

Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure, and Promotion to Full Professor: Policies and Procedures

These procedures were adopted by a paper ballot vote of 30 in favor and none against at the faculty meeting on 16 December 2016.

Introduction:

The GMU Faculty Handbook prescribes the general principles with which all units of the university must comply. These Schar School of Policy and Government procedures conform to the GMU Handbook.

These procedures specify:

1. Membership and Responsibilities of the Program Faculty Committee on Renewal, Promotion and Tenure.
2. The Procedure and the Calendar for the process of an application for renewal, promotion and tenure, and for promotion to full Professor within the School.
3. The Responsibilities of Candidates.
4. The Responsibilities of the Program Faculty Candidate Liaison Committee.
5. The Responsibilities of the Program Faculty Directors.
6. The Basis of judgment for renewal, promotion, tenure and promotion to full professor in:
 - a. Research
 - b. Teaching
 - c. Service
7. The Selection of External Reviewers.
8. The Procedures for Discussion and Voting within the Program Faculty.
9. Responsibilities of the Schar School Second Level RPT Committee.

1. Membership of the Program Faculty Committee on Renewal, Promotion and Tenure (“appointment without term”).

- a. The Program Faculty comprises all tenured members of the Program Faculty (For purposes of this document, future references to Program Faculty mean tenured or full professors, depending on the level of promotion being considered.)
- b. All applications for Renewal and for Promotion and Appointment to Associate Professor with tenure shall be reviewed by all members of the Program Faculty
- c. All applications for promotion to Full Professor shall be reviewed by the Full Professors of the Program Faculty only.
- d. The Program Faculty Director appoints a sub-committee with one member as Chair, called the Liaison Committee, drawn only from members of the Program Faculty and specific to each candidate, to assist and guide the Program Faculty in making a recommendation. A member of another program faculty may be included at the discretion of the Director.
- e. The Program Faculty Director does not vote on the candidate as a member of the Program Faculty, in consultation with the Liaison Committee chair, manages the RPT process at the Program Faculty level.

2. The Procedures for consideration of applications for Renewal, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion to Full Professor within the Program Faculty.

- a. This Calendar applies to all three categories, except that candidates for renewal do not require external reviewers and some of the dates are later. The procedure for consideration of applications for promotion and tenure, as well as for promotion to full, is as follows:
- b. (1) A candidate indicates formally in writing to the Program Faculty Director the intent to apply. (2) The Program Faculty Director appoints a Liaison Committee (PRC) one of whom is the Committee Chair. (The Program Faculty Director may include a person from the other Program Faculty if the person’s expertise is particularly relevant to the candidate’s case.) (3) The candidate submits a current CV and the names of four proposed external reviewers to the Program Faculty Director. (4) Tenured members of the Program Faculty with expertise in a candidate’s area also submit names of external reviewers to the Program Faculty Director, who then solicits commitments from external reviewers. (5) The candidate submits a portfolio. (6) The portfolio is sent to external reviewers with a deadline. (7) The Program Faculty meets to discuss the candidate’s research, teaching and service. The faculty votes by paper ballot at the meeting (with the provision that for legitimate reasons, an attending faculty member may delay her/his vote, for up to 48 hours).
- c. (7) Based on the Program Faculty discussion and vote, the Liaison Committee drafts a letter from the Program Faculty, explaining the faculty deliberations and voting to those who have attended the meeting and voted. Note that no external reviewer should be identified in the letter since the candidate will receive a copy of the letter. (8) The liaison committee then takes into account any final comments from the voting faculty and finalizes the letter. (9) The final letter is forwarded to the Program Faculty Director, who drafts her/his own letter and prepares the candidate’s package for submission to the second level review committee and the Dean.
- d. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion to Full*:

1. The Candidate declares intent	March 1
2. The Liaison Committee is appointed	March 14
3. Suggestions for external reviewers to PF Director	March 31
4. PF Director contacts external reviewers	April 15
4. Submission of portfolio by candidate to PF Director	June 14
5. Portfolios to Externals	June 21
6. Deadline for submission of letters by external reviewers	September 15
7. Program Faculty Meets, deliberates, and votes	October 14*
8. Liaison Committee circulates draft letters	October 28
9. Program Faculty approves letter to (PF Director)	November 14
10. PF Director drafts own letter; sends package to School RPT Committee (second level review) and Dean	Dec 10
11. Schar School RPT Committee submits its letter to the Dean	Jan 30
12. Dean submits Dean’s letter and all required materials to Provost Office	mid- Feb (date set by Provost Office)

*Each date in the above Calendar indicates a deadline. When a date falls on a weekend, the date should be considered to be the following Monday. In the case of meetings, the specific day may

be adjusted for scheduling reasons. The Program Faculty Director will specify the date of the PF meeting in the summer before the meeting so that faculty members can plan their fall calendars.

- e. Calendar and Procedure for Reappointment: By August 7th of their second year, faculty up for third year renewal should submit a portfolio to the PF Director in both electronic form and in hard copy. The portfolio of materials for faculty review may include:
- i. Current CV
 - ii. Statement of Research (including grant activity), Teaching and Service (8 page limit)
 - iii. Portfolio of Materials for Peer Faculty review may include the following:
 - Copies of all publications (in print, forthcoming, under review);
 - Copies of conference papers presented while at GMU (unless now in stage of publication, note as previous conference paper);
 - All syllabi for courses taught at GMU;
 - All GMU course evaluations (including original student forms) [*paper only*];
 - Grant activity where appropriate (proposal, reviews);
 - Supplemental materials, e.g. letters from students, colleagues, professional groups acknowledging something you have done.

From time to time, the School may be asked to approve a candidate for a tenured appointment, usually at the nomination of the Provost or the Dean. The Program Faculty and Director shall determine an appropriate schedule, including the appointment of a Liaison Committee, for review of the candidate in strict adherence to the Program Faculty's criteria for judgment of quality.

3. The Responsibilities of the Candidate.

- a. Prospective candidates should insure that their teaching is peer evaluated on a regular basis, and should seek guidance from Program Faculty members about their research and service.
- b. Candidates provide electronic (as much as possible) copies of a portfolio containing:
 - i. Current *curriculum vita* containing a) books, articles, chapters, and other works divided by type, publication status, peer review category, and authorship (in the case of multi-authored pieces and other group projects, candidates describe the allocation of responsibility among the parties); b) grant and contract awards; c) conferences and invited talks, and d) relevant entrepreneurial activities.
 - ii. A Personal Statement describing activities and philosophies related to research, teaching, and service to the department, university, profession, and community, including future plans (not more than 8 pages).
 - iii. A teaching appendix including evidence of teaching effectiveness, e.g. a summary table of all available student course evaluations; peer teaching evaluations; and/or other material.
 - iv. A research and publication appendix providing copies of all published work, manuscripts accepted for publication or under contract, and electronic materials as appropriate.
 - v. A copy of the letter of reappointment.

Candidates may provide supplementary information about (and where relevant, copies of) any changes in the status of publications or other research during the period of consideration by the

Schar School or University. Information about these changes will be sent to external reviewers if received before the deadline for their review of the candidate.

- c. A candidate will nominate at least 4 individuals deemed to be knowledgeable and objective in evaluating their work. A candidate may also name not more than 3 individuals to exclude from consideration as external reviewers.

4. The Responsibilities of the Liaison Committee.

- a. Each Liaison Committee will convene immediately on appointment to allocate responsibilities to ensure that the process is followed in a timely fashion.
- b. The primary function of the Liaison Committee is to report to the Program Faculty on a candidate's portfolio and the external reviews. This report should not be one of advocacy, but of assistance and guidance to the Program Faculty in making its judgments and in formulating a recommendation.
- c. The primary responsibilities of the Liaison Committee are to:
 - i. liaise with the candidate on the timely construction of the portfolio, usually through the relevant Committee Chair
 - ii. review portfolio drafts as appropriate to ensure that the candidate has made an effective presentation,
 - iii. check that sufficient peer reviews of teaching have been conducted or are planned,
 - v. prepare a letter to the Program Faculty Director with a recommendation following the Program Faculty's discussion and voting on the candidate.

5. The Responsibilities of the Program Faculty Director.

- a. To schedule the meetings of the Program Faculty meetings on RPT.
- b. To ensure that the RPT procedures are fully implemented, including solicitation of external reviewers.
- c. To ensure that all relevant opinions are taken into account and that judgments are carefully examined and considered,
- d. To liaise with the Chairs of Liaison Committees on all matters under their purview,
- e. To facilitate these procedures, the Program faculty Chair may appoint a faculty member as "chair" of the proceedings to ensure that the meetings are orderly and all have a chance to participate.

6. The Basis for the Program Faculty's Judgments shall conform to the GMU Faculty Handbook.

a. Research

The Program Faculty's judgment about a candidate's research should ultimately be based upon the quality of the work. In reaching judgment, the Program Faculty will consider several different types of information including, but not limited to: the opinions of the external reviews who are asked to provide letters regarding the candidate's scholarship; the scholarly reputation of the presses and journals in which the candidate's published work appears; published reviews of the candidate's work; manuscript reviews sought by the publisher during the editorial process (in the case of books in press or recently published); the impact of the candidate's research (reflected,

inter alia, in citations, testimony before government agencies or legislatures, and/or changes in scholarly or organizational practices that resulted from the candidate's work).

A judgment of "genuine excellence" or "high competence" in research will therefore be based on a range of considerations, with the publication of peer reviewed books and articles as the primary, but not the sole evidence of scholarly accomplishment. The record of published research should be sufficiently extensive to assure the university community of the candidate's commitment to and aptitude for a life of ongoing scholarship. Collaborative research is an entirely appropriate mode of scholarship, but candidates for promotion and tenure should ensure that they present a sufficient quantity of sole-authored research, and evidence regarding the allocation of responsibility in co-authored research, to permit a reliable judgment about their capability for independent writing and research.

Of the many forms of scholarship, the Program Faculty considers the generation of new knowledge to be the most important, and accordingly, expects candidates to demonstrate significant accomplishments in this area. Other forms of scholarship (such as applied research, reviews and other syntheses, the editing of books or special issue journals, public intellectual activities, or the preparation of policy reports) are also valued and may contribute strength to a corpus of work. The acquisition of grant, contract, or fellowship funding is also valued.

In consideration of promotion to Full Professor, the Program Faculty will be guided by the GMU Faculty Handbook (2.4, p. 27) which states that:

"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." (2.4, p. 27)

Scholarship conducted before joining GMU will be considered, in accord with the Faculty Handbook, Section 2.7.1, p. 34.

b. Teaching

The Schar School uses four main sources in the evaluation of a candidate's teaching quality:

- i. Written syllabi distributed to classes together with other materials including class web sites (e.g. on Blackboard), and quantity and quality of work expected of students.
- ii. Reflective self-evaluations usually contained in the 'teaching statement' section of the portfolio,
- iii. Student evaluations of all courses taught, and
- iv. Peer review through classroom visits.

No relevant evidence is excluded, e.g., the quality of teaching conducted extra-murally on which independent reports are available may merit consideration. Where the written comments of students on a course are included, the Program Faculty will need to be assured that the comments provide a full, not a selective account of those comments from a specific course.

In consideration of promotion to Full Professor, the Program Faculty expects a sustained record of high competence in teaching.

c. Service

In consideration of candidates for renewal and for promotion and tenure, the Program Faculty is aware of the priority it gives to research and to teaching and therefore does not demand an exemplary record of service. This implies that, in judging a candidate in these two categories, such a record of service cannot compensate for quality manifest in research and teaching.

The Schar School considers service in three categories:

- i. Service to the School (e.g. committee membership, assistance with student activities, attendance at faculty meetings, participation in faculty personnel matters, and curriculum development),
- ii. Service to the University (e.g. committee membership, broader university activities, assistance with student activities), and
- iii. Service to the profession and/or to the public (e.g. policy involvement or advice for a Government agency or nonprofit, leadership or committee membership for a professional association).

In consideration of promotion to Full Professor, the Department expects an exemplary and contributory record of service generally in all three categories

7. The Selection of and procedures for External Reviewers for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion to Full Professor.

The School is committed to using assessment by distinguished external reviewers with expertise in the relevant area of scholarship, who will consider the scholarly accomplishments and qualifications of a candidate for promotion and tenure and for promotion to Full Professor. The Program Faculty Director will seek 6 external reviews as a minimum for each candidate. The Provost requires a minimum of 5 “outside letters” (external reviews) with no more than 40% chosen by the candidate. All letters received will be forwarded with the candidate’s file; if only 5 letters are received, only those 5 will be forwarded.

The process for selection of external reviewers is:

- i. The nomination of external reviewers by the candidate and nominations from tenured members of the faculty in the candidate’s area of expertise.
- ii. Following these nominations, the Program Faculty Director, in consultation with the Liaison Committee Chair, will then invite at least 2 of the candidate’s nominees and at least 4 others to be external reviewers.
- iii. External reviewers will receive the candidate’s CV, copies of publications of the candidate, and a research statement not to exceed five (5) pages in length.
- iv. Names of external reviewers, their affiliations, and their letters are confidential and shared only with the relevant faculty committees and administrative offices involved in promotion and tenure decisions.
- v. The CVs of external reviewers will be included in the candidate’s file, along with the letters.

8. The Program Faculty procedures for discussion and voting.

- a. At the first Fall Semester meeting of Faculty the Program Director confirms the dates for the consideration of candidates in the three categories of Renewal, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion to Full Professor and announces dates for the availability of portfolios for review by tenured faculty.
- b. There will be separate meetings of the tenured faculty to consider cases for RPT, and of tenured full professors for cases of promotion to full professor. At these meetings, the chair of each liaison committee will present a full account of the candidate's work and achievements. Throughout the discussion, the PF Director [or his/her appointed "chair"] will ensure that all relevant opinions are taken into account and that judgments are carefully examined and considered.
- c. The Chair of each Liaison Committee is responsible for taking detailed notes of faculty opinion.
- d. At the conclusion of the Program Faculty review meeting, Program Faculty members will receive paper ballots and be encouraged to submit their vote and comments on "genuine excellence" or "high competence" for both research and teaching. The anonymous ballots will be counted by the liaison committee in the presence of the Program Faculty members. Those who do not attend the meeting and discussion are ineligible to vote.
- e. The Liaison Committee Chair, in consultation with Liaison Committee members and taking into account the results of the voting and the discussions, prepares a draft letter to the Program Faculty Director that reflects the Program Faculty's views and makes a recommendation based on the vote. This draft is then circulated to the eligible voting members of the Program Faculty for comment.
- f. The draft letter is amended by the liaison committee, and re-circulated to eligible Program Faculty as the final letter.
- g. In the event of external letters of recommendation being received after the Program Faculty has voted, the Chair of the Liaison Committee and the Program Faculty Director will determine whether to reconvene the Program Faculty. They should do so only where the recommendation is strongly at variance with the Program Faculty's recommendation. Otherwise the letter should be attached to the Program Faculty Director's letter of recommendation with a note that it arrived too late for consideration.
- h. The Chair of the Liaison Committee sends the agreed upon version of the letter to the Program Faculty Director.
- i. The Program Faculty Director communicates with the candidate the results of the deliberation and vote, usually by sending the candidate a copy of the letter from the Program Faculty to the PF Director. The letter is also forwarded, together with all other materials to the Schar School (second level) RPT Committee and to the Dean.

9. The Schar School Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure Committee

In accord with the GMU Faculty Handbook and the Schar School Bylaws, the Schar School elects the RPT Committee, which is responsible for the second level review of candidates for promotion and tenure.

A. Selection

The School RPT Committee will be elected for a three-year term from the tenured professors of the Schar School faculty, in accordance with Section VI.C.i of the Schar School bylaws. The Dean will appoint a non-voting full professor to chair of the committee, whose term will be two years.

B. Membership

The Committee will be composed of three members from each Program Faculty. The majority of each Program Faculty members shall be full professors elected by all tenured faculty of the School. Members of the School RPT Committee may not participate in the first level review of candidates by the Program Faculty.

C. Process

The RPT Committee will receive the materials of the candidates as well as the PF letter to the PF Director and the PF Director's letter to the Dean.

D. Criteria

The RPT Committee will use the same criteria for judging candidates as is specified in the faculty handbook and used by the Program Faculty.

E. After considering the full promotion and tenure materials of the candidate and the letters by the Program Faculty and the Program Faculty Director, the Committee will vote on the candidate's promotion and compose its own letter to the Dean.

10. The Dean will make an independent judgment about the candidate.

This evaluation will take into account the letters from the Program Faculty, the Program Faculty Director, and the Schar School RPT Committee (second level review) as well as any other relevant materials. The Dean will then convey to the Provost whatever materials the Provost Requires.

The faculty member will receive copies of the letters from the Program Faculty, the Program Faculty Director, and the Dean.

Transition rules, from the Schar School Faculty Meeting of May 9, 2016

From the minutes of the meeting of 9 May 2016:

“The proposed amendment now specifies that tenure track faculty who signed a contract prior to August 25, 2014 and are candidates for third-year renewal, for tenure or for both tenure and promotion can be reviewed and voted upon by the legacy units in which they were originally hired or according to the procedures adopted by the School – at the discretion of the candidate. And candidates for promotion to full professor in fiscal years through 2017-2018 may likewise choose to be reviewed by their legacy unit or by the procedures adopted by the School.”

“A motion was made and seconded to approve both amendments to the By-laws, and both were approved by an oral vote.”

**Appendix A. Peer Review of Teaching Form
Peer Review of Teaching Methods and Materials**

Professor Visited: _____

Course/Section #/Class Size: _____

Peer Reviewer: _____

Date of Classroom Visit: _____

Evaluate both teaching materials and teaching methods of the form below using a five-point rating scale. Excellent-5; Very Good-4; Good-3; Fair-2; and, Poor-1. Attach a description of the class you observed and an analysis of the strengths of teaching methods, and effectiveness, and areas for improvement.

Teaching Methods

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<u>Clarity and effectiveness of presentation</u> (e.g., professor displays a clear understanding of the course material, organizes and expresses thoughts clearly, presents material effectively and enthusiastically)	
<u>Teaching of concepts and relationships</u> (e.g., professor effectively blends theory and practice emphasizing conceptual understanding and relationships among topics, and uses well-selected examples and illustrations)	
<u>Involvement of the student in class sessions</u> (e.g., professor challenges students with questions, promotes discussion and debate, and seeks to open students' minds and broaden their perspectives)	
<u>Professor/student respect and rapport</u> (e.g., professor exhibits respect towards students and divergent viewpoints, and is skilled in building rapport with the class)	
<u>Selection of appropriate teaching methods</u> (e.g., lecture/discussion, group exercises, films, diagrams, use of blackboard/overheads/slides, use of Internet)	

Teaching Materials

(syllabus, textbook(s), outside reading, papers, exams, special projects, etc)

<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Course goals and objectives</u> (e.g., well conceived, clearly stated, consistently pursued, and fulfill obligation of course to the program curriculum)
<u>Course content</u> (e.g., appropriate to academic preparation in the area and fits the course description and level)
<u>Textbook and readings</u> (e.g., well written and organized, current in the field, well related to course goals, within student's comprehension)
<u>Assignments</u> (e.g., well related to course goals, clearly and creatively designed, reasonable length and difficulty)
<u>Examinations</u> (e.g., components of course grade are appropriate; exams fairly assess what the student is supposed to learn, are clearly presented, are reasonable in length and difficulty, and require original thought and subject integration)

Signature of Peer Reviewer