissertations supervised, advising responsibilities) are copied from #5 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #3.

Part 4: The evaluation of performance in research

If applicable, separate folders (examples of grants, published works, and Scholarship of Teaching) are copied from #6 of the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #4.

Part 5: The evaluation of administrative and/or leadership responsibilities

If applicable, the 2-page statement of accomplishments is copied from the candidate's CEHD portfolio and placed into #5.

Part 6: Valid certificate of completion for Title IX Overview and Sexual Harassment Prevention training

The certificate provided by the candidate is placed into #6.

Suggestions Relating to Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service Narratives

NOTE: The Provost's guidelines state that the combined Teaching and Research and Scholarship narratives must not exceed 8 pages total (i.e., approximately 4 pages each).

Teaching Narrative

The overall narrative is reflective in nature. In it the author explains his/her approach to teaching, the impact in terms of improvements that have taken place, and future goals. It might include the following (note that #4 must be included):

1. Introduction
 - a. Teaching assignments—number and type of courses, number and type of students, other information related to teaching assignments (e.g., cohort operations, collaboration in teaching, school partnerships, etc.)
 - b. Doctoral dissertation committees
 - c. Advising load (including doctoral advising committees)
 - d. Course and program development activity
 - e. Other relevant activities (e.g., teaching articles, grants, special projects, etc.)
2. Approach to Teaching
 - a. Philosophy, Beliefs—and how these are reflected in the classroom
 - b. Relationship of teaching to research and literature (on instructional design/delivery, as well as the specific professional field)
3. Teaching Performance
 - a. Overall impact—documented improvements in students' knowledge, skills and/or dispositions
 - b. Discussion of teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, instructional aids, performance assessments, etc.)
 - c. Innovations, leadership
 - d. Analysis/reflection on student and peer evaluations and observations
 - e. Formative and summative self-assessments used
 - f. Other efforts at improvement

4. Future Outlook (**must be included**)

- a. Goals
- b. Strategies

Research and Scholarship Narrative

In this narrative faculty reflect on the rationale for their scholarly work, the major themes they are pursuing, the relationship between their research and other aspects of their professional lives, and the impact of their output. Included might be (note that #4 must be included):

- 1. Rationale
 - a. Beliefs and interests, and how these translate into scholarly activity
 - b. The significance of the rationale
 - c. Connection between rationale and other professional activity, including teaching and service

2. Themes and Subthemes Which Have Developed from the Rationale

3. Output

- a. Overview of output
 - i. Scholarship of discovery and integration (original data and conceptualizations; possible audience is other scholars)
Publications, presentations, grants, etc.
 - ii. Scholarship of application (use of existing knowledge to facilitate the work of education professionals; major audience is practitioners and future practitioners)
Publications, presentations, grants, etc.

(Describe print output by journal, articles, chapters, books, monographs, technical reports, book reviews, media reviews, and other; and non-print media by type.)

- b. Highlight characteristics of sample products
- c. The impact of this output (substance, rather than outlet) on the field: how the nature of the work (rather than where it appears) advances the field
- d. The quality of the outlets: measures of quality (readership, citations, requests for reprints, and other inquiries)
- e. Collaborations
 - i. With colleagues, students, schools, etc.
 - ii. Nature of contribution
- f. Innovations, leadership
- g. Grants
 - i. Scholarly basis
 - ii. Linkage with other aspects of scholarship
- h. Presentations
 - i. Scholarly basis
 - ii. Linkage with other aspects of scholarship
- i. Recognition – awards

4. Future goals and plans (**must be included**)

- a. Description of growth as a result of scholarship
- b. Goals
- c. Strategies

Service Narrative and Other Supporting Materials

NOTE: The Provost's guidelines state that the Service Narrative, including other evaluative materials, must not exceed 4 pages.

This narrative should describe how service activities are related to the profession, as well as the goals of Mason, CEHD and the program. Leadership activities should be highlighted. Content might include:

1. Rationale for service
 - a. Belief system
 - b. Connection between service, teaching, and research
2. Involvement
 - a. Overall description of types of service (e.g., mentoring, committees, etc.)
 - b. Relationship of service to goals of professional field, Mason, CEHD, and program (primary and secondary affiliations)
3. Leadership activities (including definition, contribution) – briefly describe the nature of the leadership activities noted in the self-report form
4. Future goals and plans

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES:

Timeline/Milestones

College of Education and Human Development

Mark R. Ginsberg, Dean

This document provides an integrated overview of the timeline for implementing tenure, promotion, tenure-track contract renewal, and multi-year contract renewal evaluations each academic year. It also provides a separate listing of “milestones” for tenure-track faculty, along with timing considerations for tenured associate professors and term instructional faculty.

Timeline

Except for determinations of tenure and academic rank in hiring processes, there is only one time frame each academic year during which any particular type of evaluation procedure can be implemented. The different types of evaluation procedures are organized in a sequential fashion throughout the academic year so as not to “overload” evaluation committees and academic administrators with too many cases being processed simultaneously.

The chart on the next page shows the specific timeline and deadlines for all of the evaluation procedures related to tenure, promotion, and renewal during the 2017-18 academic year. While the specific dates are unique to that particular academic year, the evaluation calendar typically only varies by a few days each year for each type of procedure.

The chart also shows deadlines for annual evaluation submissions, as the annual evaluation process is closely aligned with tenure evaluations for tenure-track faculty (because each year they must submit a “developmental portfolio” that mimics the tenure portfolio). Juxtaposing annual evaluation deadlines with the tenure, promotion, and contract renewal deadlines also helps candidates and administrators regulate the time required to fulfill their evaluation responsibilities over a limited time period.

Please note that the “CEHD Faculty Evaluation and Workload Coordinator” (abbreviated to “Coordinator” in multiple rows in the chart) is a support staff position responsible for:

1. Alerting faculty to upcoming deadlines
2. Mentoring faculty on the logistics of creating/completing required evaluation documents and compiling a portfolio
3. Monitoring timely submission of evaluation materials from faculty
4. Ensuring that evaluation committees and the CEHD Dean receive materials and produce evaluation letters in a timely manner
5. Reviewing each evaluation letter to ensure editorial accuracy/clarity and compliance with college and university guidelines
6. Submitting evaluation letters, dossiers, and other required materials to the Provost Office by the stated deadline

Tenure/Promotion/Contract Renewal/Annual Evaluation Deadlines, 2017-2018

Deadline	Due From/What	Process
8/15	P&T candidates suggest external reviewers (to the Senior Associate Dean)	P&T (tenure-line faculty)
8/15	P&T candidates submit materials (to Coordinator) to be sent to external reviewers	P&T (tenure-line faculty)
9/6	Term faculty submit promotion portfolio	Term promotion to associate/full professor
9/12	Tenure-track faculty in their P&T year submit portfolios to TTARC (Tenure-Track Annual Review Committee)	Annual evaluation – developmental portfolio (must also submit online annual evaluation form)
9/14	Term faculty submit contract renewal portfolios	Term multi-year contract renewal
9/20	Tenure-track faculty NOT in their P&T year submit portfolios to TTARC	Annual evaluation – developmental portfolio (must also submit online annual evaluation form)
9/20	Tenured & term faculty submit online annual evaluation form	Annual evaluation (no developmental portfolio required)
10/4	First-tier committees submit letters (term)	Term promotion to associate/full professor
10/4	P&T Committee submits letters (term renewal)	Term multi-year contract renewal
10/18	P&T Committee submits letters (term promotion)	Term promotion to associate/full professor
10/25	Dean submits letters (term renewal)	Term multi-year contract renewal
10/26	P&T candidates submit portfolios	P&T (tenure-line faculty)
10/26	Dean submits letters (term promotion)	Term promotion to associate/full professor
11/1	Coordinator submits materials (term contract renewal)	Term renewal e-portfolios to Provost
11/1	Coordinator submits materials (term promotion)	Term promotion e-portfolios to Provost
11/30	First-tier committees submit letters (P&T)	P&T (tenure-line faculty)
12/14	P&T Committee submits letters (P&T)	P&T (tenure-line faculty)
1/26	Dean submits letters (P&T)	P&T (tenure-line faculty)
1/31	Tenure-track faculty submit portfolios (renewal)	Tenure-track contract renewal
2/9	Coordinator submits materials (P&T)	P&T e-portfolios to Provost
2/21	P&T Committee submits letters (tenure-track)	Tenure-track contract renewal
3/7	Dean submits letters (tenure-track)	Tenure-track contract renewal
3/16	Coordinator submits materials (tenure-track)	Tenure-track renewal e-portfolios to Provost

Milestones

For tenure-track assistant and associate professors

Tenure-track faculty are hired on a 3-year contract that is renewable for an additional 3 years (assuming a favorable contract renewal decision in the 3rd year of employment on the tenure clock). Although this 6-year journey may be shortened for those with prior experience (and appropriate accomplishments) in a tenure-track (or similar) position, the standard expectations are as follows:

- YEAR 1: Initiate Mason research program; begin to establish Mason teaching record; engage in appropriate Mason and professional service activities; plan for timing of tenure-track study leave (best if taken in Year 2, 3, or 4).
- YEAR 2: Construct first iteration of the developmental portfolio and receive initial feedback from the Tenure-Track Annual Review Committee (Fall semester); continue engagement and progress in teaching, research, and service activities.
- YEAR 3: Submit second iteration of the development portfolio to TTARC (early Fall); submit contract renewal portfolio (very similar to the developmental portfolio) to the P&T Committee (Spring); identify and target any identified vulnerabilities in teaching, research, and service.
- YEAR 4: Submit third iteration of the developmental portfolio to TTARC (early Fall); continue to address any areas identified as “off track” or less than optimal with respect to Mason and CEHD tenure criteria; take tenure-track study leave no later than Spring of this year; make specific plans for publication efforts throughout the remainder of the tenure-track period.
- YEAR 5: Submit fourth iteration of the developmental portfolio to TTARC (early Fall); plan and prioritize “final push” agenda in anticipation of the tenure portfolio submission deadline the following year; seek targeted mentoring for any and all areas of potential vulnerability; read online guidelines and suggestions and then meet with the CEHD Faculty Evaluation and Workload Coordinator and the CEHD Senior Associate Dean to ensure that there is no uncertainty or confusion about tenure-related criteria, procedures, expectations, or timelines.
- YEAR 6: Submit names of proposed external reviewers, along with materials to be sent to the external reviewers, to the Faculty Evaluation and Workload Coordinator and Senior Associate Dean (August); submit fifth iteration of the developmental portfolio to TTARC (early Fall) and use that feedback to “polish and perfect” tenure-related materials; submit tenure portfolio (end of October).

For tenured associate professors

Eligibility to be considered for promotion to the full professor rank would typically require at least 5 full years in the associate rank (with the evaluation occurring in the following year), along with performance data that went well beyond the thresholds used in evaluations for tenure and promotion to the associate rank. Specifically, tenured candidates for full professor must provide evidence of significant impact beyond the boundaries of the university that is much more substantial than in such cases. Clear and convincing evidence must be provided of an established external reputation in the primary field, based on consequential achievements in teaching, research and scholarship, or professional activities directly related to teaching and research and scholarship.

There is no time limit for seeking promotion to the full professor rank, nor are there specific milestones along the associate professor pathway as there are for tenure-track faculty. For that reason, it is especially important for tenured associate professors who aspire to be promoted to the full professor rank to proactively seek ongoing mentoring from senior faculty colleagues and from the CEHD Dean's Office.

For term assistant and associate professors (instructional faculty)

Term assistant professors are hired and renewed on year-to-year contracts. The potential opportunity to move to a multi-year contract is contingent on earning the rank of associate professor (among other factors). For assistant professors the primary basis for year-to-year contract renewal is the assessment of teaching and service provided annually by the SOED, KINE, or SRTM Faculty Evaluation Team.

Eligibility for promotion to associate professor follows a timeline analogous to tenure-track faculty (i.e., consideration for promotion in rank would typically occur after 5 years of full-time Mason employment, with a shorter period possible for those with prior experience in an assistant professor or equivalent position).

Eligibility to be considered for promotion to the full professor rank would typically require at least 5 full years in the associate rank, along with performance data that went well beyond the High Competence threshold used for multi-year contract renewal and term promotion to associate evaluations. Specifically, term instructional faculty must reach the Genuine Excellence threshold in Teaching, which requires substantial evidence of significant impact beyond the boundaries of the university and an established external reputation in the primary field.

There is no time limit for seeking promotion to either the associate or full professor rank, nor are there specific milestones along the associate professor pathway as there are for tenure-track faculty. For that reason, it is especially important for term faculty who aspire to be promoted in rank to proactively seek ongoing mentoring from senior faculty colleagues and from the CEHD Dean's Office.

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES:

Criteria for Tenure

College of Education and Human Development

Mark R. Ginsberg, Dean

This document provides both an overview of the criteria for earning tenure at George Mason University and detailed suggestions about the kind of materials and information that would provide clear and compelling evidence that a tenure candidate has successfully met those criteria.

Overview of the Criteria for Earning an Appointment without Term (aka Tenure)

From the Mason *Faculty Handbook* (section 2.4):

Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University which are teaching; research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied; and service... Although candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in each of these areas, high competence is expected. Genuine excellence must be exhibited either in teaching or in research/scholarship. High competence must be exhibited in both areas. The primary consideration in the evaluation of the candidate's achievements will be the extent to which these continue to improve the academic quality of the University... Appointment without term should leave no doubt about the candidate's value to the University over an extended period.

In addition, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor 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 teaching, there should be evidence that the candidate's contributions have influence beyond the immediate classroom; if 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.

Criteria for Achieving High Competence/Genuine Excellence in Teaching

All instructional faculty are expected to fulfill their contractual teaching load and to teach at a high level of effectiveness. Provided below are relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook* as well as a document provided by the Office of the Provost. These are followed by information specific to achieving Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Teaching in CEHD, including possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio. For additional information and resources, please refer to the Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning website (<http://stearnscenter.gmu.edu/>).

Faculty Handbook: 2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

2.4.1 Teaching

Effective teaching is demonstrated by the clarity, appropriateness, and efficacy of course materials, methods and presentations, and by successful learning outcomes. Contributions to teaching include the development and implementation of new courses and programs; the development of instructional materials, including applications of new technologies; the training and supervision of teaching assistants; mentoring graduate students; clinical and field supervision of students; and student advising.

Faculty Handbook: 2.5 Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

2.5.1 Teaching

Local academic units regularly evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their faculty. In doing so, they are expected to incorporate data from both peers and students. Whatever additional methods may be used to gather information from students, the process should provide for their anonymous participation in course evaluations and should allow for comparisons among faculty teaching similar courses. Peer evaluation is expected to include, at a minimum, data on the development and implementation of new courses and programs, the appropriateness of course materials currently used, the level and quality of student advising, and learning outcomes. Additional forms of peer evaluation are expected. These may include, but are not limited to, peer observation of classroom teaching, evaluations by mentors, assessments of teaching performance by colleagues, and teaching portfolios.

Recommended Criteria for Evaluating Genuine Excellence in Teaching

(<https://provost.gmu.edu/administration/departments/chairs/recruitment/evaluating-excellence-teaching>)

1. **Outstanding classroom teaching and learning outcomes, as evidenced by the usual measures, including but not limited to student evaluations.** Other evidence of teaching effectiveness includes peer observations; letters of support from students, alumni, and colleagues (solicited and unsolicited); student comments based on the whole population, not selected samples; and/or student focus groups. Thoughtful reflection on teaching will be sought in the teaching statement.
2. **Effective teaching is demonstrated by the clarity, appropriateness, and efficacy of course materials, methods and presentations, and by successful learning outcomes.** Example syllabi, other course materials created by the candidate, and student work used with permission can be used as sources of evidence.
3. **When applicable, evidence of educational work with students outside the classroom.** For example, supervising undergraduate research, master's theses, and dissertations; advising and mentoring activities; and/or clinical and field supervision of students.
4. **Faculty leadership in promoting student learning and teaching excellence.** For example, developing successful and innovative curricula and programs; developing instructional materials;

teaching-related training, supervising, and mentoring of other faculty and graduate students; developing teaching innovations (e.g., the use of technology); leading team-teaching initiatives; and/or building support for educational partnerships within and across institutions.

5. **Teaching excellence across a variety of classes**, e.g., large and small, face-to-face and hybrid or online, undergraduate and graduate, while maintaining a consistent and appropriate teaching load.
6. **Maintenance of at least highly competent research**, evidenced by the usual measures, including outside letters.
7. **Evidence of teaching and learning impact beyond the classroom**. This involves some combination of conference presentations, workshops, performances, or exhibitions; invitations to other places; texts or teaching materials, including electronic; or articles on teaching and/or learning outcomes (see also #3 above). External funding for curricular development, piloting teaching methods, or advising could serve in this category also.

“Note that building a case for Genuine Excellence in Teaching and steps toward appropriate evidence usually emerges over the career of the professor and is not a last-minute event. Outside evaluative letters should be based on a holistic evaluation of all of the above criteria. Very occasionally, exceptions to these criteria can be made, based on truly unusual and evidenced classroom impact and impact on other faculty members on campus.”

Judgments of Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Teaching

Consistent with the documents provided above, teaching in CEHD is seen as multifaceted, to include teaching of classes and mentoring as well as participation or leadership in other teaching-related activities such as curriculum development, accreditation tasks, and scholarship related to teaching. In CEHD, a rating of “High Competence” is achieved by receiving average or above average student evaluations of teaching and positive peer evaluations; participating appropriately in curriculum development, assessment, and accreditation tasks; and showing evidence of versatility (in teaching assignments, mentoring and supervision, the use of innovative methods, and so forth). A rating of “Genuine Excellence” is achieved when accomplishments in the above areas are at a higher standard and provide evidence of impact beyond the classroom—specifically, course ratings must be superior, consistency and versatility must be greater, and there must be additional evidence of teaching excellence and impact. This could take a variety of forms, including increased mentoring and supervision activity, leadership in curriculum and program improvements/innovations, evidence of alumni success, scholarship of teaching, providing workshops on field of specialization to the community, presentations at national conferences related to teaching innovations, and so forth. The reflective statement from the faculty applicant should be consistent with theory and research on student learning and address how the faculty member has learned from student and colleague feedback.

Considerations for Achieving Genuine Excellence

There are several important considerations with respect to meeting the standard of *genuine excellence*.

1. One critical issue is the quality of the evidence provided to document claims of excellence. A single data point does not provide a convincing case. An example of how to provide a more

compelling case would be to couple student evaluations with strong peer observation information or performance data to show that the students are meeting the course goals.

2. The focus should be on student outcomes, not just professor activities. Evidence should show, for example, how students expanded their disciplinary knowledge and/or skills, or became more willing to engage in difficult concepts, or learned new ways to approach questions. If teaching does not produce significant learning, it will not be considered excellent.
3. There also should be evidence of continued faculty learning and evolution. If there is attention to fostering learning, then teaching will necessarily evolve over time, because students themselves evolve over time. Also, genuinely excellent teachers actively seek to incorporate new knowledge and skills into their teaching.
4. Evidence for excellence in teaching ought to come from independent multiple sources which provide a pattern of data consistent with the concept of “genuine excellence” over time. Such evidence may reasonably accommodate periods of challenge and growth in the face of new and different teaching opportunities (i.e., variability in performance should be clearly linked to contextual influences).

Possible Artifacts for Inclusion

The following represent possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio of teaching accomplishments for CEHD faculty members:

Teaching of courses

- Teaching evaluations (numerical analysis per instructions)
- Peer observations
- Letters of support from students, alumni, and colleagues (solicited and unsolicited)
- Student comments (from teaching evaluations or another source) based on the whole population, not selected samples; and/or student focus groups
- Thoughtful reflection on teaching (will be sought in the teaching statement)
- Example syllabi, other course materials created by the candidate, and student work used with permission

Educational work with students outside the classroom (where applicable)

- Evidence of effective supervision of students conducting research
- Evidence of effective supervision of theses and/or dissertations as well as effective guidance provided as a member of PhD advising and dissertation committees
- Evidence of effective supervision of internships, independent studies, and field experiences (not already included in course evaluation data)
- Other effective advising and mentoring activities

Faculty leadership in promoting student learning and teaching excellence

- Examples of the development of new and successful and innovative curricula and programs, instructional materials, and/or teaching-related training programs
- Evidence of supervising and mentoring of other faculty and graduate students in relation to teaching; leading team-teaching initiatives; serving as a course leader for a program
- Revising/developing syllabi and course related materials and assessments for program improvement based on student achievement data and accreditation requirements
- Developing teaching innovations (e.g., the use of technology)
- Leading team-teaching initiatives; and/or building support for teaching- related partnerships within and across institutions

Evidence of teaching excellence across a variety of classes, e.g., large and small, face-to-face and hybrid or online, undergraduate and graduate, while maintaining a consistent and appropriate teaching load

Evidence of teaching and learning impact beyond the classroom

- conference presentations (related to teaching innovations or research on teaching)
- workshops, performances, or exhibitions
- invitations to teach at other places
- texts or teaching materials, including electronic
- articles on teaching and/or learning outcomes
- external funding for curricular development, piloting teaching methods, or advising

Aggregating Evidence to Form a Conclusion about High Competence/Genuine Excellence

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments that equate to “genuine excellence” or “high competence” in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). This *equifinality* principle (i.e., the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

Criteria for Achieving High Competence/Genuine Excellence in Research and Scholarship

Faculty who have research as part of their assigned role are expected to engage in consequential research and scholarship on a continuous basis. Faculty who only have teaching and service assignments are still expected to engage in “scholarship of teaching” activities as appropriate to their areas of expertise and specific teaching assignments.

Provided below are relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook (2018) as well as information specific to achieving Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Research and Scholarship in CEHD, including possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio.

Faculty Handbook: 2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty 2.4.2 Research and Scholarship

Scholarly achievement is demonstrated by original publications and peer-reviewed contributions to the advancement of the discipline/field of study or the integration of the discipline with other fields; by original research, artistic work, software and media, exhibitions, and performance; and by the application of discipline- or field-based knowledge to the practice of a profession.

Judgments of Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Research and Scholarship

Evaluations of faculty accomplishments are based on holistic judgments made by integrating evidence related to quantity (productivity), quality (e.g., publication venues), impact, and developmental trajectory. High competence is awarded for good productivity and a trajectory demonstrating continuity and scholarly coherence and growth. In addition, genuine excellence requires “signature scholarly products” (i.e., things you are known for) that are of high quality and high impact, as demonstrated by favorable assessments by leaders in the field of study. For tenure-track faculty, genuine excellence is often associated with an accelerating trajectory of scholarly activity and accomplishments.

To earn a designation of high competence or genuine excellence, candidates must provide evidence of an established line of inquiry which demonstrates increasing breadth and depth over time. The accomplishments may be of a theoretical and/or applied nature, but they must be consequential and merit positive regard by experts in the field.

Criteria for genuine excellence include, but are not limited to:

- Sustained and demonstrated ability to provide leadership in the acquisition of extramural funding
- Conducting research and scholarship that has a demonstrated and substantive impact on the field as judged by experts in the field
- Recognized and replicated innovations in the conduct and delivery of research and scholarship
- Advancing the field through the development of new constructs and/or theoretical models
- Recognized expertise in the field of study among scholars, practitioners, and/or policy makers
- Participation in, and leadership of, multidisciplinary/transdisciplinary projects and initiatives

Considerations for Achieving Genuine Excellence

There are several important considerations with respect to meeting the standard of *genuine excellence*.

1. One important consideration is the quality of the evidence provided to document claims of genuine excellence. A single publication or grant, even if impressive as a stand-alone accomplishment, is insufficient. Coupling multiple publications of high impact with a pattern of strong external funding or high-visibility scholarly presentations can be convincing.
2. The evidence presented should represent accomplishments as part of a coherent plan/trajectory within the individual's research agenda (as explained in the research and scholarship narrative). For tenure-track faculty, these accomplishments should demonstrate substantial progress toward becoming a consistently productive scholar whose work is "making a difference" in terms of creating new knowledge and ideas and/or expertly addressing applied problems.
3. Another consideration is the type of venues in which publications appear and presentations are made. Research and scholarship addressed to national and international audiences will be regarded as more consequential than publications and presentations in regional and state-level venues. While collaboration is strongly valued, peer-reviewed articles in which one serves as the lead or sole author provide a particularly convincing way to demonstrate leadership and impact. Invited presentations or publications based on public acknowledgment of professional expertise and leadership in the field of study can also provide evidence of excellence. Books, chapters, and monographs can also be used to demonstrate genuine excellence in the field of study; however, the context of these publications should be described in sufficient detail that reviewers can appropriately assess specific individual contributions as well as the quality of the publication itself. Quality might be indicated, for example, by favorable reviews, frequent citations, low acceptance rates, or adoption of a text or publication by other universities or schools/agencies.
4. Finally, external experts in the field of study will contribute to the review process for promotion and tenure. In planning, it is important to remember one's professional connection to leaders in the field (as this evolves personally). Through publications and presentations, through work in professional organizations, and through leadership in the field it is important to plan thoughtfully and strategically for professional growth from assistant professor, to associate professor, and ultimately to full professor.

If research and scholarship does not have a demonstrated significant impact it will not be deemed genuinely excellent.

Possible Artifacts for Inclusion

The following represent possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio of research and scholarship accomplishments for CEHD faculty members:

- Publishing in peer-reviewed journals recognized in the field or discipline
 - Sole author
 - Lead author
 - Collaborative

- Book/book chapters/edited book volumes that are invited based on expertise and/or peer reviews
- Publishing in non-traditional formats/venues (e.g., web-based documents, films, creative productions)
- How others have used the research and scholarship
- Ways in which professional efforts have influenced policy and programmatic decisions
- Discussion of research findings and recommendations in media (newspaper, magazine, radio, television)
- Election to prestigious national organizations that recognize excellence in a discipline
- Research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, and industry
- External research funding from sources outside the university that are peer-reviewed (state, national, or international)
 - Funding for grants and contracts clearly linked to the field of study
 - The candidate's specific role in writing the proposal for funding
 - The candidate's role, activities, and accomplishments with the activities
 - Documentation of products and noteworthy accomplishments emanating from the funding
- Patents, inventions, and other such developments of a significant nature for the field or discipline
- Development of creative resources (e.g., computer-based modules, curricula, products)
- Preparation of technology-grounded or technology-infused research strategies
- Publication of scholarly research-based monographs
- Publication in peer-reviewed proceedings—international or national
- Peer-reviewed presentations in recognized conferences for the field or discipline
- Innovations in delivery of research and scholarship, building constructs and new theoretical models
 - Ways in which the research and scholarship are presented, including use of standard and cutting edge technology
- Media attention to research and scholarship
- Citations in recognized databases
- Appointments to state, national, international commissions and/or study groups
- Invitations to present at conferences (e.g., keynote presentations based on recognized expertise)

Aggregating Evidence to Form a Conclusion about High Competence/Genuine Excellence

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments that equate to “genuine excellence” or “high competence” in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). This *equifinality* principle (i.e.,

the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

Criteria for Achieving High Competence/Genuine Excellence in Service

The assigned part of a faculty job typically labeled “Service” can be separated into three distinct components: (1) *required* university service (called “citizenship” within the CEHD context); (2) university service that goes beyond minimum job requirements; and (3) professional service (which typically occurs outside the boundaries of the university).

As explained below, good citizenship is necessary to avoid an unsatisfactory performance evaluation, but it is not evidence of high competence/genuine excellence. High competence is associated with a high level of participation in university and professional service as appropriate for one’s academic rank. Genuine excellence is associated with the effective fulfillment of rank-appropriate leadership roles in university and professional service venues, especially when those roles involve a range of contributions and support the teaching and research mission of the university.

As in the areas of teaching and research and scholarship, service activities that actively promote and encourage multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary perspectives and initiatives should be given substantial weight in the evaluation process.

Faculty Handbook: 2.4.3 University and Professional Service

Annual evaluations and decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure will be influenced by the extent of the candidate’s service to the University. All full-time faculty are expected to participate as part of their professional responsibilities in governance and operational activities outside the classroom. Required university service includes, but is not limited to, such activity as attendance at faculty meetings and participation in faculty personnel matters and curriculum development. University service beyond that which is required of all faculty members will be given positive weight in personnel decisions. Each local academic unit will make known in a timely manner its requirements concerning the minimum acceptable level of university service and its policies concerning positive weight to be given for intramural service in excess of that minimum requirement.

Professional service is demonstrated by contributions to recognized societies and associations that promote research and scholarship and by consultancies and cooperative projects that make the faculty member’s discipline of field-based knowledge and skills available to individuals, groups or agencies outside the University. Local academic units will develop and disseminate in a timely manner (i) specific discipline- or field-based expectations regarding the types of professional service that will be considered appropriate as evidence in annual evaluations and for reappointment, promotion and tenure cases; and (ii) the criteria to be used in assessing the quality of this service.

Judgments Regarding Required University Service (Citizenship)

Required Service in CEHD is defined as **Citizenship** and encompasses the following expectations:

- (1) regular attendance at appropriate program, division, and college-wide meetings;
- (2) appropriate participation in course and curriculum development;
- (3) appropriate participation in accreditation and program review functions;
- (4) appropriate participation in student advisement;
- (5) appropriate participation in program recruitment and admissions processes;
- (6) essential work with adjunct faculty (e.g., course lead); and
- (7) other program duties as assigned by program coordinators, division directors, or college administrators.

All CEHD faculty must meet minimum citizenship requirements. When minimum citizenship requirements are not met, no service points will be awarded in the annual evaluation process, resulting in an unsatisfactory evaluation in service *and* in the faculty member's overall evaluation. Faculty with unsatisfactory evaluations are not eligible for salary increases or for contract renewals. Tenured faculty with consecutive or multiple unsatisfactory evaluations are subject to post-tenure review, which can lead to a variety of sanctions, including dismissal.

Service expectations will vary based on rank and tenure status.

Judgments Regarding University Service Beyond Minimum Requirements

In CEHD service includes significant contributions beyond required citizenship responsibilities and includes, for example, contributions such as:

At the CEHD (college/school/division/program) level:

Leadership in program curriculum development; leadership in accreditation and program review; leadership in academic advising and student services; coordination of clinical or field-based aspects of a program; leadership in professional development activities (e.g., related to teaching, research, technology, etc.); service as division director, academic program coordinator, or professor-in-charge of a specific subunit; chair/member of a college or school governance committee; chair/member of a search committee, first-tier promotion/tenure review committee, or other ad hoc committee; leadership of efforts to enhance college resources through gifts, external grants and contracts, and revenue activities; active participation in marketing, alumni relations, and school partnership activities.

At the university level:

Member/chair of governance committees (e.g., Faculty Senate), search committees or other university-level committees; task force assignments and other special assignments from central administration (e.g., HSRB); participation in university accreditation-related activities; participation in cross-unit collaborative activities and partnerships.

Judgments Regarding Professional Service

In CEHD professional service includes significant contributions to the faculty member's profession beyond the boundaries of George Mason University, and includes, for example, contributions such as:

Reviewing for professional conferences, journals and publications; serving as a member/leader in professional organizations; serving on state, national, and international committees or advisory boards; sharing expertise (e.g., through presentations) with local and regional audiences; serving as editor or assistant editor of a journal or edited volume; serving as session chair or discussant at professional meetings; advising/supporting educational organizations using professional experience and expertise.

Please note that community service unrelated to one's profession or position at George Mason University should not be included as part of a professional service portfolio. It is incumbent upon the faculty to make the case for seemingly unrelated items.

Aggregating Evidence to Form a Conclusion about High Competence/Genuine Excellence

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments that equate to "genuine excellence" or "high competence" in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). This *equifinality* principle (i.e., the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES: Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

College of Education and Human Development

Mark R. Ginsberg, Dean

This document provides both an overview of the criteria for earning promotion to the rank of full professor at George Mason University and detailed suggestions about the kind of materials and information that would provide clear and compelling evidence that the candidate has successfully met those criteria.

Overview of the Criteria for Earning Promotion to the Full Professor Rank

From the Mason *Faculty Handbook* (section 2.4):

Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University which are teaching; research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied; and service... Although candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in each of these areas, high competence is expected. Genuine excellence must be exhibited either in teaching or in research/scholarship. High competence must be exhibited in both areas. The primary consideration in the evaluation of the candidate's achievements will be the extent to which these continue to improve the academic quality of the University... Appointment without term should leave no doubt about the candidate's value to the University over an extended period.

Candidates seeking promotion to the rank of full 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. Clear and convincing evidence must be provided of an established external reputation in the primary field, based on consequential achievements in teaching, research and scholarship, or professional activities directly related to teaching and research and scholarship.

The *Faculty Handbook* makes it clear that the *sine qua non* of the Genuine Excellence concept is "impact beyond the boundaries of the University." In that spirit, full professors are expected to manifest either:

1. Substantially greater breadth with respect to Genuine Excellence than would be required for promotion to the associate rank (i.e., Genuine Excellence in at least 2 of the 3 areas of evaluation, with at least High Competence in the remaining area), *or*

2. Substantially greater depth with respect to Genuine Excellence than would be required for promotion to the associate rank (i.e., Genuine Excellence in research or teaching at a level that is far beyond the threshold required for this designation, with at least High Competence in the remaining areas).

Another way in which the criteria guiding tenure and promotion decisions must appropriately vary based on academic rank relates to the concept of *leadership*. This is a “meta-criterion” cutting across all three areas of faculty work that is particularly relevant to decisions regarding the appropriateness of promoting a faculty member (whether in a term or tenured position) from the associate rank to the full professor rank. For example, whereas promotion to the associate rank might focus on evidence regarding whether one is teaching courses well and having an impact on students, full professor evaluations might also be attuned to evidence that the faculty member is playing a leadership role in program development, in facilitating the program’s resource base and reputational strength, and in mentoring the next generation of faculty leaders. Similarly, whereas tenure-track faculty might earn promotion by publishing with increasing frequency in well-regarded venues, full professor candidates would be expected to have widely cited signature scholarly products and already established recognition for their research contributions that demonstrate their leadership role in the field.

Criteria for Achieving High Competence/Genuine Excellence in Teaching

All instructional faculty are expected to fulfill their contractual teaching load and to teach at a high level of effectiveness. Provided below are relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook* as well as a document provided by the Office of the Provost. These are followed by information specific to achieving Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Teaching in CEHD, including possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio. For additional information and resources, please refer to the Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning website (<http://stearnscenter.gmu.edu/>).

Faculty Handbook: 2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

2.4.1 Teaching

Effective teaching is demonstrated by the clarity, appropriateness, and efficacy of course materials, methods and presentations, and by successful learning outcomes. Contributions to teaching include the development and implementation of new courses and programs; the development of instructional materials, including applications of new technologies; the training and supervision of teaching assistants; mentoring graduate students; clinical and field supervision of students; and student advising.

Faculty Handbook: 2.5 Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

2.5.1 Teaching

Local academic units regularly evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their faculty. In doing so, they are expected to incorporate data from both peers and students. Whatever additional methods may be used to gather information from students, the process should provide for their anonymous participation in course evaluations

and should allow for comparisons among faculty teaching similar courses. Peer evaluation is expected to include, at a minimum, data on the development and implementation of new courses and programs, the appropriateness of course materials currently used, the level and quality of student advising, and learning outcomes. Additional forms of peer evaluation are expected. These may include, but are not limited to, peer observation of classroom teaching, evaluations by mentors, assessments of teaching performance by colleagues, and teaching portfolios.

Recommended Criteria for Evaluating Genuine Excellence in Teaching

(<https://provost.gmu.edu/administration/department-chairs/recruitment/evaluating-excellence-teaching>)

1. **Outstanding classroom teaching and learning outcomes, as evidenced by the usual measures, including but not limited to student evaluations.** Other evidence of teaching effectiveness includes peer observations; letters of support from students, alumni, and colleagues (solicited and unsolicited); student comments based on the whole population, not selected samples; and/or student focus groups. Thoughtful reflection on teaching will be sought in the teaching statement.
2. **Effective teaching is demonstrated by the clarity, appropriateness, and efficacy of course materials, methods and presentations, and by successful learning outcomes.** Example syllabi, other course materials created by the candidate, and student work used with permission can be used as sources of evidence.
3. **When applicable, evidence of educational work with students outside the classroom.** For example, supervising undergraduate research, master's theses, and dissertations; advising and mentoring activities; and/or clinical and field supervision of students.
4. **Faculty leadership in promoting student learning and teaching excellence.** For example, developing successful and innovative curricula and programs; developing instructional materials; teaching-related training, supervising, and mentoring of other faculty and graduate students; developing teaching innovations (e.g., the use of technology); leading team-teaching initiatives; and/or building support for educational partnerships within and across institutions.
5. **Teaching excellence across a variety of classes, e.g., large and small, face-to-face and hybrid or online, undergraduate and graduate, while maintaining a consistent and appropriate teaching load.**
6. **Maintenance of at least highly competent research,** evidenced by the usual measures, including outside letters.
7. **Evidence of teaching and learning impact beyond the classroom.** This involves some combination of conference presentations, workshops, performances, or exhibitions; invitations to other places; texts or teaching materials, including electronic; or articles on teaching and/or learning outcomes (see also #3 above). External funding for curricular development, piloting teaching methods, or advising could serve in this category also.

“Note that building a case for Genuine Excellence in Teaching and steps toward appropriate evidence usually emerges over the career of the professor and is not a last minute event. Outside evaluative letters should be based on a holistic evaluation of all of the above criteria. Very occasionally, exceptions to these criteria can be made, based on truly unusual and evidenced classroom impact and impact on other faculty members on campus.”

Judgments of Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Teaching

Consistent with the documents provided above, teaching in CEHD is seen as multifaceted, to include teaching of classes and mentoring as well as participation or leadership in other teaching-related activities such as curriculum development, accreditation tasks, and scholarship related to teaching. In CEHD, a rating of “High Competence” is achieved by receiving average or above average student evaluations of teaching and positive peer evaluations; participating appropriately in curriculum development, assessment, and accreditation tasks; and showing evidence of versatility (in teaching assignments, mentoring and supervision, the use of innovative methods, and so forth). A rating of “Genuine Excellence” is achieved when accomplishments in the above areas are at a higher standard and provide evidence of impact beyond the classroom—specifically, course ratings must be superior, consistency and versatility must be greater, and there must be additional evidence of teaching excellence and impact. This could take a variety of forms, including increased mentoring and supervision activity, leadership in curriculum and program improvements/innovations, evidence of alumni success, scholarship of teaching, providing workshops on field of specialization to the community, presentations at national conferences related to teaching innovations, and so forth. The reflective statement from the faculty applicant should be consistent with theory and research on student learning and address how the faculty member has learned from student and colleague feedback.

Considerations for Achieving Genuine Excellence

There are several important considerations with respect to meeting the standard of *genuine excellence*.

1. One critical issue is the quality of the evidence provided to document claims of excellence. A single data point does not provide a convincing case. An example of how to provide a more compelling case would be to couple student evaluations with strong peer observation information or performance data to show that the students are meeting the course goals.
2. The focus should be on student outcomes, not just professor activities. Evidence should show, for example, how students expanded their disciplinary knowledge and/or skills, or became more willing to engage in difficult concepts, or learned new ways to approach questions. If teaching does not produce significant learning, it will not be considered excellent.
3. There also should be evidence of continued faculty learning and evolution. If there is attention to fostering learning, then teaching will necessarily evolve over time, because students themselves evolve over time. Also, genuinely excellent teachers actively seek to incorporate new knowledge and skills into their teaching.
4. Evidence for excellence in teaching ought to come from independent multiple sources which provide a pattern of data consistent with the concept of “genuine excellence” over time. Such evidence may reasonably accommodate periods of challenge and growth in the face of new and different teaching opportunities (i.e., variability in performance should be clearly linked to contextual influences).

Possible Artifacts for Inclusion

The following represent possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio of teaching accomplishments for CEHD faculty members:

Teaching of courses

- Teaching evaluations (numerical analysis per instructions)
- Peer observations
- Letters of support from students, alumni, and colleagues (solicited and unsolicited)
- Student comments (from teaching evaluations or another source) based on the whole population, not selected samples; and/or student focus groups
- Thoughtful reflection on teaching (will be sought in the teaching statement)
- Example syllabi, other course materials created by the candidate, and student work used with permission

Educational work with students outside the classroom (where applicable)

- Evidence of effective supervision of students conducting research
- Evidence of effective supervision of theses and/or dissertations as well as effective guidance provided as a member of PhD advising and dissertation committees
- Evidence of effective supervision of internships, independent studies, and field experiences (not already included in course evaluation data)
- Other effective advising and mentoring activities

Faculty leadership in promoting student learning and teaching excellence

- Examples of the development of new and successful and innovative curricula and programs, instructional materials, and/or teaching-related training programs
- Evidence of supervising and mentoring of other faculty and graduate students in relation to teaching; leading team-teaching initiatives; serving as a course leader for a program
- Revising/developing syllabi and course related materials and assessments for program improvement based on student achievement data and accreditation requirements
- Developing teaching innovations (e.g., the use of technology)
- Leading team-teaching initiatives; and/or building support for teaching-related partnerships within and across institutions

Evidence of teaching excellence across a variety of classes, e.g., large and small, face-to-face and hybrid or online, undergraduate and graduate, while maintaining a consistent and appropriate teaching load

Evidence of teaching and learning impact beyond the classroom

- conference presentations (related to teaching innovations or research on teaching)

- workshops, performances, or exhibitions
- invitations to teach at other places
- texts or teaching materials, including electronic
- articles on teaching and/or learning outcomes
- external funding for curricular development, piloting teaching methods, or advising

Aggregating Evidence to Form a Conclusion about High Competence/Genuine Excellence

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments, along with amplifying evidence related to leadership and multidisciplinary accomplishments, that equate to “genuine excellence” or “high competence” in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). Perhaps most notably, there are many different types of leadership roles and venues that may support a full professor promotion evaluation. This *equifinality* principle (i.e., the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

Criteria for Achieving High Competence/Genuine Excellence in Research and Scholarship

Faculty who have research as part of their assigned role are expected to engage in consequential research and scholarship on a continuous basis. Faculty who only have teaching and service assignments are still expected to engage in “scholarship of teaching” activities as appropriate to their areas of expertise and specific teaching assignments.

Provided below are relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook (2011) as well as information specific to achieving Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Research and Scholarship in CEHD, including possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio.

Faculty Handbook: 2.4 Criteria for Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty 2.4.2 Research and Scholarship

Scholarly achievement is demonstrated by original publications and peer-reviewed contributions to the advancement of the discipline/field of study or the integration of the discipline with other fields; by original research, artistic work, software and media, exhibitions, and performance; and by the application of discipline- or field-based knowledge to the practice of a profession.

Judgments of Genuine Excellence and High Competence in Research and Scholarship

Evaluations of faculty accomplishments are based on holistic judgments made by integrating evidence related to quantity (productivity), quality (e.g., publication venues), impact, and developmental trajectory. High competence is awarded for good productivity and a trajectory demonstrating continuity and scholarly coherence and growth. In addition, genuine excellence requires “signature scholarly products” (i.e., things you are known for) that are of high quality and high impact, as demonstrated by favorable assessments by leaders in the field of study. For tenure-track faculty, genuine excellence is often associated with an accelerating trajectory of scholarly activity and accomplishments.

To earn a designation of high competence or genuine excellence, candidates must provide evidence of an established line of inquiry which demonstrates increasing breadth and depth over time. The accomplishments may be of a theoretical and/or applied nature, but they must be consequential and merit positive regard by experts in the field.

Criteria for genuine excellence include, but are not limited to:

- Sustained and demonstrated ability to provide leadership in the acquisition of extramural funding
- Conducting research and scholarship that has a demonstrated and substantive impact on the field as judged by experts in the field
- Recognized and replicated innovations in the conduct and delivery of research and scholarship
- Advancing the field through the development of new constructs and/or theoretical models
- Recognized expertise in the field of study among scholars, practitioners, and/or policy makers
- Participation in, and leadership of, multidisciplinary/transdisciplinary projects and initiatives

Considerations for Achieving Genuine Excellence

There are several important considerations with respect to meeting the standard of *genuine excellence*.

1. One important consideration is the quality of the evidence provided to document claims of genuine excellence. A single publication or grant, even if impressive as a stand-alone accomplishment, does not provide a convincing case. Coupling multiple publications of high impact with a pattern of strong external funding or high-visibility scholarly presentations can be convincing.
2. The evidence presented should represent accomplishments as part of an overall plan or trajectory within the individual’s research agenda (as explained, for example in the research and scholarship narrative). For tenure-track faculty, these accomplishments should demonstrate substantial progress toward becoming a consistently productive scholar whose work is “making a difference” in terms of creating new knowledge and ideas and/or expertly addressing applied problems.
3. Another consideration is the type of venues in which publications appear and presentations are made. Research and scholarship addressed to national and international audiences will be regarded as more consequential than publications and presentations in regional and state-level venues. While collaboration is strongly valued, peer-reviewed articles in which one serves as the

lead or sole author provide a particularly convincing way to demonstrate leadership and impact. Invited presentations or publications based on public acknowledgment of professional expertise and leadership in the field of study can also provide evidence of excellence. Books, chapters, and monographs can also be used to demonstrate genuine excellence in the field of study; however, the context of these publications should be described in sufficient detail that reviewers can appropriately assess specific individual contributions as well as the quality of the publication itself. Quality might be indicated, for example, by favorable reviews, frequent citations, low acceptance rates, or adoption of a text or publication by other universities or schools/agencies.

4. Finally, external experts in the field of study will contribute to the review process for promotion and tenure. In planning, it is important to remember one's professional connection to leaders in the field (as this evolves personally). Through publications and presentations, through work in professional organizations, and through leadership in the field it is important to plan thoughtfully and strategically for professional growth from assistant professor, to associate professor, and ultimately to full professor.

If research and scholarship does not have a demonstrated significant impact it will not be deemed genuinely excellent.

Possible Artifacts for Inclusion

The following represent possible artifacts for inclusion in a portfolio of research and scholarship accomplishments for CEHD faculty members:

- Publishing in peer-reviewed journals recognized in the field or discipline
 - Sole author
 - Lead author
 - Collaborative
- Book/book chapters/edited book volumes that are invited based on expertise and/or peer reviews
- Publishing in non-traditional formats/venues (e.g., web-based documents, films, creative productions)
- How others have used the research and scholarship
- Ways in which professional efforts have influenced policy and programmatic decisions
- Discussion of research findings and recommendations in media (newspaper, magazine, radio, television)
- Election to prestigious national organizations that recognize excellence in a discipline
- Research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, and industry
- External research funding from sources outside the university that are peer-reviewed (state, national, or international)
 - Funding for grants and contracts clearly linked to the field of study
 - The candidate's specific role in writing the proposal for funding
 - The candidate's role, activities, and accomplishments with the activities

- Documentation of products and noteworthy accomplishments emanating from the funding
- Patents, inventions, and other such developments of a significant nature for the field or discipline
- Development of creative resources (e.g., computer-based modules, curricula, products)
- Preparation of technology-grounded or technology-infused research strategies
- Publication of scholarly research-based monographs
- Publication in peer-reviewed proceedings—international or national
- Peer-reviewed presentations in recognized conferences for the field or discipline
- Innovations in delivery of research and scholarship, building constructs and new theoretical models
 - Ways in which the research and scholarship are presented, including use of standard and cutting edge technology
- Media attention to research and scholarship
- Citations in recognized databases
- Appointments to state, national, international commissions and/or study groups
- Invitations to present at conferences (e.g., keynote presentations based on recognized expertise)

Aggregating Evidence to Form a Conclusion about High Competence/Genuine Excellence

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments, along with amplifying evidence related to leadership and multidisciplinary accomplishments, that equate to “genuine excellence” or “high competence” in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative (e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). Perhaps most notably, there are many different types of leadership roles and venues that may support a full professor promotion evaluation. This *equifinality* principle (i.e., the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

Criteria for Achieving High Competence/Genuine Excellence in Service

The assigned part of a faculty job typically labeled “Service” can be separated into three distinct components: (1) *required* university service (called “citizenship” within the CEHD context); (2) university service that goes beyond minimum job requirements; and (3) professional service (which typically occurs outside the boundaries of the university).

Faculty Handbook: 2.4.3 University and Professional Service

Annual evaluations and decisions on reappointment, promotion and tenure will be influenced by the extent of the candidate's service to the University. All full-time faculty are expected to participate as part of their professional responsibilities in governance and operational activities outside the classroom. Required university service includes, but is not limited to, such activity as attendance at faculty meetings and participation in faculty personnel matters and curriculum development. University service beyond that which is required of all faculty members will be given positive weight in personnel decisions. Each local academic unit will make known in a timely manner its requirements concerning the minimum acceptable level of university service and its policies concerning positive weight to be given for intramural service in excess of that minimum requirement.

Professional service is demonstrated by contributions to recognized societies and associations that promote research and scholarship and by consultancies and cooperative projects that make the faculty member's discipline of field-based knowledge and skills available to individuals, groups or agencies outside the University. Local academic units will develop and disseminate in a timely manner (i) specific discipline- or field-based expectations regarding the types of professional service that will be considered appropriate as evidence in annual evaluations and for reappointment, promotion and tenure cases; and (ii) the criteria to be used in assessing the quality of this service.

Judgments Regarding Required University Service (Citizenship)

Required Service in CEHD is defined as **Citizenship** and encompasses the following expectations:

- (1) regular attendance at appropriate program, division, and college-wide meetings;
- (2) appropriate participation in course and curriculum development;
- (3) appropriate participation in accreditation and program review functions;
- (4) appropriate participation in student advisement;
- (5) appropriate participation in program recruitment and admissions processes;
- (6) essential work with adjunct faculty (e.g., course lead); and
- (7) other program duties as assigned by program coordinators, division directors, or college administrators.

All CEHD faculty must meet minimum citizenship requirements. When minimum citizenship requirements are not met, no service points will be awarded in the annual evaluation process, resulting in an unsatisfactory evaluation in service *and* in the faculty member's overall evaluation. Faculty with unsatisfactory evaluations are not eligible for salary increases or for contract renewals. Tenured faculty with consecutive or multiple unsatisfactory evaluations are subject to post-tenure review, which can lead to a variety of sanctions, including dismissal.

Service expectations will vary based on rank and tenure status.

Judgments Regarding University Service Beyond Minimum Requirements

In CEHD service includes significant contributions beyond required citizenship responsibilities and includes, for example, contributions such as:

At the CEHD (college/school/division/program) level:

Leadership in program curriculum development; leadership in accreditation and program review; leadership in academic advising and student services; coordination of clinical or field-based aspects of a program; leadership in professional development activities (e.g., related to teaching, research, technology, etc.); service as division director, academic program coordinator, or professor-in-charge of a specific subunit; chair/member of a college or school governance committee; chair/member of a search committee, first-tier promotion/tenure review committee, or other ad hoc committee; leadership of efforts to enhance college resources through gifts, external grants and contracts, and revenue activities; active participation in marketing, alumni relations, and school partnership activities.

At the university level:

Member/chair of governance committees (e.g., Faculty Senate), search committees or other university-level committees; task force assignments and other special assignments from central administration (e.g., HSRB); participation in university accreditation-related activities; participation in cross-unit collaborative activities and partnerships.

Judgments Regarding Professional Service

In CEHD professional service includes significant contributions to the faculty member's profession beyond the boundaries of George Mason University, and includes, for example, contributions such as:

Reviewing for professional conferences, journals and publications; serving as a member/leader in professional organizations; serving on state, national, and international committees or advisory boards; sharing expertise (e.g., through presentations) with local and regional audiences; serving as editor or assistant editor of a journal or edited volume; serving as session chair or discussant at professional meetings; advising/supporting educational organizations using professional experience and expertise.

Please note that community service unrelated to one's profession or position at George Mason University should not be included as part of a professional service portfolio. It is incumbent upon the faculty to make the case for seemingly unrelated items.

Aggregating Evidence to Form a Conclusion about High Competence/Genuine Excellence

Because the operational meaning of (i.e., evidence required to document) genuine excellence and high competence is dynamic and multifaceted, faculty and administrators should resist the temptation to try to quantify the teaching, research and scholarship, and service accomplishments, along with amplifying evidence related to leadership and multidisciplinary accomplishments, that equate to "genuine excellence" or "high competence" in artificially precise terms. Teaching excellence can be manifested in many different ways depending on the person, context, and discipline. Extraordinary accomplishments in research and scholarship can take many forms, both within and across disciplines and academic units. Exceptional service may similarly stand out on dimensions that are more qualitative than quantitative

(e.g., breadth or magnitude of impact, timeliness or uniqueness of a particular contribution, reputational consequences for the individual and Mason). Perhaps most notably, there are many different types of leadership roles and venues that may support a full professor promotion evaluation. This *equifinality* principle (i.e., the same end state can be reached through many different means) is at the core of what it means to celebrate (rather than punish) diversity and innovation in faculty accomplishments.

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

External Reviewer Qualification and Selection Process

College of Education and Human Development

Mark R. Ginsberg, Dean

This document refers to the process used by the CEHD Dean's Office to identify the external reviewers (aka "external evaluators" or "outside reviewers") who will be asked to provide confidential assessments of a faculty member's appropriateness for a tenured appointment and/or promotion in rank. **Please note that this process *only* pertains to tenure-line faculty, and only to tenure and promotion evaluations** (not tenure-track contract renewal). Term faculty seeking promotion in rank are required to include outside letters concerning teaching effectiveness and/or scholarship of teaching, but those letters are acquired by the candidate (i.e., they are *not* confidential evaluations obtained by the Dean's Office).

Tenure-line candidates may also include letters of support in their portfolio that they acquire from outside sources; however, such letters are separate from the confidential letters from external reviewers that are used as part of the peer evaluation process for tenure-line faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion in rank.

Rationale for Using External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must provide evidence that their research and scholarship is impactful at national and international levels and well regarded by other scholars (among other intended audiences). Indeed, the Mason Faculty Handbook explains that "scholars in a particular field have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues," with such scholars often residing outside the Mason campus. Promotion to full professor is even more dependent on assessments by outside scholars, as the Handbook emphasizes that "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. Clear and convincing evidence must be provided of an established external reputation in the primary field."

Qualifications for Serving as an External Reviewer

First and foremost, external reviewers must have authentic expertise in the *specific* domains of research and scholarship in which candidates have focused their work. It is not sufficient for a prospective evaluator to have expertise in the same general discipline or multidisciplinary domain of study (e.g., "multicultural education" or "school counseling" or "kinesiology"). Rather, external reviewers must have a demonstrated record of scholarly accomplishments on precisely those themes and topics that the candidate has described as the primary areas of work in which he or she aspires to have an impact. Example: if an educational psychologist's primary research themes are in the domain of school-based

motivation, it would be inappropriate to select external reviewers whose primary expertise is in learning and cognition, even if those prospective evaluators identify as educational psychologists.

Structurally, external reviewers must have already earned the rank and tenure status that the candidate is seeking. That does not mean that the evaluator must currently be in an academic position, but if tenure and appropriate rank has *never* been earned in that scholar's history, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the prospective evaluator's scholarly accomplishments are equivalent to those who have earned tenure and the appropriate academic rank at a Research I university.

International external reviewers are a valued and welcome part of the process; however, care must be taken to ensure that the academic appointment/title of an international scholar is equivalent to someone in the U.S. who has earned (at least) the rank and tenure status that the candidate is seeking.

Typically, external reviewers are also expected to be employed at a Research I university (or the international equivalent), or to have an employment history that includes a tenured position at the appropriate academic rank at a Research I university. Thus, for example, an emeritus/a scholar from a Research I setting or someone who left a Research I university for a position at a lower-ranked institution would be eligible to serve as an external reviewer.

Proposed exceptions to the "Research I" criterion must be carefully assessed by the Dean's Office. Faculty who earned tenure and promotion at a Research II-level institution are acceptable *only* if their research productivity and reputation in the field is clearly aligned with the norms associated with faculty at Research I institutions (sometimes called the "big fish in a little pond" phenomenon). For cases involving candidates in the general field of educational research, such exceptions would ideally be employed at institutions that are at a comparable or higher rank than Mason in the *U.S. News and World Report's* reputational rankings of educational schools in research universities.

A final, essential qualification for all proposed external reviewers is that they be unbiased and capable of making an objective assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship. Bias and loss of objectivity can occur in a variety of different ways. An obvious disqualification would be anyone with whom the candidate has a personal (as opposed to a purely professional) relationship. In addition, when the statement, "the candidate is excellent" is tantamount to saying, "I am excellent" (because of a significant professional interdependency), a reviewer must be disqualified. That would include, for example, dissertation committee members, research mentors, and most research collaborators (with the word "most" reflecting the possibility that a single, "arms-length" collaboration would not be a threat to objectivity). Finally, the Dean's Office must be savvy enough about the candidate's work to effectively avoid prospective evaluators who might be biased for theoretical or political reasons that are orthogonal to the criteria being applied in the decision-making process. That is why candidates are permitted to notify the Dean's Office of the names of up to two outside scholars they would like to exclude from the external evaluation process.

Procedures for Identifying Specific External Reviewers

Candidates may suggest up to 40% of the external evaluators who will receive an invitation to provide an objective assessment of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. Operationally that means that, of the 12-13 invitations sent via email in the initial selection process (implemented by the CEHD Senior Associate Dean or other designee of the Dean), 5 of those initial invitations will be to individuals nominated by the candidate, with the other 7-8 invitations going to individuals identified by the Dean's Office.

Although CEHD follows the university's guideline that there must be a minimum of at least 5 external letters, the College's goal is to obtain at least 7-8 such letters (so that no one letter has an inappropriately high weighting in the process).

While the final tally of *received* letters is not required to conform exactly to the 40% threshold for *sent* letters, CEHD protocol is to continue the process of inviting outside reviewers and securing letters of evaluation until, at a minimum, the number of received letters written by evaluators nominated by the candidate is no more than the number of received letters written by evaluators identified by the Dean's Office. Thus, to take an extreme example, if, in the initial invitation process, all 5 of the candidate-nominated evaluators provided a letter but only 2 administrator-nominated evaluators had time to provide a letter, the process would not be over, even though the minimum target for the total number of letters had been reached. Instead, the process of identifying additional prospective evaluators would continue until at least 5 administrator-nominated individuals had produced a letter.

Historically the response rate for associate rank outside reviewers has been in the 70-75% range, and in the 55-65% range for full professors (who, on average, have more administrative and service commitments). This means that it is common for the Dean's Office to need a list of nominees from the candidate that goes a bit beyond a "top 5" list. Candidates are thus asked at the outset of the process to provide, in order of preference, a list of at least 10-12 nominees.

To ensure that the candidate has an opportunity to have the intended impact on the pool of external reviewers, CEHD protocol is to keep seeking evaluations until at least 3 letters written by candidate-nominated reviewers have been received. In addition, if the Dean's Office identifies a prospective reviewer through its independent protocol who ends up also being nominated by the candidate, that outside reviewer is not counted against the candidate's 40% allotment.

Although the two sets of prospective external evaluators typically do not overlap by more than one or two names (this happens most commonly in full professor cases, where the target population is, by definition, much smaller), it is not surprising that an occasional redundancy would arise given the protocol used by the Dean's Office to identify prospective external reviewers. Specifically, the primary procedure used to identify such individuals, consistent with the "authentic expertise" criterion noted above under reviewer qualifications, is to extract keywords found in the candidate's research publications and narrative material and to then use these keywords to initiate online searches designed

to identify aligned work being done by scholars from around the country (and around the world). When an individual is identified who appears to have a research program and recognized expertise on a theme or topic highlighted in the candidate's work, an effort is made to find the prospective reviewer's CV to verify, at a detailed level, that an appropriate match has been made.

If there are faculty within CEHD who have "authentic expertise" on the specific themes and topics represented in a candidate's work (which is not always the case given that the College encompasses about 30 different disciplines and sub-disciplines), a consultative protocol following this same logic is implemented. Yet any nomination from a CEHD senior faculty member still requires careful verification of the appropriateness of the prospective evaluator through a review of the specific contents of the outside scholar's CV.

Conclusion

The process of identifying the "right" external reviewers and effectively motivating them to write a letter is an essential component of the tenure and promotion process. Indeed, the substantive integrity of the entire process rests heavily on this part of the process being carried out in a thoughtful and effective manner. Just one or two letters from reviewers who are unqualified, biased, or otherwise unsuitable can negatively impact the entire process, with significant negative consequences for the candidate, the university, or both parties.

In that spirit, the current letter of invitation (template) used by the College of Education and Human Development for tenure cases—along with the comparable letter used for full professor cases—is included as an Appendix to this document.

Appendix

Sample letter sent to external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases:

[Insert Date]

Dr. [Insert Name]

[Insert Rank]

[Insert Address]

[Insert Address]

Dear Dr. [Insert Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to review the credentials of **Dr. [Insert Name]** as part of her application for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor at George Mason University. In addition to her vita, I am sending narrative background information with respect to her teaching, research, and service activities and accomplishments, as well as several recent publications that you may wish to sample as part of your analysis.

We would appreciate it if you could evaluate Dr. [Insert Name]'s accumulated record of scholarship and professional service, comment on her recognition within the field, and note any further knowledge you may have or can discern from her materials with respect to teaching and mentoring activities or other aspects of her work. Your comments will be incorporated into the review process as we evaluate whether Dr. [Insert Name]'s contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service are of sufficient scope and quality to merit tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor.

In your evaluation letter we ask that you do not specifically recommend for or against tenure and promotion, but instead focus on candidate strengths and weaknesses and whether the candidate appears to have met Mason's criteria for tenure and promotion. Also, it would be helpful to note if you have previous knowledge of Dr. [Insert Name]'s activities and accomplishments, and if so how you became familiar with her work.

As a reminder, our hoped-for deadline for receiving your letter is **[Insert Day/Date]**. If you cannot write within this time frame, please be sure that we have your letter by no later than **[Insert Day/Date]**, which is about when we will be moving from the reading phase to the deliberation phase.

To facilitate speed of response, it would be preferable if you could e-mail your letter to me at mford@gmu.edu. However, if you do so, please also forward a signed hard copy to us at the address on the top of this page. You can also reach me with any questions you may have at (703) 993-2004.

With regard to the criteria for tenure and promotion at George Mason University (Mason): our Faculty Handbook states that, to earn tenure and/or promotion in rank, faculty must demonstrate satisfactory levels of citizenship/service and either high competence in teaching and genuine excellence in research, or genuine excellence in teaching and high competence in research (genuine excellence in both areas is of course ideal). These are necessarily somewhat abstract concepts, but they do illustrate two important principles: (1) although Mason is now formally classified as a "doctoral-very high research activity" (R1) university, with expectations consistent with this status, teaching and research are equally valued in our

context (in part because we are acutely aware that enrollment is the primary source of funding for our permanently budgeted positions); and (2) faculty can be tenured or promoted despite a lack of “genuine excellence” in one domain as long as they have a solid record and accelerating trajectory of accomplishments in that domain (i.e., “high competence” is still required).

One last detail: our Provost requires that we provide a brief description of our external reviewers so that he can judge whether the reviewers are of appropriate stature and substantive relevance when he and his staff conduct the final level of review. If you have a vita handy that you could attach to an e-mail, or a website that you could point me to with biographical material, that would facilitate my preparation efforts. On the other hand, if this is an inconvenience, please do not feel obligated to provide this additional information, as there are other ways we could obtain the essential documentation.

With sincere thanks,

Martin E. Ford
Senior Associate Dean and
Professor of Education

Confidentiality Statement

Your letter will be kept confidential from the candidate and all others not directly participating in the evaluation process. In the event of a grievance or legal action, we cannot assure complete confidentiality, but we are committed to disclosing information only to the extent required by law. Please note that very brief excerpts from letters, without attribution, are sometimes included in the evaluation letters at different levels of review.

Sample letter sent to external reviewers for promotion to full professor cases:

[Insert Date]

Dr. [Insert Name]
[Insert Rank]
[Insert Address]
[Insert Address]

Dear Dr. [Insert Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to review the credentials of **Dr. [Insert Name]** as part of his application for promotion to the rank of professor at George Mason University. In addition to his vita, I am sending narrative background information with respect to his teaching, research, and service activities and accomplishments, as well as several recent publications that you may wish to sample as part of your analysis.

We would appreciate it if you could evaluate Dr. [Insert Name]’s accumulated record of scholarship and professional service, comment on his recognition within the field, and note any further knowledge you

may have or can discern from his materials with respect to teaching and mentoring activities or other aspects of his work. Your comments will be incorporated into the review process as we evaluate whether Dr. [Insert Name]'s contributions in scholarship, teaching, and service are of sufficient scope and quality to merit promotion to the rank of professor.

In your evaluation letter we ask that you do not specifically recommend for or against promotion, but instead focus on candidate strengths and weaknesses and whether the candidate appears to have met Mason's criteria for promotion. Also, it would be helpful to note if you have previous knowledge of Dr. [Insert Name]'s activities and accomplishments, and if so how you became familiar with his work.

As a reminder, our hoped-for deadline for receiving your letter is **[Insert Day/Date]**. If you cannot write within this time frame, please be sure that we have your letter by no later than **Insert Day/Date]**, which is about when we will be moving from the reading phase to the deliberation phase.

To facilitate speed of response, it would be preferable if you could e-mail your letter to me at mford@gmu.edu. However, if you do so, please also forward a signed hard copy to us at the address on the top of this page. You can also reach me with any questions you may have at (703) 993-2004.

With regard to the criteria for tenure and promotion at George Mason University (Mason): our Faculty Handbook states that, to earn tenure and/or promotion in rank, faculty must demonstrate satisfactory levels of citizenship/service and either high competence in teaching and genuine excellence in research, or genuine excellence in teaching and high competence in research (genuine excellence in both areas is of course ideal). These are necessarily somewhat abstract concepts, but they do illustrate two important principles: (1) although Mason is now formally classified as a "doctoral-very high research activity" (R1) university, with expectations consistent with this status, teaching and research are equally valued in our context (in part because we are acutely aware that enrollment is the primary source of funding for our permanently budgeted positions); and (2) faculty can be tenured or promoted despite a lack of "genuine excellence" in one domain as long as they have a solid record and accelerating trajectory of accomplishments in that domain (i.e., "high competence" is still required). In addition, faculty submitting for promotion to full professor must provide "clear and convincing evidence . . . of an established external reputation in the primary field, based on consequential achievements in teaching, research and scholarship, or professional activities directly related to teaching and research and scholarship."

One last detail: our Provost requires that we provide a brief description of our external reviewers so that he can judge whether the reviewers are of appropriate stature and substantive relevance when he and his staff conduct the final level of review. If you have a vita handy that you could attach to an e-mail, or a website that you could point me to with biographical material, that would facilitate my preparation efforts. On the other hand, if this is an inconvenience, please do not feel obligated to provide this additional information, as there are other ways we could obtain the essential documentation.

With sincere thanks,

Martin E. Ford
Senior Associate Dean and
Professor of Education

Confidentiality Statement

Your letter will be kept confidential from the candidate and all others not directly participating in the evaluation process. In the event of a grievance or legal action, we cannot assure complete confidentiality, but we are committed to disclosing information only to the extent required by law. Please note that very brief excerpts from letters, without attribution, are sometimes included in the evaluation letters at different levels of review.