

**BYLAWS OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN
DEVELOPMENT**

Approved by the faculty May 4, 2011

**The George Washington University
Graduate School of Education and Human Development**

**Bylaws of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development
at the George Washington University
*Approved by the faculty May 4, 2011***

I. NAME OF THE ORGANIZATION

The name of this organization shall be the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, hereinafter GSEHD.

II. MISSION

The Graduate School of Education and Human Development, strategically based in the nation's capital and serving the global community, develops informed and skilled leaders through innovative teaching and learning that: Engages in scholarly inquiry that raises the level of academic excellence by enriching theory, policy, and practice across the life-span; Promotes leadership, diversity, learning, and human development reflective of changing global societies; Creates public and private partnerships; and Advocates continuous self examination and critical analysis towards excellence.

III. PURPOSE OF BYLAWS

These Bylaws establish the structures and procedures by which the Faculty of GSEHD exercise their responsibilities in fulfilling the School's mission. The construction, validity and effect of these bylaws will not contravene regulations established by the Trustees, the University, or the provisions of the *Faculty Code*.

IV. MEMBERSHIP IN THE FACULTY

Voting membership in GSEHD shall extend to all persons whose primary appointments are regular active status as defined by the *Faculty Code*: University Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Directors of Administrative Units are also eligible to vote.

Nonvoting membership in GSEHD shall extend to other faculty members who are appointed as limited service active status, visiting active status, research active status, retired status, and professional personnel.

V. AUTHORITY OF THE FACULTY

The duties of the voting members of the faculty include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Attendance at meetings, regular and special, that are called during the year
- (2) Periodic evaluation of Administrators.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS

An Administrative Unit is defined as an organizational component with one or more Administrative Officers, a budget and identified fiscal responsibility, and authority over and responsibility for specified functions within the GSEHD. There are various Administrative Units within GSEHD: The Office of the Dean, Academic Departments, and Other Administrative Units.

- (1) **The Office of the Dean:** The Administrative Officers of the Office of the Dean consist of the Dean and Associate/Assistant Dean(s). The Office of the Dean shall collaborate with the other Administrative Units in exercising its authority and carrying out its responsibilities in:
 - (a) Implementing the strategic direction and plan for the School
 - (b) Approving the establishment of programs and program locations
 - (c) Approving the granting of degrees
 - (d) Granting admissions and financial aid
 - (e) Determining the standards of scholarship
 - (f) Coordinating the accreditation of GSEHD
 - (g) Making decisions related to student appeals
 - (h) Promoting of academic programs
 - (i) Monitoring the facilitation of equal opportunities for all students, faculty and staff
 - (j) Approving of all sponsored projects.
- (2) **The Academic Departments:** The Administrative Officer of each Department shall be the Chair. The number and composition of Academic Departments shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the faculty. Each Academic Department has the following authority and responsibilities within its Department:
 - (a) Selection and recommendation for appointment of the Department Chair in accordance with the *Faculty Code*
 - (b) Establishment of criteria and procedures for evaluating the Department Chair and reporting evaluation results to the Department Chair
 - (c) Academic instruction and advising
 - (d) Professional development of the faculty
 - (e) Recommendations for faculty appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, leave, and retirement
 - (f) Recommendations relative to student admissions, financial aid, appeals, and disciplinary actions

- (g) Program accreditation and Academic Program Review compliance shared with the Dean's Office
 - (h) Planning the direction and total responsibilities of the Department
 - (i) Recommendations relative to the establishment and deletion of courses and programs
 - (j) Academic program development and enhancement
 - (k) Providing equal opportunities and fair treatment for all students, faculty, and staff.
- (3) **Other Administrative Units:** The Administrative Officer of other Administrative Units shall be the Director. Administrative Units that reflect faculty, program, and/or department interests shall be directly responsible to and operate under the Department Chair. Each Academic Department shall determine the policy and procedures for those Administrative Units. Administrative Units that reflect school-wide interests shall be directly responsible to and operate under the authority delegated by the Dean.

VII. ADMINISTRATORS

- (1) The Dean shall be the chief Administrative Officer of GSEHD with the following responsibilities:
- (a) Developing the strategic direction and plan for the School
 - (b) Coordinating relationships among the Departments and other Administrative Units
 - (c) Maintaining relationships within the University and among Administrative Officers
 - (d) Maintaining relationships with individuals and groups outside the University that relate to GSEHD's interests, needs and directions
 - (e) Securing adequate resources and facilities necessary for the work of GSEHD
 - (f) Reviewing and concurring or disagreeing with Department recommendations concerning appointments, retention, tenure, promotion, leave, retirement, and appeals
 - (g) Employing, supervising and terminating staff of GSEHD
 - (h) Assisting Departments and Administrative Units with program development and promotion
 - (i) Developing and controlling the budget
 - (j) Holding meetings of GSEHD department chairs
 - (k) Overseeing off-campus programs and activities
 - (l) Overseeing the program review process
 - (m) Providing administrative assistance to the faculty
 - (n) Monitoring adherence to all policies and procedures specified in the GSEHD Bylaws
 - (o) At the request of any committee, serving or designating an Associate/Assistant Dean to serve as a non-voting participant of that committee
 - (p) Submitting an annual report to the faculty including the following information: the state of the School in terms of enrollment, budget, trends, future outlook, state of affairs in each Department; standing committee reports; specific recommendations concerning all aspects of the School; and any other information related to the status of the School.

(2) Selection of a Dean

To select a Dean, a search committee shall be formed consisting of one tenured faculty member elected from each Department, two tenured faculty members elected at large from and by the voting members of the faculty, and others designated by the EVPAA/Provost. The Chair of the search committee, elected by the voting members of the search committee, shall establish criteria and procedures to be presented for approval by full membership of GSEHD. The committee shall then circulate a vacancy announcement and screen applicants. All final candidates for the position of Dean will be brought to the campus for interviews which will include but not be limited to a separate scheduled presentation by the candidate to each of the following constituent groups: GSEHD faculty, GSEHD staff, and GSEHD current students. Written feedback will be gathered by a member of the search committee and summarized by the search committee and considered in their deliberations on a slate of candidates to be recommended to the University Administration. No members of the search committee other than voting members of the faculty will vote on the slate of candidates to be recommended to the University Administration.

(3) The Associate and Assistant Deans shall serve as administrators for GSEHD under the authority of the Dean, who may delegate the following responsibilities to them:

- (a) Analyzing and monitoring the fiscal status of GSEHD
- (b) Serving as a liaison to other University Offices
- (c) Overseeing the academic operations of GSEHD, Academic Program Reviews, Admissions and Student Services, GSEHD Physical Systems, and Sponsored Research projects
- (d) Performing other administrative tasks and responsibilities
- (e) At the request of any committee, serving as a non-voting participant of that committee
- (f) Presenting an annual report to the entire GSEHD Faculty including the information under VII.(1)p
- (g) Carrying out the policies established by the GSEHD Faculty
- (h) Keeping the Faculty regularly informed all matter that affect GSEHD.

(4) The Department Chair shall be the chief administrator for an Academic Department with the following responsibilities:

- (a) Developing and implementing the strategic direction and plan for the department
- (b) Supporting and promoting faculty research efforts in coordination with the dean's office
- (c) Maintaining relationships with other units in GSEHD and its administrators
- (d) Maintaining relationships with the individuals and groups outside of the University on all Departmental matters
- (e) Participating in the planning and assignment of facilities
- (f) Planning and managing the Department Budget
- (g) Overseeing completion of the class schedule for each semester both on and off campus
- (h) Employing, supervising, evaluating, and terminating staff of the Department

- (i) Evaluating faculty of the Department, establishing procedures for periodically informing faculty as to their progress towards promotion and tenure, and recommending salary
 - (j) Recommending the appointment of all part time faculty of the Department both on and off campus
 - (k) Submitting to the Dean an annual report on the state of the Department.
- (5) The Director of the units identified as Other Administrative Units in VI (3) and shall perform roles and responsibilities as specified by the Dean or the Department Chair for the purpose(s) of that administrative unit. The Director shall submit an annual status report of the administrative unit to the Dean or Department Chair.

VIII. MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

All GSEHD faculty meetings shall be governed by the *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*.

Regular Meetings of voting faculty members shall be held throughout the academic year, per the following:

- (1) The Dean of GSEHD shall establish the agenda, meeting place, and time of meetings
- (2) Notice of the regular meeting agenda shall be distributed to the voting faculty members of GSEHD from the Office of the Dean at least seven working days prior to each regular meeting
- (3) Items for the agenda of a meeting may be submitted to the Dean of GSEHD by any member of the school in writing ten working days before the publication of the agenda for the meeting
- (4) Minutes of the meeting shall be recorded, published, and sent to the voting faculty members of GSEHD within ten working days following the regular meeting
- (5) All minutes of the meeting shall be subject to approval by the voting faculty members at the following regular meeting of the voting faculty members of the GSEHD.

One-half of the number of voting faculty members plus one member shall make a quorum. Faculty on leave are not included in the number of voting faculty members. To take action on an item of the agenda, there must be a majority vote of those present and voting.

Special or emergency meetings may be called for a specific purpose by the Dean of GSEHD as needed at any time of year. Notice of the meeting agenda shall be distributed to the voting faculty members of GSEHD from the Office of the Dean at least seven working days prior to each meeting. In the case of emergency situations the requirement of notice may be waived.

IX. STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing Committees exist to perform a continuing function and maintain a close working relationship with the Dean of GSEHD to assure continuous rapport between the Office of the

Dean and the Faculty of the School. Standing Committees remain Standing Committees. The Standing Committees are: Executive, Curriculum, Faculty and Personnel, Doctoral Studies, Post Master's Appeals, and Master's Appeals.

A Standing Committee must be constituted either by specific provision of the Bylaws or by a resolution that is in effect a special rule of order and therefore requires the same notice and approval as an amendment to the Bylaws.

The members of Standing Committees shall serve staggered 2-year terms and continue their duties until their successors have been chosen. Staggered terms are selected by lot. There are no limits to the number of terms of service. The Dean and/or Associate/Assistant Dean(s) may be invited to attend or invited to serve as non-voting participants of any standing committee or committee meeting at the request of the committee. At any time, any committee may choose to operate in executive session with elected members only present. The Committees may also invite specific members of the Dean's staff to attend or serve as non-voting Committee participants.

Each Standing Committee will elect a Chair annually or more frequently if the office becomes vacant, from among the voting faculty members of that Standing Committee by a majority vote of that Standing Committee's members. Chairs may be re-elected. No one shall concurrently chair more than one Standing Committee. The Committee Chair shall be responsible for:

- (1) Convening and chairing all meetings of the Committee in accordance with *Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised*
- (2) Securing an adequate site for each meeting
- (3) Developing and distributing an agenda to the Committee one week prior to the meeting; distributing minutes one week following the meeting; and maintaining any other necessary records of Committee business and distributing copies to Committee members and relevant others
- (4) Submitting a proposed budget for the operation of committee, if appropriate
- (5) Submitting a written annual report of committee activities to the voting faculty members prior to the end of the academic year
- (6) Making recommendations relative to committee functions, committee continuation, and related information in the annual report.

Standing Committees must distribute Committee meeting dates at least one week before each meeting to permit any interested faculty members to attend (but not vote). In emergency situations, Standing Committees must provide 1 day advance notification of their meetings.

X. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall be constituted as follows:

- One regular active status faculty member elected by each Academic Department
- The Chair of each Academic Department

- The Chair of the Executive Committee shall be elected from among the elected members of the Committee but shall not be an Academic Department Chair.

The Executive Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) Representing the faculty in advising the Dean in all matters pertaining to GSEHD with the exception of individual faculty personnel matters
- (2) Reviewing the mission and strategic plan of GSEHD and recommending changes to the Dean, as needed
- (3) Making decisions for the faculty or faculty committees on any emergency matters that occur outside of the September to May academic year
- (4) Establishing the criteria and manner of conducting periodic evaluations of Administrators to take place no less than every three years:
 - (a) The Dean shall be evaluated by all voting faculty members. The Executive Committee shall present and discuss the results of the evaluation with the Dean. At the first regular faculty meeting after the Executive Committee has reported the evaluation results to the Dean, the Executive Committee shall present a summary to the faculty
 - (b) The Associate and Assistant Dean(s) shall be evaluated by all voting faculty members. The Executive Committee shall consult with the Dean regarding the evaluation criteria and the manner of conducting the evaluation. The Executive Committee shall report the results of the evaluation to the Dean. The Dean and the Chair of the Executive Committee shall present and discuss the results with the Associate or Assistant Dean(s). The Executive Committee shall present a summary to the faculty
 - (c) The Directors of Administrative Units shall be evaluated by Dean. The Executive Committee shall collaborate with the Dean regarding the evaluation criteria and the manner of conducting the evaluation. The Dean shall report the results of the evaluation to the Director and shall discuss with her or him the implications of the evaluation. The Dean shall report the results of the evaluation and a summary of the evaluation conference with the Director to the Executive Committee.
- (5) Oversee salary equity issues and concerns of the faculty
- (6) Dealing with matters related to the GSEHD Bylaws as follows:
 - (a) Considering all proposals for amendments or substantive modifications to the GSEHD Bylaws and making recommendations to the voting members of the faculty
 - (b) Considering all recommendations for editorial changes to the GSEHD Bylaws for purposes of accuracy, making editorial changes as necessary, and announcing those changes to the GSEHD faculty. Editorial changes will not require a vote by voting faculty members unless a challenge is made
 - (c) Systematically reviewing the GSEHD Bylaws for consistency of policy and practice within GSEHD and the University, and advising the GSEHD faculty accordingly
 - (d) Ensuring that official archives of past and current versions of the GSEHD Bylaws are maintained by the Office of the Dean.

XI. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

The Curriculum Committee shall deal with matters relevant to the curriculum at the Master's level. The Curriculum Committee shall be constituted as follows:

- One regular active status faculty member elected by each Academic Department.

The Curriculum Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) Considering all proposals for new regular course offerings and experimental 700 series courses referred by GSEHD departments and making recommendations to the Office of the Dean
- (2) Considering all proposals for new programs in GSEHD and making recommendations to the Office of the Dean
- (3) Considering all proposals for the termination of programs and to making recommendations to the Office of the Dean
- (4) Systematically reviewing existing programs and courses of GSEHD and its Departments, and making recommendations in the following sequence to: 1) Program coordinator(s), 2) the Department Chair(s), 3) the faculty of the Department(s), 4) the Office of the Dean.

XII. FACULTY AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Faculty and Personnel Committee shall deal with matters related to faculty appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, and equal employment opportunity. The Faculty and Personnel Committee shall be constituted as follows:

- One tenured faculty member elected by each Academic Department
- The Dean or her/his appropriate representative as a non-voting participant

The Faculty and Personnel Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) Developing and recommending policies and procedures related to faculty appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, and equal employment opportunity pertinent to all GSEHD faculty, which are not specifically stated in the *Faculty Handbook* or in the *Faculty Code*, and evaluating the consistency across GSEHD department policies and procedures
- (2) Recommending criteria and procedures related to appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion pertinent to all GSEHD faculty
- (3) Advising the Dean on matters of tenure, appointments with tenure and promotions for regular active status faculty
- (4) Reviewing departmental requests for tenure accruing lines and making recommendations to the Dean
- (5) Promoting and ensuring an equal employment opportunity policy for all faculty members and for all who seek faculty status in GSEHD

- (6) Evaluating needs and recommending faculty development activities as appropriate for GSEHD.

In conducting its affairs, the Committee will observe the following:

- All discussions and recommendations of the Committee are to be held in strict confidence
- The voting members of the Committee shall have the right to declare a portion of the meeting closed to non-Committee members when issues of a confidential nature are to be discussed
- The Committee may request that a Department Chair, or other academic members of GW with relevant expertise attend a meeting, to help explain a tenure or promotion candidate's contribution in her/his field
- Absentee votes on recommendations submitted in writing to the Chair will be accepted only on the condition that, in the judgment of the majority of the Committee, the member casting the absentee vote has been present for a significant portion of the Committee's discussion of the issue being voted upon
- All necessary communications between the Committee and the Dean, faculty members, and departments will be made through the Chair of the Faculty and Personnel Committee
- Any appeals of Committee decisions must follow the procedures described in the *Faculty Code* and in "The Procedures for the Implementation" of the *Faculty Code*.

With respect to all departmental recommendations for tenure, appointments with tenure, and promotions of regular active status faculty, the Committee will advise the Dean as to whether the recommended actions satisfy the relevant *Faculty Code* and GSEHD criteria (see Appendix I) The Committee will proceed in the following manner:

- (1) The Department Chair will forward to the Committee all recommendations for tenure and/or promotion. Recommendations will be accompanied by appropriate documentation as identified in the *Faculty Code*. The Committee shall conduct its evaluation in consideration of and in accordance with GSEHD and departmental criteria and procedures
- (2) After deliberation, the Committee will vote. The vote shall be recorded and presented to the Dean along with the advice of the Committee.

The guidelines for tenure, promotion, contract renewal and personnel actions appear in Appendix I of the Bylaws.

XIII. DOCTORAL STUDIES COMMITTEE

The Doctoral Studies Committee shall deal with matters related to programs, policies and procedures of advanced graduate studies (studies beyond the Masters). The Doctoral Studies Committee shall be constituted as follows:

- One regular active status faculty member elected by each doctoral program
- One regular active status Research Methods faculty member elected by the Research Methods faculty.

The Doctoral Studies Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) Considering proposals concerning programs, policies and procedures for doctoral and specialist programs and to making recommendations to the faculty
- (2) Initiating proposals it deems worthy of consideration concerning policies and procedures which affect candidates generally
- (3) Participating in reviews, evaluations, and studies of various operational issues associated with advanced graduate studies.

XIV. POST MASTER'S APPEALS COMMITTEE

The Post Master's Appeals Committee shall deal with appeals from applicants to or students in the programs of study leading to the Education Specialist (Ed.S.) or the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree. The Post Masters Appeals Committee shall be constituted as follows:

- One regular active status faculty member elected by each doctoral program
- One regular active status Research Methods faculty member elected by the Research Methods faculty.

The Post Master's Appeals Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) Making recommendations to the Office of the Dean on actions regarding appeals
- (2) Proposing policies and procedures for the post-masters appeals process in consultation with the Office of the Dean
- (3) Making recommendations to the Doctoral Studies Committee, as appropriate, regarding post-masters academic policies related to post masters students.

In conducting its affairs, the Committee will observe the following:

- Individuals may appeal to the Committee when contesting GSEHD admission decisions or requesting exceptions to existing GSEHD policies and procedures
- Review by the Committee is considered a formal appeal and students must first attempt to resolve the dispute informally.

XV. MASTER'S APPEALS COMMITTEE

The Master's Appeals Committee shall deal with appeals from candidates for the Master of Arts (M.A), Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) and Master of Education (M.Ed.) degrees and Graduate Certificates regarding issues and concerns of an academic nature such as residency requirements, admissions decisions, academic sanctions and grade appeals.

The Master's Appeals Committee shall be constituted as follows:

- One regular active status faculty member elected by each Academic Department

- Two non-voting doctoral students elected by the faculty on the Master's Appeals Committee from amongst those students suggested by the academic departments. The elected students should be enrolled in different doctoral programs.

The Master's Appeals Committee shall be responsible for the following:

- (1) Making recommendations to the Office of the Dean on actions regarding appeals
- (2) Making recommendations to the Office of the Dean, as appropriate, regarding policies of an academic nature related to masters' degree students.

In conducting its affairs, the Committee will observe the following:

- Individuals may appeal to the Committee when contesting GSEHD admission decisions or requesting exceptions to existing GSEHD policies and procedures
- Review by the Committee is considered a formal appeal and students must first attempt to resolve the dispute informally.

XVI. AD HOC COMMITTEES

The purpose of an Ad Hoc Committee shall be identified and the committee appointed, as the need arises, to carry out a specific task. Once the specific task is completed (i.e. presentation of its final report to the assembly), the Ad Hoc Committee will cease to exist. An Ad Hoc Committee should not be appointed to perform a task that falls within the assigned function of an existing standing committee. Ad hoc committees shall be appointed by the Dean after the endorsement of the membership and scope of the charge by the Executive Committee.

XVII. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS

The procedure for amending the Bylaws is as follows:

- Proposed amendments to the Bylaws shall be submitted in writing by any member(s) of the voting faculty members to the Executive Committee
- The Executive Committee shall study the proposed amendments and, if approved, present the proposed amendments to the voting faculty members with its recommendation
- Amendments to the Bylaws shall be submitted in writing by the Executive Committee to the voting faculty members 14 days in advance of a regular GSEHD meeting
- Amendments to the Bylaws shall be presented and discussed at a regular GSEHD meeting of the voting faculty members
- The voting faculty members shall vote on the proposed amendments at the next regular or special GSEHD meeting or subsequent meetings
- Proposed amendments to the Bylaws must receive the approval of 2/3 of those present and voting.

Appendix I

Guidelines and Procedures for Recruitment, Appointment, Reappointment and Tenure

**The George Washington University
Graduate School of Education and Human Development**

Appendix I

Guidelines and Procedures for Recruitment, Appointment, Reappointment and Tenure

	Page
Overview	13
Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty	13
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure	15
GSEHD Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review of Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty	17
I. The Faculty Development Panel for Tenure-Accruing Faculty	17
II. Midcourse Evaluation of Tenure-Accruing Faculty Guidelines	17
III. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Personnel Actions for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty	18
1. Scholarship	19
2. Teaching	21
3. Service	23
IV. Procedural Guidelines for the Evaluation of Requests for Tenure and Promotion of Tenured Faculty	24
V. Portfolio (Dossier) Content Specifications for Tenure Faculty	28
VI. Sample Letter Requesting External Evaluation of a Tenure Candidate's Scholarly Work	30
GSEHD Guidelines for Renewal and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Accruing Full-Time Regular Active-Status Faculty	31
I. Overview	31
II. The Faculty Development Panel for Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty	32
III. Criteria for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion of Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty	32
1. Teaching	34
2. Scholarship	35
3. Administrative Responsibilities	37
4. Service	38
IV. Procedural Guidelines for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion Reviews of Non Tenure Accruing Faculty	39
V. Deadlines for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion Review of Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty	40
VI. Portfolio (Dossier) Specifications for Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty	42
VII. Sample Letter Requesting External Evaluation of a Non-Tenure Candidate's Scholarly Work	44
Summary of Deadlines for Tenure and Promotion Review for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty	45
Summary of Deadlines for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion of Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty	46

Overview

This document provides the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) school-wide criteria for faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion. Academic Departments in GSEHD at The George Washington University (GWU) may have additional criteria that speak to specific expectations of scholarship in the candidate's discipline. Departments may establish their own procedures for the review and evaluation of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service. Departmental criteria may supplement the GSEHD's criteria and procedures (described herein) which constitute the required *minima*.

Recommendations for appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure shall be made solely on the basis of merit, except where the academic or fiscal needs of the University have changed. In such a case those factors may be considered in determining recommendations. At all times, recommendations for appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure shall be made regardless of race, color, religion, sex, sexual preference, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, or any other category protected by applicable law. (Faculty Code IV. E.) Department chairpersons shall make known to all members of their departmental faculty the GSEHD's criteria and procedures pertaining to personnel action as well as any additional departmental guidelines. The Chairperson of each department shall notify each regular active status faculty member of his or her eligibility for consideration of reappointment. The chairperson will provide to the faculty member a list of materials that the faculty member must submit by a specific date in order to be considered for reappointment. A faculty member who submits the required materials by the deadline will be considered a candidate for reappointment. The materials should be submitted in an organized portfolio (dossier) which becomes the property of the Department. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to keep a copy of the materials submitted.

The criteria and procedures for personnel action set forth in this document shall apply to all regular active status members of the GSEHD as defined by the Faculty Code of GW particularly section IV on Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion and its amendments.

Making judgments of academic excellence is a complex matter and cannot be reduced to a quantitative formula. The considerations applicable in individual cases cannot always be adequately described in specific terms since the merits of each personnel action case is considered individually. The criteria to be applied in all cases must represent excellence in the quality of the candidate's performance as a teacher, scholar, and contributor to the work of the GSEHD, the GWU and the broader profession. The candidate's productivity shall reflect a serious and sustained commitment to a life of scholarship. All additional departmental criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure must be consistent with those adopted by the GSEHD and its mission.

Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty

- A. **Recruitment:** The Dean of the GSEHD of GWU shall initiate and supervise the recruitment of faculty members as follows:

1. Program faculty shall regularly review the teaching and research needs of the School and determine the credentials, teaching areas, and other aspects desired in prospective appointees. This discussion shall serve as the basis for developing position requests with supporting position descriptions for presentation to the GSEHD Dean and for approval by the University. If a position is approved, the Dean, in consultation with the pertinent departmental chairperson, shall appoint a Search Committee.
2. The Search Committee shall conduct a faculty search following the School and University policies and procedures. The Committee shall screen applicants and determine the top-rated applicants for the position, who shall be invited on campus for interviews and presentations. The GSEHD Dean is to be notified of candidates selected for interview and provided an opportunity to screen the credentials and then interview each candidate who shall be invited for a campus interview.

B. **Appointment:** The appointment of full-time faculty shall follow the following criteria:

1. An earned doctorate is required for appointment to the rank of assistant professor or higher.
2. No candidate shall be appointed who has her/his last degree from the appointing department. This rule does not apply to persons who have been employed away from the institution for five years or more following the awarding of the degree. Exceptions to this rule may be made only with a recommendation of the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee and the GSEHD Dean.
3. To be hired, candidates must meet four criteria: attainment of a relevant degree, teaching or administrative ability, demonstrated capacity for scholarship, and knowledge of areas of specialization appropriate to the position being filled. The criteria for determining the rank of the appointment other than instructor or assistant professor shall be the same as those used in recommending promotion to that position.
4. The faculty of the department in which the search is to be conducted, shall arrive at its recommendations for hire by secret ballot. A majority vote of all eligible faculty in the department is required for a positive appointment recommendation in the form of rated list of candidates to be forwarded to the GSEHD Dean by the department chairperson.
5. The GSEHD Dean shall recommend to the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs the person to be hired, her/his rank, and other conditions of employment.

C. **Joint appointments:** Joint appointments with other units of the University shall be made according to similar procedures, integrating these procedures with those of other units.

D. **Research faculty, clinical faculty, regular part-time faculty, and visiting faculty appointments:** The GSEHD Dean, in consultation with pertinent faculty, is authorized to make appointments for research faculty, clinical faculty, regular part-time faculty, and

visiting faculty after timely notification, subject to the approval of the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

- E. **Other faculty appointments:** The GSEHD Dean is authorized to make other part-time faculty appointments, related to covering specific courses, in consultation with the director/coordinator of the appropriate degree program and the department chairperson, subject to the approval of the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

- A. **Annual Evaluation of Faculty:** The GSEHD Dean and department chairpersons are responsible for conducting annual evaluations of each School faculty member's performance in accordance with University guidelines. In the spring semester each year, full-time faculty are required to complete the Annual Report form, covering their professional activities and accomplishments during the academic year. This annual reporting provides an opportunity for faculty members to update information in their personnel files on degrees, publications, committee assignments, and other research and service activities. The department chairperson shall evaluate the completed Annual Report forms, provide comments, and then forward the annual report and evaluation forms to the GSEHD Dean. The Dean completes the Annual Report form by adding comments and recommendations. The faculty has the opportunity to review and to respond in writing to comments that department chairpersons and the GSEHD Dean have appended to the Annual Report. The Annual Reports are then forwarded to the Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs where they become part of the faculty member's personnel file. This process provides an excellent opportunity for department chairpersons and the GSEHD Dean to discuss with individual faculty members their continuing professional development
- B. The GSEHD Dean makes recommendations on GSEHD faculty reappointment to the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs based on departmental recommendations. Promotion and tenure personnel actions in the GSEHD involve a dual evaluation process that is initiated by the department of the individual faculty member (candidate) for such action. The department of the candidate shall act on such requests and initiate reviews for reappointment, promotion, or tenure following the established GSEHD criteria and procedures that are delineated in this document. The GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee shall also act on only promotion and tenure requests and conduct its own review of these requests using materials submitted by the candidate, external review letters, and the review summaries of the Personnel Committee of the candidate's department.
- C. Pursuant to GSEHD bylaws pertaining to decisions on tenure, reappointments, and promotion to *Associate Professor*, only tenured School faculty members are eligible to vote. For reappointments and promotion to *Professor* rank, only tenured School faculty of the Professor rank are eligible to vote at the departmental level. The review of candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall be initiated by the Personnel Committee of the candidate's department. Among eligible faculty present and voting in the department's Personnel

Committee a majority vote is required for a favorable recommendation on all personnel action to the GSEHD Dean. The chairperson of the department of the candidate seeking personnel action shall forward to the GSEHD Dean a summary of the deliberation of the departmental Personnel Committee concerning the candidate's personnel request, the numerical vote on the action, and the committee's recommendation, along with the material submitted by the candidate. In the event that the chairperson of the department of candidates seeking personnel action is ineligible to serve as chairperson of the departmental personnel committee, a chairperson shall be elected by the eligible departmental faculty to carry out the pertinent tasks.

- D. The GSEHD Dean shall in turn forward the candidate's submitted material (portfolio) along with the Departmental recommendation to the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee for its review using the criteria and procedures delineated in this document. The GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee shall act only on the promotion or tenure requests by individual faculty members and initiate a review following the criteria and procedures established by the Faculty Code, criteria and procedural guidelines of the GSEHD as detailed in this document, the criteria and procedural guidelines of the candidate's department, and any relevant directives by the Dean and the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee shall review all of the submitted material pertaining to the candidate's request. These materials include all documents submitted by the candidate in a portfolio (dossier), the numerical vote, the department chairperson's summary of the deliberation, the recommendation by the departmental Personnel Committee concerning the candidate's request, and other relevant documentation submitted by the office of the GSEHD Dean. The GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee shall then forward its recommendation including the numerical vote and summary of its deliberations to the GSEHD Dean.
- E. The GSEHD Dean shall review and consider all submitted documentation including the portfolio submitted by the candidate, the external letters evaluating the candidate's record, the recommendation and summary of deliberations by the departmental personnel committee, and the recommendation and summary of deliberations by the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee. The GSEHD Dean shall formulate her/his recommendation regarding the personnel action request by faculty candidates and forward it to the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- F. **Criteria for reappointment, promotion and tenure:** The GSEHD shall adopt and publish its own criteria and procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure consistent with the criteria and processes in the Faculty Code of GWU. **These criteria shall apply to all departments within the GSEHD.** Later sections of this document detail the criteria and procedural guidelines of all such personnel actions.

GSEHD Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review of Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty

Promotion or tenure-granting decisions have vital importance to an institution of higher education, where the quality of education is dependent upon the strength of scholarship, the quality of teaching and prominence of individuals appointed as members of the faculty. The primary duty of tenured faculty in such institutions is to provide a rigorous, fair, and effective review of a candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion. The process begins with the tenured faculty review, which is governed by clear, objective, and equitable standards and procedures. These policies and procedural guidelines are outlined in this document. The George Washington University *Faculty Code* (amended in 2004) contains rules and procedures for appointments, renewals, promotions, and tenure. It is ultimately the authoritative and definitive guideline. The guidelines that follow in this document are intended to augment those University standards by specifying rules and procedures particular to the GSEHD.

The GSEHD Dean and the pertinent department chairperson have the responsibility to formally inform an eligible faculty member of the criteria and procedures for tenure and/or promotion during the first month of her/his appointment in the current position. This notification may be in the form of a letter with the criteria and procedures attached. The GSEHD Dean and the pertinent department chairperson shall inform the candidate during the annual evaluation process about whether she/he is making satisfactory progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

I. The Faculty Development Panel for Tenure Accruing Faculty

- A. With input from tenured faculty in the candidate's department, the departmental chairperson recommends and the GSEHD Dean appoints members of the Faculty Development Panel, that shall be established at the inception of the candidate's position by the department chairperson. With the candidate's concurrence, a Faculty Development Panel comprising a minimum of two tenured faculty members (one of whom must be appointed in the candidate's department) who have expertise in the candidate's or a closely related field shall offer informal guidance to the tenure-accruing candidate as she/he works towards tenure. The Faculty Development Panel shall assume a mentoring and advisory role and not assume any formal supervisory or performance evaluation role. This Panel shall meet with the candidate at least twice annually to provide guidance and support during the candidate's progress towards attaining tenure and promotion. Faculty Development Panel members may request copies of the candidate's annual personnel evaluations and/or curriculum vitae from the candidate as necessary.
- B. After the tenure decision of a candidate, the mentoring and advisory role of the Faculty Development Panel shall cease.

II. Midcourse Evaluation of Tenure-Accruing Faculty Guidelines

- A. Every tenure-accruing candidate shall receive a midcourse evaluation of her/his progress towards attaining tenure. The midcourse review process itself, along with the feedback it

generates, is intended to be constructive, informative, and help strengthen the areas in which the candidate may need improvement to increase the likelihood of a successful tenure decision. Candidates who have negotiated a shorter tenure clock upon appointment shall have their review completed during the academic year when their tenure midcourse falls.

- B. Candidates in tenure-accruing positions must submit to their departmental chairperson materials that comprise the midcourse review portfolio following the tenure guidelines for portfolio composition (see material listed in the "Portfolio Content" section) by **February 1**.
- C. The candidate's departmental Personnel Committee shall review the submitted material, meet to deliberate, and then make recommendations to the GSEHD Dean regarding the progress of the candidate towards tenure by **March 1**. In most cases this review also has contract implications and the resulting recommendation by the departmental Personnel Committee shall include recommendation for renewal or non-renewal of the candidate's contract.
- D. The departmental Personnel Committee may, in consultation with the GSEHD Dean or her/his Associate for Academic Affairs, seek input from the candidate's Faculty Development Panel and/or external evaluation of the submitted mid-course portfolio by scholars in other institutions to assess the candidate's portfolio of accomplishments in the area of scholarship. All external reviewers, if this option is pursued, shall have no conflict of interest with the candidate.
- E. The midcourse portfolio material and the resulting department recommendation shall be immediately forwarded to the GSEHD Dean by the chairperson of the candidate's departmental Personnel Committee no later than **March 1**. The department chairperson shall inform the candidate of the outcome of this midcourse review in writing no later than **March 31** of the midcourse evaluation year.

III. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion Personnel Actions for Tenure Accruing and Tenured Faculty

The productivity and contributions of faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion are carefully evaluated in the GSEHD at the George Washington University. The guidelines described below are consistent with the University Faculty Code and delineate specific criteria for the evaluation of the promotion and tenure applications in the School. This document provides details and explanation of the School's bylaws for tenure and/or promotion that apply to all tenure-accruing and tenured faculty members in the School.

In the GSEHD, recommendations and decisions regarding promotion to the rank of *Associate Professor* or *Professor* or tenure at the *Associate* or *Professor* ranks, are based on professional excellence as evidenced by teaching ability, productive scholarship, participation and leadership in professional societies, service to the University, and public service.

To be considered for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of *Associate Professor*, the candidate must have accomplished a successful record in teaching, scholarship, and service since her/his

appointment at GWU as well as relevant prior experience if agreed upon in her/his letter of appointment. In teaching, the candidate should have effectively taught a schedule of courses that meets her/his program's needs at a demonstrated level of excellence. In scholarship, the candidate should have maintained an active program of research that establishes a pattern of productivity and contribution to her/his field, as judged by the candidate's departmental Personnel Committee, the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee, and the GSEHD Dean aided by input from external reviewers. She/he should have taken an active role in providing service and/or administrative contributions to the department, the School, or the University, as well as to the profession.

To be considered for promotion to and/or tenure at the *Professor* rank, the candidate must have demonstrated accomplishments in effective teaching, a consistent and high-quality record of scholarship that goes beyond contributions made at the previous rank, and valued leadership in service and/or administrative duties within and outside the University. In addition, as judged by the candidate's department Personnel Committee, the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee and the GSEHD Dean, aided by input from external reviewers, the candidate's scholarly work must be seen as having significantly advanced or served the field with the expectation that through her/his scholarship, the candidate will have achieved a national reputation.

What follows is a detailed description of the evaluation requirements and the procedures to be followed when a request for tenure and/or promotion is evaluated in the GSEHD. The candidate submitting the request for tenure and/or promotion must provide information about the scope of her/his work, as well as evidence of the quality of her/his contributions in each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

1. Scholarship

The GSEHD recognizes the importance of multiple perspectives and forms of empirical or other scholarship including, but not limited to, critical research, evaluation research, interpretive research, policy and practice research, synthesis research, or theory development.

Faculty members are expected to be continuously and effectively engaged in scholarly activity of high quality and significance. Such scholarship shall be valued in advancing the faculty member's field and should reflect a continuing research agenda. Evidence of accomplished scholarly activity and its quality shall be established through careful evaluation by the GSEHD Faculty. Collaboration, while not required, is viewed as a means of productive scholarship and valued cross-disciplinary research. Clearly, the quality of the research and the relative contributions of the participants in joint work must be weighed. Documentation of the role and contribution of the individual is expected for collaborative efforts. A faculty member's scholarship is expected to contribute to the body of knowledge and scholarship in her/his respective field, as well as enhance her/his teaching.

The GSEHD Faculty shall use the School's criteria and guidelines for scholarship accomplishments in evaluating requests for tenure and promotion. In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion, a tenure-accruing and/or tenured faculty member must present clear evidence of her/his performance record, accumulated consistently over her/his professional

career and the period of her/his service in the current academic rank in the School. This record must demonstrate substantial and significant achievement according to the School's evaluative criteria for faculty members. Furthermore, this record should provide reasonable support for a judgment that the faculty member will continue to perform and achieve in substantial and significant ways throughout an extended academic career in the School.

Expectations of productivity. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion is expected to be continuously involved in productive research, writing, and creative effort. Recent publications and scholarly presentations at professional meetings are important evidence of present and probable future activity. These include: the publication of monographs, books, book chapters, and papers in scholarly and peer-reviewed professional journals of high quality, the development of software, products, and electronically published material reflecting quality scholarship. The School values both multiauthored and single-authored scholarly works.

Expectations of quality. The quantity of published material is not sufficient evidence of scholarship. The quality of each endeavor undertaken by the candidate must be carefully documented and is more important than quantity. Quality is judged in terms of contributions, creativity, significance, rigor, discriminating judgment, focus of scholarship, and conformity with accepted standards of professional ethics and integrity. Quality is also judged by the significance of the work as indicated by the stature of the journal or other media in which it is published. Grants awarded on the basis of the scholarly merit of the proposal shall also be considered indications of quality scholarship. Presentations at refereed conferences and professional meetings as well as invited addresses to major professional and civic organizations are also valued and shall supplement the merits of the candidate's scholarship.

Documentation of accomplished scholarship is expected to occur in the form of publication of manuscripts in selective journals as well as other formats that would be considered evidence of scholarly activity. Additional evidence may include citations in scholarly and professional books and journals; the salience of journal stature; utilization of findings by policy makers, practitioners, or judicial bodies; reprinting of documents; abstraction for other publications; or other forms of recognition by colleagues in the field. Documentation of the quality of journals and other outlets is required of the candidate. An addendum of scholarly activities may be submitted by the candidate up to the day before the departmental personnel committee meets to consider the personnel action request.

What follows are examples of scholarly activities commonly considered in tenure/promotion decisions.

- A. *Research and published works:* No specific number of products, single authored or coauthored, would determine a pattern of productivity. Emphasis shall be placed on the body of work produced by the candidate as manifested by the qualitative aspects of scholarly contributions, such as their importance, rigor, originality, and scope. In addition, work published prior to assuming the tenure-track position at GSEHD shall be considered. Typical patterns of productivity can be, but are not limited to, *at least* and *on average*, one refereed scholarly work each year since the candidate's initial appointment at GWU. While this

example is a typical minimum, the GSEHD values the quality of scholarship as superseding any absolute number of scholarly products.

Research and published works may be a combination of the following:

- Articles in blind peer-reviewed journals and publications
- Books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution
- Edited books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution
- Refereed monographs, full papers published in conference proceedings, or standardized test manuals published by a respected and nationally recognized press
- Chapters in an edited book
- Other refereed products, include computer-based projects, published videos or multimedia works, or scholarly exhibits
- Invited articles in refereed publications

- B. *Funded grant proposals* by nationally recognized agencies and foundations.
- C. *Presentations at professional meetings*: Evidence of presentations at professional meetings (regional, national, or international) with indication of refereed and non-refereed conference presentations.
- D. *Other*: Other examples of scholarship may include (but are not limited to) curriculum development packages, editorial responsibilities for a scholarly publication, book reviews (invited and juried), commissioned papers, technical or grant reports, unpublished manuscripts, non-refereed journal articles, seminars, other invited presentations, major exhibits and demonstrations, and submitted but unfunded grant proposals.

2. Teaching

High-quality teaching and academic advising are essential in promotion and tenure decisions. The candidate under review for tenure and/or promotion is expected to be regularly and effectively engaged in teaching and advising activities of high quality. The dissemination of knowledge through effective teaching has many manifestations, including classroom instruction, the skillful use of technology, and a broad range of faculty-student relationships. Instruction is expected to reflect the expertise and skillful use of the faculty member's own research and gained knowledge over the years, which would enhance the learning experiences of students.

Teaching is broadly defined to include activities such as classroom instruction, instruction using technological media, laboratory or clinical setting instruction, academic advising, dissertation/thesis advising and directing, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Factors considered in assessing teaching performance or promise include (but are not limited to) knowledge of the material; clarity of delivery; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism; institutional compliance and ethics; and ability to stimulate further education.

It is the responsibility of the School's administration and the candidate to plan teaching assignments so that the candidate has the opportunity to gain experience and develop skills in the

various types of coursework relevant to the educational mission of the School and her/his program while teaching in areas that are appropriate for the candidate. The responsibility for the evaluation of teaching performance rests on the candidate's academic department. Each academic department shall have clearly developed and disseminated criteria to be used in the evaluation of the teaching performance of its faculty. The evaluation should include course evaluations by students and peer evaluations by colleagues. Evidence of the candidate's teaching and advising skills shall be collected and considered in the tenure and/or promotion review process.

The quality of teaching is commonly considered to include (but is not limited to) the following factors:

- Knowledge of a field and developments in it
- Skillfully communicating with students, arousing their interest, and helping them to learn substantive content and skills
- Stimulating students to think critically
- Leading students to appreciate the nuances of fields of knowledge
- Applying knowledge to solving problems, when appropriate

Specific aspects of teaching to be considered include course development, classroom teaching, student advising and mentoring, and responsibility for doctoral dissertations. The School expects its faculty to demonstrate evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness through the following ways:

- *Student course evaluations*: Positive written summary evaluations as evidenced by student course evaluations that generally demonstrate above-average overall instructor and course ratings (required).
- *Course development and practice*: Sustained involvement in curriculum review and evaluation, self-directed learning activities, and if called for, innovative and creative change of teaching methods, materials, and pedagogy, as evidenced by course syllabi with additional comments about changes, innovations, and improvements (required).
- *Peer evaluations*: Generally positive peer evaluations (required).
- *Advising and dissertation/thesis supervision*: Advising students and supervising theses, master's projects, or dissertation research and serving on dissertation committees, as evidenced by documentation of the numbers of students advised, degree objective, and the advisory role (i.e., chairperson, committee member) (required).
- *Student support and development*: Teaching activities that involve student development and support or the conduct of seminars, workshops, resource and instructional websites, or other learning experiences for students, faculty, alumni, or other interested groups as evidenced by the number of students advised, degree objective, and the advisory role. Additional evidence may include documentation of involvement in student activities, mentoring, dissertation seminars, and alumni accomplishments.
- *Other*: Evidence of remaining current in and/or expanding on one's field of specialization through appropriate faculty development activities as evidenced by, for example, teaching assignments elsewhere, team teaching, conduct of professional seminars or workshops,

participation in teacher effectiveness workshops, attendance at professional conferences, obtaining additional degrees or certificates, etc.

3. Service

The GSEHD values and expects its faculty members to engage in academic service to the University, the community, and the profession. By virtue of their special scholarly or professional qualifications and expertise, faculty members often render distinctive academic service to various committees, boards, scholarly/professional organizations, councils, schools, and other entities outside the GSEHD. This may include service such as membership on University committees, consultation with a variety of institutions, appointment to a leadership position of a scholarly organization, and appointment as an editor or editorial board member for a scholarly journal. In general, a constructive record of academic service is a positive factor in personnel action decisions. Academic service to community organizations and governmental agencies in advisory or consulting roles constitutes an important factor.

The candidate can effectively serve through accomplishments and contributions beyond those expected in teaching and scholarship. The following activities are valued.

A. Internal Service

1. *Administrative Responsibilities:* Examples of functions and tasks under this category include:
 - a. Coordinate, administer, and manage programs: This may include service as a program area coordinator or project/program director, department chairperson, dean, and other related administrative contributions.
 - b. Develop new programs or enhance existing offerings in her/his program.
 - c. Evaluate programs, including assessment of goal accomplishment, student satisfaction, and other related functions.
 - d. Contribute to and lead program development efforts.
 - e. Assume leadership in accreditation and program evaluation activities.
 - f. Develop and evaluate initiatives that promote the program and its growth and quality.
 - g. Market the program and/or recruit new students.
 - h. Work with regular and adjunct faculty to provide a consistently high quality program of instruction.
 - i. Coordinate clinical training activities such as arranging and overseeing clinical placements, providing clinical supervision, and coordinating an off-site training facility.
2. *Membership on committees:* Participate on standing and *ad hoc* committees at the University, School, and departmental levels.
3. *Completion of special projects and assignments:* Engage in services such as, but not limited to, editing School and University publications, coordinating a colloquium series, advising a student organization, or providing clinical service to an organization.

B. External Service

1. *Participation in the profession:* Participate in professional organizations and societies (state, regional, national, or international level) as an officer, conference organizer, discussant/chairperson of conference sessions, committee chairperson, editor, advisory or editorial board member, or committee member; completion of a special assignment; or contribution through workshop or discussion presentations at state, regional, or national meetings. Candidates seeking the rank of *Professor* should have exhibited leadership in service activities such as chairing committees, serving as an external reviewer for other institutions, carrying out administrative responsibilities, authoring a report or editorial, holding governing board memberships, or serving as a journal editor.
2. *Communication to the field:* Publication of service-oriented papers, such as reports of meetings or events, magazine columns, bulletins, videotapes, manuals, magazine articles, opinion pieces, calls for action, and other forms of writing that do not necessarily meet the criteria for scholarly publications listed above.
3. *Consultant to community organizations:* Service to community organizations, such as schools, school districts, community/business organizations, nonprofit organizations or social service agencies.

IV. Procedural Guidelines for the Evaluation of Requests for Tenure and Promotion of Tenured Faculty

- A. Midcourse Review: Every tenure-accruing candidate shall receive a midcourse evaluation of her/his progress towards attaining tenure. The midcourse review process itself, along with the feedback it generates, is intended to be constructive, informative, and help strengthen the areas in which the candidate may need improvement to increase the likelihood of a successful tenure decision. Candidates with a shorter tenure clock shall have their review completed during the academic year when their tenure midcourse falls. Candidates in tenure-accruing positions must submit to their departmental chairperson materials that comprise the midcourse review portfolio following the tenure guidelines for portfolio composition (see materials listed at the end of this document) by **February 1**. The candidate's departmental Personnel Committee shall review the submitted material, meet to deliberate, and then make recommendations to the GSEHD Dean regarding the progress of the candidate towards tenure by **March 1**. The candidate's departmental Personnel Committee shall discuss strengths and weaknesses of a candidate, and offer appropriate suggestions and mentoring in regard to new or more productive approaches or directions in scholarship or dissemination of results, more effective use (or improvement) of teaching skills and knowledge, and more appropriate service assignments. In most cases this review has contract implications and the resulting recommendation by the departmental Personnel Committee shall include recommendation for renewal or non-renewal of the candidate's contract. The Chairperson of the candidate's departmental Personnel Committee shall forward to the GSEHD Dean regarding the progress of the candidate towards tenure by **March 1**. The department

chairperson shall inform the candidate of the outcome of this midcourse review in writing no later than **March 31** of the midcourse evaluation year.

- B. For tenure-accruing faculty, the promotion and/or tenure review process must be completed at least one academic year before her/his current contract term expires. For tenured faculty seeking promotion, the review follows the same timeline. The candidate must by **April 1** be notified by the office of the Dean in writing of her/his eligibility for tenure and the requirements of the process. Accordingly, the department chairperson is required to meet with the faculty candidate no later than **April 30** of the academic year before the promotion and/or tenure application is to be reviewed to discuss the GSEHD guidelines, procedures, and the required promotion/tenure portfolio (dossier) contents. No later than **June 1** of the academic year immediately preceding that during which the promotion and/or tenure request is reviewed, the candidate must provide her/his department chairperson a complete portfolio (dossier) of her/his documentation of accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service (see "Portfolio Content" section below) that is to be considered for personnel action following the guidelines delineated in this document. The department chairperson shall then seek external evaluations of the candidate's portfolio in the form of submitted letters following the guidelines set forth by this document.
- C. Evidence of the quality of scholarly work must be established by at least **five (5)** letters from external experts about the quality of work and any other evidence of the impact or influence of the work on the scholarly literature. For tenure and/or promotion to the rank of **Associate Professor**, the Department Chairperson shall obtain at least **Five (5)** letters evaluating the quality of the candidate's scholarly work written by external experts in the field of the candidate's expertise and scholarship. For promotion to the rank of **Professor**, the Department Chairperson shall obtain at least **Five (5)** letters attesting to the quality of the candidate's scholarly work from widely recognized scholars in the field of the candidate's expertise and scholarship. The process of selecting scholars (referees) who would review the candidate's record should allow for some participation by the candidate in providing a suggested list of scholars. The list of referees drawn by the School shall be developed with some input from faculty in the candidate's field. The final list of chosen solicited scholars shall, to the extent possible, draw names from both the candidate's and the School's list. The Department Chairperson must specify which of the external reviewers were on the candidate's list, which were on the School's list and which were on both lists. The candidate shall submit a list of potential scholars in the field who might serve as external reviewers by **June 1**, along with a sufficient number of copies of the materials to be sent to the external reviewers. Under no circumstance shall the external reviewers have any conflict of interest, directly or indirectly with the candidate. By **June 10**, the department chairperson shall devise a list of external reviewers. She/he shall seek more than the minimum number of letters to ensure a sufficient number of responses. The deadline for receiving the external letters is **October 1**. Scholars reviewing the candidate's submitted portfolio shall be prominent experts in the candidate's field who shall, following the guidelines in this document, provide candid and written assessment of the candidate's portfolio chronicling her/his accomplishments in the areas of scholarship. All external reviewers shall have no conflict of interest or any questionable association with the candidate, whether remotely or

closely. All received external letters must become part of the candidate's documentation that shall be reviewed by the personnel committees.

- D. The solicited external reviewers should receive copies of the candidate's scholarly works. The letter of solicitation written by the department chairperson (see sample at the end of this document) should be clear in seeking an assessment of the quality of scholarship achieved by the candidate. The letter should ask the reviewer to provide a thorough and candid written evaluation of the scholarly works submitted by the candidate as well as some articulation of the basis for that judgment. The letter should alert the reviewer to avoid stating whether the candidate would attain tenure at the reviewer's institution.
- E. The department chairperson should assemble all portfolio and supporting material, including the external letters, for evaluation by the department's Personnel Committee, which shall be composed of tenured faculty in that department who are eligible to vote. For decisions on promotion to a *Professor* rank, only tenured faculty at the *Professor* rank are eligible to review the request and vote on the promotion. The departmental review must be completed no later than **October 31**. The department Personnel Committee shall meet and complete its review of the portfolio and supporting material submitted by the candidate and the external reviewers, by **October 31** of the academic year when the candidate's tenure/promotion request is being reviewed. The departmental Personnel Committee shall deliberate and then vote by secret ballot on the merit of the candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure using the criteria established by the School (refer to the Criteria section). Absentee or proxy voting by members of the department's Personnel Committee is not allowed since faculty must participate in the deliberations of the committee as it reviews the application. A majority of votes in favor of the action is needed for the committee to recommend her/his promotion and/or tenure. Immediately after the Personnel Committee's vote is submitted, the chairperson must inform the candidate of the outcome of the vote.
- F. The department chairperson must forward to the office of the Dean a summary of the department deliberation and the outcome of the vote, along with the candidate's submitted portfolio, no later than **November 7**. The GSEHD Dean shall then forward to the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee the submitted material, including the candidate's portfolio, the external evaluation letters, and the summary of the department deliberation and vote.
- G. The GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee shall meet no later than **December 15** to review the request by the candidate and the supporting material. All assessments of the merits of the candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure, by the Faculty and Personnel Committee as well as the departmental Personnel Committee, will be considered confidential, and all votes will be cast by secret ballot. The chairperson of the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee shall prepare a summary of the committee's deliberations and the vote count on the request by the candidate and then forward its recommendation to the GSEHD Dean. The GSEHD Dean shall in turn evaluate the submitted department and school personnel committees' summaries of deliberations and recommendations, along with all the material submitted. She/he then prepares his or her recommendation regarding the candidate's request and submits it, by the university set deadline, to the Provost/Executive

Vice President of Academic Affairs along with all relevant documents including the transmission letters forwarded by both personnel committees.

H. Contents of the portfolio (dossier), which comprise the material to be reviewed by the department as well as the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committees for the purpose of evaluating the candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure, must include evidence of effective teaching, evidence of research and scholarly productivity, and evidence of service to the department, the School, the University and other professional or community organizations. Portfolio contents as well as suggested sample materials are outlined in the "Portfolio Content" at the end of this document. At a minimum the dossier submitted by the candidate must include:

1. A copy of the GSEHD and departmental bylaws and policies that are being used for evaluating the promotion and/or tenure request by the candidate.
2. A summary statement that synthesizes achievements in each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.
3. A detailed up-to-date Curriculum Vitae that lists in order starting with the most current, and indicating dates and places as needed for degrees held and job positions held. Scholarly publications and contributions shall be listed in clear and separate sections for each of the following categories: books, edited books, refereed articles, refereed chapters in books, refereed articles in conference proceedings, non-refereed publications, invited scholarly talks, external grants and contracts for which the candidate serves(d) as a Principal Investigator, honors received, professional affiliations, doctoral dissertations directed and completed, master's theses directed and completed, and professional service activities.
4. A detailed record of achievement in teaching, a detailed record of achievement in research and scholarship, and a detailed record of internal and external service including administrative accomplishments.

I. The George Washington University's Faculty Code stipulates: ***Failure by the University to conform to these procedures and the timelines contained in them will not be grounds for a rehearing/re-review unless the failure materially damages the candidate's chances.***

V. Portfolio (Dossier) Content Specifications for Tenure Faculty

At a minimum, candidates are expected to include the following contents in their promotion/tenure dossier:

1. A copy of the bylaws and guidelines that are used to evaluate the candidate's portfolio.
2. Transmitting letters by the GSEHD Dean, the chairperson of the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee, and the candidate's department chairperson (to be inserted by each responsible party upon competition of pertinent reviews).
3. Synthesis summary of the candidate's contributions in the form of two pieces:
 - a. Short report/response on the candidate's productivity based on the position responsibilities as communicated by the Department chairperson.
 - b. Self-evaluation of the candidate's contribution.
4. Curriculum Vitae of the Candidate: the Vita, which, at a minimum, must contain the following elements in the order listed, with the appropriate dates and places indicated as needed, and in chronological order starting with the most recent:
 - a. Degrees held, university granting, field, year
 - b. Job positions held, where, period of time
 - c. Scholarly publications and contributions shall be listed in clear and separate sections for each of the following categories: books, edited books, refereed articles, refereed chapters in books, refereed articles in conference proceedings, non-refereed publications
 - d. Invited scholarly talks (full citations)
 - e. External grants and contracts for which the candidate served as a principal investigator
 - f. Honors received
 - g. Professional affiliations
 - h. Doctoral dissertations directed and completed, with title, student name, and year
 - i. Master's theses directed and completed, with title, student name, and year
 - j. Professional service activities
5. Detailed teaching contributions, which, at a minimum, must contain the following elements:
 - a. Summary of teaching accomplishments
 - b. Syllabi of courses taught
 - c. Copies of forms and reports of evaluations by students
 - d. Copies of letters or forms of evaluations by peers
 - e. Description of any teaching innovations such as integrating technology in the classroom
 - f. Doctoral dissertations and master's theses/projects directed and completed with title, student name, and year
6. Detailed description of scholarly publications and contributions separated according to the following categories:
 - a. Scholarship statement or summary
 - b. Publications and presentations

- Articles in blind peer-reviewed journals and publications
 - Books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution (single or coauthored)
 - Edited books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution
 - Refereed monographs or conference proceedings or standardized test manuals, published by a professional society
 - Chapters in an edited book
 - Other refereed products, including computer-based projects, published videos or multimedia works, or scholarly exhibits
 - Invited articles in refereed publications
- c. External grants and contracts in which the candidate served as principal investigator or co-principal investigator, listing the title, source, amount, and period of time; as well as the contribution of this work to knowledge
- d. Honors received
7. External/University/School/Department service:
- a. Service contribution summary separating the service location
 - b. Membership and/or leadership of committees and service within and outside the University
 - c. Any special recognition for service

VI. Sample Letter Requesting External Evaluation of a Tenure Candidate's Scholarly Work

Dear Dr. [Name]:

You have been nominated to review the portfolio of [candidate], who is being considered for [tenure and/or promotion] to the rank of [associate professor/professor] in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development at The George Washington University. I am writing to ask if you would be willing to serve as an outside reviewer for [candidate]. I have attached a copy of [her/his] curriculum vitae for your information.

If you are willing and able, we ask that you evaluate [candidate's] scholarship according to the following criteria for tenure and promotion to [associate professor/professor] in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development: (1) whether [candidate's] record provides evidence of sustained scholarly activity of high quality in the form of refereed and/or other reviewed published works, with the expectation of continued publications; and (2) whether [candidate] has achieved recognition as a noteworthy and productive scholar. Our school bylaws indicate that *“no specific number of products, single authored or coauthored, would determine a pattern of productivity. Emphasis shall be placed on the body of work produced by the candidate as manifested by the qualitative aspects of scholarly contributions, such as their importance, rigor, originality, and scope.”*

If you are willing to serve as a reviewer, we will send you a packet including [candidate's] research statement, [her/his] curriculum vitae, [her/his] published papers, and selected papers that are under review. We have this packet ready to send to you immediately. We would need to have your review back to us by **October 1** electronically if possible in the form of a letter to me at [e-mail address]. If it is necessary to use regular mail, please send your evaluation to [mailing address]. Please also include your own CV or biosketch.

I know that your schedule is a busy one, but we would be most grateful if you are able to help us out in this important task.

If you have any questions that might help you decide whether to serve as a reviewer, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Chairperson
Department of [name]
GSEHD
[Phone and e-mail address]

GSEHD Guidelines for Renewal and Promotion of Non-Tenure Accruing Full-Time Regular Active-Status Faculty

I. Overview

In the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) of The George Washington University (GWU), a faculty member (candidate) seeking contract renewal or promotion is expected to demonstrate a record of productivity in all functions of her/his appointment, including administrative responsibilities if applicable. A candidate is also expected to be productive in her/his position's primary responsibilities as stipulated in the letter of appointment. In the event that the nature of appointment or the job description has undergone significant changes since the initial appointment, as determined by the GSEHD Dean and the department chairperson, such changes must be documented in a revised letter of appointment issued by the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, in accordance with a recommendation from the department chairperson. At all times, each non-tenure-accruing faculty member should have a letter of appointment in their personnel file that accurately reflects expectations of her/his position. This letter will provide the basis for the evaluative criteria of contract renewal and/or promotion decisions.

Contract renewal of non-tenure-accruing full-time regular active-status faculty in the GSEHD is based on evidence of high-quality teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative responsibilities following the GWU Faculty Code. Performance excellence, as defined by the criteria below is required for contract renewal. The candidate should have effectively taught a schedule of courses that meets her/his program's needs and established a successful teaching record. As delineated by the candidate's appointment letter, she/he should have maintained an active program of scholarship and should have provided service and administrative contributions (as they apply) following the stated criteria and procedures in this document.

Promotion of non-tenure-accruing full-time regular active-status faculty is based on performance excellence as defined in the criteria below for the ranks of *Associate Professor* and *Professor*. A minimum of **six years** of service in rank is required for promotion from *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor*. A minimum of **five years** of service in rank is required for promotion from *Associate Professor* to *Professor*. In teaching, the candidate should have effectively taught a schedule of courses that meets her/his program's needs and established a successful teaching record. As delineated by the candidate's appointment letter, she/he should have maintained an active program of scholarship and should have provided service and administrative contributions following the criteria and procedures in this document. As judged by the candidate's departmental Personnel Committee, the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee and the GSEHD Dean and aided by selected external reviewers who articulate the candidate's scholarly contributions; the candidate's work must be seen as having significantly advanced or served the field through her/his scholarship. Additionally, for promotion to a *Professor* rank, the candidate must have demonstrated a consistent and high-quality program of scholarship that has made important contributions to the candidate's field, going beyond contributions made at the previous rank, and must have provided valued leadership in service and administrative responsibilities within and outside the University. It is expected that through

her/his work, the candidate for promotion to a *Professor* rank will have achieved a national reputation as a scholar and/or a leader.

What follows is a detailed description of the how requests for contract renewal and/or promotions of non-tenure-accruing regular active-status faculty are evaluated and the procedures to be followed in the GSEHD. These guidelines constitute the School's bylaws for renewal and promotion of non-tenure-accruing full-time regular active-status faculty in the GSEHD. Individual departmental bylaws regarding contract renewal and promotion of non-tenure-accruing regular active-status faculty augment but do not supersede these guidelines.

A non-tenure-accruing faculty member submitting a request for contract renewal and/or promotion must provide well-organized documentation and information about the scope of her/his work. Additionally the candidate must provide evidence of the quality of her/his contributions in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, administrative responsibilities as they apply, and service following her/his contractual letter(s) of appointment and subsequent revisions to it. Such documentation must be presented in an organized portfolio of materials outlining accomplishments since the last contractual appointment/renewal, as described in the "Portfolio Content" at the end of this document.

II. The Faculty Development Panel for Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty

- C. With input from faculty in the candidate's department, the departmental chairperson recommends and the GSEHD Dean appoints members of the Faculty Development Panel, that shall be established at the inception of the candidate's position by the department chairperson. With the candidate's concurrence, a Faculty Development Panel comprising a minimum of two tenured or non-tenured faculty members (one of whom must be appointed in the candidate's department), who have expertise in the candidate's or a closely related field shall offer informal guidance to the non-tenure accruing candidate as she/he works towards contract renewal and, if requested, her/his promotion. The Faculty Development Panel shall assume a mentoring and advisory role and not assume any formal supervisory or performance evaluation role. This Panel shall meet with the candidate at least twice annually to provide guidance as to her/his progress towards attaining renewal of her/his contract. With the candidate's approval, Faculty Development Panel members may request copies of the candidate's annual personnel evaluation reports from the Dean's office for use as they advise the candidate.
- D. After the first contract renewal decision for a candidate, the mentoring and advisory role of the Faculty Development Panel shall cease.

III. Criteria for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion of Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty

At the time of the contractual appointment, the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs writes a letter to the candidate indicating the nature of the appointment. This letter must detail the nature of the responsibilities of the candidate's position, with clear

percentages of the candidate's expected job effort divided among teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative responsibilities. This letter must be consistent with the original position description used to recruit for the position assumed by the candidate or any changes thereafter. The departmental Personnel Committee and the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee must use this letter from the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs as the basis and guide for evaluating the candidate's request and in arriving at their recommendation regarding contract renewal or promotion. All assessments of the merits of the candidate's request for contract renewal or promotion, by the Faculty and Personnel Committee as well as the department Personnel Committee, shall be considered confidential, and all votes will be cast by secret ballot. In the event that the nature of the appointment and position description had significantly changed since the faculty member's initial appointment, as determined by the GSEHD Dean and the candidate's department chairperson, such changes shall be documented in a revised letter issued by the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, in accordance with a recommendation by the department chairperson. The revised letter shall be used by personnel committees in their evaluation of the candidate's submitted record. At all times, every non-tenure-accruing faculty member will have a letter that accurately reflects her/his current position description and the expectations for the position. It is the responsibility of the GSEHD Dean to ensure that every non-tenure-accruing faculty has a current letter of appointment that accurately reflects the terms of the contract.

For contract renewal requests, only the candidate's departmental Personnel Committee shall review the material submitted by the candidate as indicated below to make recommendations for the renewal of the candidate's contract. The departmental committee shall forward its recommendations concerning the contract renewal request directly to the GSEHD Dean.

For promotion requests, both the departmental Personnel Committee and the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee must review the evidence presented by contract non-tenure-accruing faculty and assess their performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, administrative responsibilities, and service as described below to arrive at a decision of whether the candidate sufficiently met the criteria to be recommended for promotion in rank.

Candidates for contract renewal or promotion who have appointments in more than one department in the GSEHD shall be evaluated by both departmental committees if the appointment is equally shared by both departments and if the letter of appointment clearly states the candidate's responsibilities in both departments. Otherwise, the home department that assumes most of the budgeted salary shall conduct the evaluation alone.

The sections below detail the evidence and criteria for the candidate's teaching, scholarship, administrative responsibilities, and service accomplishments that are reviewed by both the Personnel Committee of the candidate's department and the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee to assess the merits of the candidate's request and make recommendations for action.

1. Teaching

High-quality teaching and academic advising are essential in contract renewal and promotion decisions. The non-tenure-accruing candidate under review for contract renewal and/or promotion is expected to be regularly and effectively engaged in teaching and advising activities of high quality. The dissemination of knowledge through effective teaching has many manifestations, including classroom instruction, the skillful use of technology, and a broad range of faculty-student relationships. Instruction is expected to reflect the expertise and skillful use of the faculty member's own research, practice, and gained knowledge over the years that would enhance the learning experiences of students.

Teaching is broadly defined to include activities such as classroom instruction, instruction using technological media, laboratory or clinical setting instruction, academic advising, dissertation/thesis advising and directing, mentoring, program building, and curricular innovation. Factors that are considered in assessing teaching performance or promise include (but not limited to) knowledge of the material, clarity of delivery, effective communication skills, helpfulness in learning, style of interaction with students, availability, professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics, and ability to stimulate further education.

It is the responsibility of the School's administration and the candidate to plan teaching assignments so that the candidate has the opportunity to gain experience and develop skills in the various types of coursework relevant to the educational mission of the School and her/his program while teaching in areas that are appropriate for the candidate. The responsibility for the evaluation of teaching performance rests on the candidate's academic department. Each academic department shall have clearly developed and disseminated criteria to be used in the evaluation of the teaching performance of its faculty. The evaluation should include course evaluations by students and peer evaluations by colleagues. Evidence of the candidate's teaching and advising skills shall be collected and considered in the contract renewal and/or promotion review process.

The quality of teaching is commonly considered to include (but is not limited to) the following factors:

- Knowledge of a field and developments in it
- Skillfully communicating with students, arousing their interest, and helping them to learn substantive content and skills
- Stimulating students to think critically
- Leading students to appreciate the nuances of fields of knowledge
- Applying knowledge to solving problems, when appropriate

Specific aspects of teaching to be considered include course development, classroom teaching, student advising and mentoring, and responsibility for doctoral dissertations. The School expects its faculty to demonstrate evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness through the following ways:

- *Student course evaluations*: Positive summary of teaching evaluations for all courses taught, as evidenced by student course evaluations that demonstrate above-average overall instructor and course ratings (required).
- *Course development and practice*: Sustained involvement in curriculum review and evaluation, self-directed learning activities, and if called for, innovative and creative change of teaching methods, materials, and pedagogy, as evidenced by course syllabi with additional comments about changes, innovations, and improvements (required).
- *Peer evaluations*: Generally positive peer evaluations (required).
- *Advising and dissertation/thesis supervision*: Advising students as applicable. Examples include: supervising theses, master's projects, or dissertation research and serving on dissertation committees, as evidenced by documentation of the numbers of students advised, degree objective, and the advisory role (i.e., chairperson, committee member).
- *Student support and development*: Teaching activities that involve student development and support or the conduct of seminars, workshops, resource and instructional websites, or other learning experiences for students, faculty, alumni, or other interested groups as evidenced by the number of students advised, degree objective, and the advisory role. Additional evidence may include documentation of involvement in student activities, mentoring, dissertation seminars, alumni accomplishments, etc.
- *Other*: Evidence of remaining current in and/or expanding on one's field of specialization through appropriate faculty development activities as evidenced by, for example, teaching assignments elsewhere, team teaching, conduct of professional seminars or workshops, participation in teacher effectiveness workshops, attendance at professional conferences, obtaining additional degrees or certificates, etc.

2. Scholarship

The record in support of the request for contract renewal, or promotion from the rank of *Assistant Professor* to *Associate Professor* or from the rank of *Associate Professor* to *Professor*; must include evidence of productive scholarship in the form of contributions to the scholarly literature or to relevant practice or policy. These contributions can be in the form of scholarly publications, presentations at scholarly meetings, or other relevant professional activities. An addendum of scholarly activities may be submitted by the candidate up to the day before the departmental personnel committee meets to consider the personnel action request.

For promotion requests, the evidence of the quality of scholarly work must be established by solicited letters from experts about the quality of work or evidence of the impact or influence of the work on the scholarly literature or relevant practice or policy. The process of selecting scholars (referees) who would review the candidate's record should allow for some participation by the candidate in providing a suggested list of scholars. The list of solicited scholars should combine in a final list and to the extent possible, names evenly drawn from both the candidate's and her/his department's list. Under no circumstance shall the external reviewers have any conflict of interest, directly or indirectly with the candidate. The solicited scholars in the field should receive an abbreviated record of the candidate's scholarship, as well as a sample of candidate's scholarly products. The letter of solicitation written by the candidate's department chairperson to the reviewing scholars should be clear in seeking an assessment of only scholarship. In this letter (see a sample at the end of this document), the department chairperson

shall ask the reviewing scholars to provide opinion on the scholar's contribution to the field. For promotion to the rank of *Associate Professor*, the candidate's department chairperson must secure at least five (5) letters attesting to the quality of her/his work written by experts in the field of the candidate's expertise and scholarship. For promotion to the rank of *Professor*, the candidate's department chairperson *must* obtain at least five (5) letters attesting to the quality of the candidate's work from widely recognized scholars in the field of the candidate's expertise and scholarship. Below a sample letter to be sent to external reviewers seeking their assistance is provided.

For promotion applications, the candidate must submit to the department chairperson a list of at least seven (7) potential scholars who are qualified to review (referee) her/his accomplishments to the department chairperson in accordance with School and University guidelines. The candidate's department, in consultation with faculty members with expertise in the candidate's field, should also come up with at least seven (7) potential external reviewers. These two lists should be combined, and the names should be drawn evenly, to the extent possible, from both the candidate's and the department's list. Under no circumstance shall the external reviewers have any conflict of interest, directly or indirectly, with the candidate.

The solicited scholars in the field should receive an abbreviated record of the candidate's scholarship, as well as a sample of the candidate's scholarly products. The letter of solicitation, written by the candidate's department chairperson to the reviewing scholars, should be clear in seeking an assessment of only scholarship. In this letter, the department chairperson asks the reviewing scholars to provide an opinion on the candidate's contribution to the field. For candidate promotions to the rank of either associate professor or professor, the department chairperson must secure at least five letters attesting to the quality of the candidate's work written by experts in the candidate's field of expertise and scholarship. Letters are due by **October 1**. All received external letters must become part of the candidate's documentation that shall be reviewed by the personnel committees.

To assist candidates in preparing their application for contract renewal or promotion, the following breakdown of types of evidence is offered. Evidence of productivity in scholarship may include the following:

- A. *Scholarly publications*: Strong and consistent evidence of scholarship that establishes a pattern of productivity and significant contribution to the field or area of expertise. No specific number of products, single authored or coauthored, would determine a pattern of productivity, and emphasis is placed on the qualitative aspects of scholarly contributions, such as their importance, rigor, originality, and scope. Typical patterns of productivity for those with equal distribution of effort (between teaching, scholarship, and service) can be, but are not limited to, *at least* and *on average*, one refereed scholarly work each year since the last promotion or initial appointment, with the expectation that the candidate mixes refereed and non-refereed products that characterize the quality of her/his contributions. While this example is a typical minimum, the GSEHD values the quality of scholarship as superseding any absolute number of scholarly products. If the distribution of a non-tenure accruing faculty's effort (as stipulated by the appointment letter) is not equally apportioned among teaching, scholarship, and service; then the expectations for

scholarship productivity shall take into account such arrangement. In addition, work published prior to assuming the non-tenure accruing position at GSEHD shall be considered. These works may be any of the following:

- a. Articles in peer-reviewed journals and publications
 - b. Books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution
 - c. Edited books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution
 - d. Peer-reviewed conference proceedings, monographs, or standardized test manuals, published by a professional society
 - e. Chapters in an edited book
 - f. Published video or multimedia work
 - g. Invited articles in refereed publications
- B. *Funded grant proposals by nationally recognized agencies and foundations*
- C. *Presentations at professional meetings*: Evidence of presentations at professional meetings (regional, national, or international) with indication of refereed and non-refereed conferences.
- D. *Other*: Other examples of scholarship may include curriculum development packages, book reviews (invited and juried), editorial responsibilities for scholarly publications, commissioned papers, technical or grant reports, bulletins, videotapes, manuals, magazine articles, unpublished manuscripts, non-juried journal articles, seminars, other invited presentations, major exhibits and demonstrations, and submitted but unfunded grant proposals.

3. Administrative Responsibilities

Since not all contract non-tenure-accruing faculty members assume administrative responsibilities and responsibilities, only those with such responsibilities as indicated in their letter of appointment are subject to evaluation under this area. Effective and successful fulfillment of administrative responsibilities can be demonstrated through accomplishments and contributions by the candidate beyond those expected in teaching, scholarship, and service based on the position description in the candidate's appointment letter. Effectiveness in administration is primarily determined by the department chairperson and the GSEHD Dean. Although successful accomplishments in these responsibilities vary depending on the nature and responsibilities of the position, the following are typical activities that are expected and considered by the departmental and School Personnel Committees to be listed and documented:

- A. Coordinate, administer, and manage programs: This may include service as a program area coordinator or project/program director and any other related contributions.
- B. Develop new programs or enhance existing concentrations or specialties in her/his program.
- C. Evaluate programs: This may include assessing goal accomplishment, assessing student satisfaction, and other related functions.
- D. Contribute to and lead program development efforts.

- E. Assume leadership for (rather than participate in) accreditation and program evaluation activities.
- F. Develop and evaluate initiatives that promote the program and its growth and quality.
- G. Market the program and/or recruit new students.
- H. Work with regular and adjunct faculty to provide a consistently high quality program of instruction.
- I. Coordinate clinical training activities such as arranging and overseeing clinical placements, providing clinical supervision, and serving as a coordinator of an off-site training facility.

4. Service

The GSEHD expects its faculty members to engage in academic service to the University, the community, and the profession, and it values this service. By virtue of their special scholarly or professional qualifications and expertise, faculty members often render distinctive academic service to various committees, boards, scholarly/professional organizations, councils, schools, and other entities outside the GSEHD. This may include service such as membership on University committees, consultation with a variety of institutions, appointment to a leadership position of a scholarly organization, and appointment as an editor or editorial board member for a scholarly journal. In general, a constructive record of academic service is a positive factor in appraising the advisability of appointment, reappointment (with or without tenure), or promotion. Academic service to community organizations and governmental agencies in advisory or consulting roles constitutes an important factor for consideration in appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The candidate can effectively serve through accomplishments and contributions beyond those expected in teaching and scholarship. The following activities are valued.

A. Internal service

1. *Membership on committees:* Participation on standing and *ad hoc* committees at the University, School, and departmental levels.
2. *Completion of special projects and assignments:* Services such as, but not limited to, editing School and University publications, coordinating a colloquium series, advising a student organization, or providing service to an organization.

B. External service

1. *Participation in the profession:* Evidence of participation in professional organizations and societies (state, regional, national, or international level) as an officer, conference organizer, discussant/chairperson of conference sessions, committee chairperson, editor, advisory or editorial board member, or committee member; completion of a special assignment; or contribution through workshop or discussion presentations at state, regional, or national meetings. Candidates seeking the rank of *Professor* should have exhibited leadership in service activities such as chairing committees, serving as an external reviewer for other institutions, carrying out administrative responsibilities,

authoring a report or editorial, holding governing board memberships, or serving as journal editor.

2. *Communication to the field*: Publication of service-oriented papers, such as reports of meetings or events, magazine columns, bulletins, videotapes, manuals, magazine articles, opinion pieces, calls for action, and other forms of writing that do not necessarily meet the criteria for scholarly publications listed above.
3. *Consultant to community organizations*: Service to community organizations, such as schools, school districts, community/business organizations, nonprofit organizations, or social service agencies.

IV. Procedural Guidelines for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion Reviews of Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty

Contents of the portfolio (dossier), which comprise the material to be reviewed by the departmental Personnel Committee as well as the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee for the purpose of evaluating requests by candidates for contract renewal and/or promotion, must include evidence of effective teaching, evidence of scholarly productivity, evidence of service to the Department/School/University/other professional or community organizations, as well as evidence of productivity in conducting administrative responsibilities. Portfolio contents as well as suggested sample materials are outlined below. At a minimum the dossier submitted by the candidate must include:

- A. A copy of the bylaws and policies that are being used for evaluating the promotion and/or tenure request by the candidate.
- B. A copy of the letter of appointment and subsequent revisions to it, written by the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in which the nature of the responsibilities of the candidate's position with clear distribution (percentages) of the candidate's expected job effort divided between teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities are delineated. (Note: please blank out any reference to the designated salary)
- C. A summary statement that synthesizes achievements in each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and administrative responsibilities as they apply.
- D. A detailed up-to-date Curriculum Vitae that lists in order starting with the most current, and indicating dates and places as needed for degrees held and job positions held. Scholarly publications and contributions shall be listed in clear and separate sections for each of the following categories: books, edited books, refereed articles, refereed chapters in books, refereed articles in conference proceedings, non-refereed publications, invited scholarly talks, external grants and contracts for which the candidate serves(d) as a Principal Investigator, honors received, professional affiliations, doctoral dissertations directed and completed, master's theses directed and completed, and professional service activities.

- E. A detailed record of achievement in teaching, a detailed record of achievement in scholarship, and a detailed record of internal and external service, as well as administrative service accomplishments.

V. Deadlines for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion Review of Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty

By May 30: For contract renewal requests, it is the responsibility of the candidate's department chairperson to inform the candidate of the process for review. For promotion requests, the faculty candidate must notify her/his department chairperson in writing of the intention to be considered for promotion. Requests for promotion to a non-tenure accruing *Associate Professor* rank can only be considered during (or any time after) the sixth contractual year in which the candidate served in the *Assistant Professor* rank. Promotion to a *Professor* rank can only be considered after an *Associate Professor* serves at least five contractual years in her/his rank.

By June 15: The candidate must be notified in writing by her/his department chairperson of the requirements for contract renewal and/or promotion to the rank she/he is seeking.

By June 30: The candidate for promotion (only) must submit samples of her/his scholarly accomplishments organized in a folder along with a statement of scholarship. The candidate must also provide her/his department chairperson with a list of potential external reviewers of the candidate's scholarly contributions. The list must include at least seven names of widely recognized scholars in the field, with their contact information. The department chairperson, in accordance with School bylaws and the University Faculty Code, would solicit similar lists from the department's faculty in the candidate's field. The department chairperson will then select at least five referees for promotion requests. As much as possible, there should be even representation from both lists in the selection of the final referees. Under no circumstance shall the external reviewers have any conflict of interest, directly or indirectly, with the candidate. Those external referees will be solicited by the department chairperson to write letters assessing the contributions by the candidate to her/his field in her/his area(s) of responsibilities. Included with the letter is the candidate's statement about her/his accomplishments in the field and copies of exemplars of the candidate's scholarship. External reviewers shall be asked to submit their own curriculum vita along with their assessment letter. The external review letters must be received by the department no later than **October 1**.

By September 15: The candidate for contract renewal and/or promotion must submit her/his portfolio (dossier) to her/his department chairperson for review, following the guidelines delineated in the "Portfolio Content" section of this document.

By November 1: The candidate's departmental Personnel Committee must meet to deliberate and then vote by secret ballot based on the criteria set by the School and any additional criteria for contract renewal and promotion of non-tenure-accruing faculty

set by the department. Absentee or proxy voting by members of the department's Personnel Committee is not allowed since faculty must participate in the deliberations of the committee as it reviews the application. The candidate's departmental Personnel Committee must submit its written recommendation regarding the candidate's request to the department chairperson on or around **November 1**. The letter must include its recommendation regarding granting the contract renewal or promotion, the numerical vote, and its rationale. Based on the committee's recommendation, the department chairperson must inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of this recommendation by **November 15**.

By November 15: The department chairperson's recommendation regarding contract renewal -- which must include a summary of the deliberation by the departmental Personnel Committee and its vote -- must be submitted to the GSEHD Dean, along with the complete portfolio submitted by the candidate. *For contract renewal requests*, the GSEHD Dean will review all submitted materials and forward her/his recommendation to the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs by the University's designated deadline. Note that contract renewal recommendations by the department do not involve or require review by the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee.

For promotion requests a summary of the deliberation by the department Personnel Committee, its and the candidate's submitted complete portfolio shall be forwarded by the department chairperson to the Dean's office by **November 15** who, in turn shall forward this packet to the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee for its review of the request.

By January 15: The GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee must meet and review promotion requests by non-accruing faculty. The GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee must submit its recommendation regarding the candidate's request to the GSEHD Dean in writing. The letter must include the committee's recommendation regarding the promotion request, the numerical vote, and its rationale. The GSEHD Dean shall forward her/his recommendation to the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs by the University's designated deadline.

The George Washington University's Faculty Code stipulates: *Failure by the University to conform to these procedures and the timelines contained in them will not be grounds for a rehearing/re-review unless the failure materially damages the candidate's chances.*

VI. Portfolio (Dossier) Specifications for Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty

At a minimum, candidates are expected to include the following contents in their promotion or contract renewal dossier:

1. A copy of the bylaws and guidelines that are used to evaluate the candidate's dossier.
2. A copy of the letter of appointment and any subsequent revisions to it, written by the University Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs that describe the nature of the position responsibilities, with clear distribution (percentages) of the candidate's expected job effort divided between delineated for teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities. (Note: please blank out any reference to the designated salary).
3. Transmitting letters by the GSEHD Dean and chairperson of the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee (to be inserted by each responsible party).
4. Executive summary of the candidate's contributions in the form of two pieces:
 - a) Short report/response on the candidate's productivity based on the position responsibilities as communicated by the letter of appointment and any subsequent revisions to it.
 - b) Self-evaluation of the candidate's contribution.
5. Curriculum vitae of the candidate, which, at a minimum, must contain the following elements in the order listed, with the appropriate dates and places indicated as needed:
 - a. Degrees held, university granting, field, year.
 - b. Job positions held, where, period of time.
 - c. Scholarly publications and contributions shall be listed in clear and separate sections for each of the following categories: books, edited books, refereed articles, refereed chapters in books, refereed articles in conference proceedings, non-refereed publications, and invited scholarly talks.
 - d. External grants and contracts for which the candidate served as a principal investigator.
 - f. Honors received.
 - g. Professional affiliations.
 - h. Doctoral dissertations directed and completed, with title, student name, and year.
 - i. Master's theses directed and completed, with title, student name, and year.
 - j. Professional service activities.
6. Detailed teaching contributions, which, at a minimum, must contain the following elements:
 - a. Summary of teaching accomplishments.
 - b. Syllabi of courses taught.
 - c. Copies of forms and reports of evaluations by students.
 - d. Copies of letters or forms of evaluations by peers.
 - e. Description of any teaching innovations such as integrating technology in the classroom.

- f. Doctoral dissertations and master's theses/projects directed and completed with title, student name, and year.
7. Detailed description of scholarly publications and contributions separated according to the following categories:
 - a. Scholarship statement or summary.
 - b. Publications and presentations.
 - Articles in blind peer-reviewed journals and publications.
 - Books published by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution (single or coauthored).
 - Edited books by a respected press with a national reputation and distribution.
 - Refereed monographs or conference proceedings or standardized test manuals, published by a professional society.
 - Chapters in an edited book.
 - Other refereed products, including computer-based projects, published videos or multimedia works, or scholarly exhibits.
 - Invited articles in refereed publications.
 - c. External grants and contracts in which the candidate served as principal investigator or co-principal investigator, listing the title, source, amount, and period of time.
 - d. Honors received.
 8. External/University/School/Department service:
 - a. Overall service contribution summary separating the service location.
 - b. Membership and/or leadership of committees and service within and outside the University.
 - c. Any special recognition for service.
 9. Report on administrative responsibilities and tasks accomplished depending on job expectations. Depending on the nature of the appointment and the expectations of the position, this may include a description of the contribution to activities planned and implemented; program coordination activities; program data reports on enrollment, growth, and development; and recruiting, dissemination, or other administrative responsibilities.

VII. Sample Letter Requesting External Evaluation of a Non-Tenure Accruing Candidate's Scholarly Work

Dear Dr. [Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external evaluator of the scholarly record of [candidate], who is being reviewed for promotion to rank of non-tenure-accruing [associate professor/professor] in the Department of [name] at The George Washington University. Having completed similar reviews for other universities, I am well aware of the time this effort takes and very much appreciate your contribution. I have enclosed copies of [candidate's] curriculum vita, statement of research and scholarship, and exemplars of [her/his] scholarly work.

As all schools vary somewhat in the criteria that are applied, we ask that you evaluate [candidate's] scholarship according to the following criteria for non-tenure faculty promotion to [associate professor/professor] in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Consider whether [candidate's] record provides evidence of sustained scholarly activity of high quality in the form of refereed and/or other reviewed published works, with the expectations of continued publications, and whether [candidate] has achieved recognition as a noteworthy and productive scholar. Our school bylaws stipulate that *"no specific number of products would determine a pattern of productivity. Emphasis is placed on the qualitative aspects of scholarly contributions, such as their importance, rigor, originality, and scope."* The purpose of this review is to assess whether the record of Dr. [Name] as a faculty member in a non-tenure-accruing role is sufficient for the promotion to the rank sought.

Please send your evaluation by October 1, [year], electronically if possible in the form of a letter to me at [e-mail address]. If it is necessary to use regular mail, please send your evaluation to [mailing address]. Please also include your own CV or biosketch.

We ask that you please treat this request and your review as highly confidential.

On behalf of the Department of [Name] at The George Washington University, I am very grateful for your time and effort in this most important process and thank you personally for your willingness to participate. Should you need further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me via e-mail or by phone at [number] (office) or [number] (home).

Sincerely yours,

Chairperson
Department of [Name]

Summary of Deadlines for Tenure and Promotion Review for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty

Midcourse Evaluation of Tenure-Accruing Faculty

Deadline*	Deliverable	Responsible Party
Within 30 days of appointment	Formally notify faculty member of the criteria and procedures for tenure and/or promotion	Dean
<i>Academic year in which the candidate's tenure midcourse falls</i>		
February 1	Submit midcourse review portfolio.	Candidate
March 1	Review candidate's midcourse portfolio and make recommendation about the progress of the candidate towards attaining tenure, and then meet to evaluate the progress of the candidate towards tenure.	Departmental Personnel Committee
March 1	Make recommendations to the Dean regarding progress of candidate towards tenure.	Departmental Personnel Committee
March 31	Inform candidate of the outcome of midcourse review and contract renewal recommendation in writing.	Departmental Chairperson

Evaluation Requests for Tenure and Promotion of Tenured Faculty

Deadline*	Deliverable	Responsible Party
<i>Academic year before the promotion and/or tenure application is to be reviewed</i>		
April 1	Notify candidate of her/his eligibility for tenure and the requirements of the process in writing.	Office of the Dean
April 30	Meet with faculty candidate to discuss the School guidelines, procedures, and the required promotion/tenure portfolio contents.	Department Chairperson
June 1	Provide department chairperson a complete portfolio.	Candidate
June 1	Submit a list of potential scholars in the field who might serve as external reviewers, along with copies of the materials to be sent to the reviewers.	Candidate
June 10	Devise list of external reviewers.	Department Chairperson
June 10-July30	Department Chairperson or department Personnel Committee Chairperson seeks external letters following procedures	Department Chairperson or Department Committee chairperson
<i>Academic year in which the promotion and/or tenure application is to be reviewed</i>		
October 1	Submit external review letters (only for promotion).	External Reviewers
October 31	Meet to review portfolio and supporting material submitted by the candidate and external reviewers. Make a recommendation regarding the tenure and/or promotion request. Deliberate and vote by secret ballot on the merit of the candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure.	Departmental Personnel Committee
November 7	Forward to the office of the Dean a summary of the department deliberation, the outcome of the vote, and the candidate's portfolio.	Department Chairperson or chairperson of department personnel committee

Soon after November 7	Forward to the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee the candidate's portfolio, the external evaluation letters, and the summary of the department deliberation and vote.	The Dean
December 15	Meet to review the request for tenure and/or promotion and supporting materials.	GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee
Soon after December 15	Prepare a summary of GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee's deliberations and the vote and forward the recommendation to the Dean.	Chairperson of the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee

Summary of Deadlines for Contract Renewal and/or Promotion Review of Non-Tenure Accruing Faculty

Deadline*	Deliverable	Party Responsible
<i>Academic year before the contract renewal or promotion application is to be reviewed</i>		
May 30	<i>Promotion requests:</i> Notify department chairperson in writing of intention to be considered for promotion.	Candidate
May 30	<i>Contract Renewal:</i> Notify candidate of process for review.	Department Chairperson
June 15	Notify candidate in writing of the requirements for contract and/or promotion.	Department Chairperson
June 30	<i>Promotion requests:</i> Submit samples of scholarly accomplishments in a folder with a statement of scholarship.	Candidate
June 30	<i>Promotion requests:</i> Provide department chairperson with a list of potential external reviewers.	Candidate
<i>Academic year in which the promotion or contract renewal application is to be reviewed</i>		
September 15	Submit portfolio to department chairperson.	Candidate
October 1	Submit external review letters.	External reviewers
November 1	Meet to deliberate and vote by secret ballot. Submit written recommendation regarding the candidate's request to department chairperson.	Departmental Personnel Committee
November 15	<i>Contract renewal:</i> Submit recommendation, including deliberation by the departmental Personnel Committee and its vote, and completed portfolio to the Dean.	Department chairperson
November 15	<i>Promotion requests:</i> Submit recommendation, including deliberation by the departmental Personnel Committee and its vote, and completed portfolio to the Dean. Note: The Dean's office will forward the materials to the GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee.	Department chairperson
January 15	Meet and review promotion requests (only) by non-accruing faculty. Submit recommendation to the Dean in writing.	GSEHD Faculty and Personnel Committee

* These dates are intended as guidelines. Although they are not binding, every attempt should be made to meet them.