

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure-Line Faculty
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
George Mason University
Passed by CHSS Faculty Vote, June 2020

Promotions of tenure-line faculty within George Mason University's College of Humanities and Social Sciences will be guided by the latest edition of the [Faculty Handbook](#), guidelines issued by the Provost's office, and the guidelines contained in this document. "Candidates for renewal, promotion and tenure will be evaluated in light of the missions of the University, which are teaching, research and scholarship, both theoretical and applied, and service (as defined in Section 2.4.3H).¹ Genuine excellence must be exhibited in the areas of teaching or research and high competence must be exhibited in both," with attention paid to external reviewers and impact beyond the boundaries of the University. In the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, research may include creative work where relevant, and henceforth in this document that possibility is included under the term "research." Candidates coming up for tenure and promotion to associate professor, as well as candidates coming up for promotion to full professor, have specific service options detailed in these guidelines.

These guidelines are meant to be read with the recognition that there will be variation by discipline. Candidates for tenure and promotion should discuss these variations with the relevant personnel in their department. These guidelines are also meant to be read holistically. That means that checking off, or failing to check off, one particular measure cannot be determinative of the whole, which involves judgment across many dimensions. While the guidelines seek to give candidates as much information about expectations as possible, promotion and tenure is ultimately a process involving multiple judgments, not a checklist that can be decided absent such judgment.

1. **General Guidelines**

In order to ensure equity for all faculty in the evaluation process for promotion, departments in CHSS should follow these guidelines:

- Each department will offer its own clear, written criteria for the evaluation of genuine excellence and high competence in research, teaching and service, working within the parameters laid out by the College, the provost, and the Faculty Handbook. Expectations and guidelines for research will vary widely within the College because of the range of disciplinary norms and practices. However, departments should take care that nothing in

¹ George Mason University Faculty Handbook, pp. 26-27. Available online at https://mymasonportal.gmu.edu/bbcswebdav/xid-117354535_1

these guidelines contradicts the college ones. These guidelines should be provided to the College Promotion and Tenure (P&T) committee.

- Guidelines for assessment of teaching should make clear that student evaluations are only one of several forms of evidence—alongside peer evaluations, syllabi, assignments, student learning assessments, and other materials required by the Provost’s Office--by which teaching quality will be evaluated. These guidelines should be provided to the College P&T committee.

Reappointment letters for probationary faculty should identify appropriate paths to achieve excellence/high competence at the tenure review. Thus, these letters should, as needed, be diagnostic as well as supportive. It should also be understood, however, that fulfilling all expectations described in these letters is not a guarantee of promotion and tenure.

- Departments should provide to probationary faculty a promotion-and-tenure mentoring document, which will provide more specific guidance on departmental standards for tenure, and suggest what probationary faculty members can do to improve their chances of achieving tenure. In addition, chairs should meet with probationary faculty at least once per year to discuss progress to tenure.
- Faculty may come up for tenure at any point in the probationary period if they have achieved the standard of excellence in one category and high competence in the other two expected for the granting of tenure.
- Professional accomplishments completed before a candidate’s arrival at Mason factor into tenure and promotion evaluations, but faculty are also expected to demonstrate high standards of performance at Mason. When evaluating a tenure candidate with a significant number of years elsewhere, the college will evaluate the candidate in light of the overall volume and trajectory of output typical of successful scholars at research universities, keeping disciplinary differences in mind.
- Tenure and promotion standards reflect the scholarly, teaching and service record, not a set amount of time. Candidates who come up early in their probationary period for tenure and promotion should be judged by the same standards as those who come up at the end of their probationary period. Likewise, there is no set time for promotion to full.
- Members of the College P&T committee must respect disciplinary expectations, conventions, and criteria for tenure considerations.

2. Dossier/Casebook Guidelines

As outlined in the Faculty Handbook, the candidate is responsible for the content of the dossier, with the exception of the external reviews and departmental letters. These dossiers should contain evidence that the candidate has met the criteria for either promotion to professor, or else to associate professor for tenure and promotion: that is, evidence of genuine excellence in either teaching or research, and of a minimum of high competence in service and either teaching or research. Each year, the Provost sends a memo outlining required contents of the

dossier/casebook. In compiling their dossiers, candidates should rely on the guidelines in this memo, along with whatever additional instructions are provided by CHSS and their departments. Please note that any missing materials or violations of these guidelines in terms of dossier contents can either affect or delay committee decisions.

Tenure and promotion candidate dossiers consist of the following elements:

- A letter from the department chair or program director that evaluates the candidate according to the criteria set forth in this document. This letter should also indicate disciplinary and departmental standards and norms regarding research, teaching and service (for example, type and number of publications (books, articles, or both); co-authorship and authorship order protocols; teaching expectations regarding the variety of classes offered as well as the number necessary to provide evidence of teaching quality).
- A letter from the departmental P&T committee, including a table that indicates the number of votes In Favor, Opposed, and Not Voting. (Note: “Not Voting” is used only in the case of conflicts of interest or in the case of absence. It is not to be deployed as a soft “Opposed” vote.). No other categories should be used. The letter should evaluate the candidate according to the criteria set forth in this document.
- When there are votes opposed, the letter must provide reasons for those votes
- A roster of the department faculty eligible to vote (those not voting should be indicated on the roster).
- A copy of the candidate’s three-year renewal letter from the dean (for promotion and tenure cases only).
- Letters from external reviewers (a minimum of five is required, no more than two of whom should be drawn from candidate’s list of possible reviewers) along with a copy of the chair’s letter sent to those reviewers and copies of the reviewers’ curricula vitae (CVs). (Please note additional letters may be required for candidates coming up on the basis of excellence in both teaching and research—see Sections 4 and 5.) Departments should make clear the process by which its external reviewers were selected (e.g., by the chair, etc.).
- An employment chronology that includes the date of conferral of the PhD; the date of initial hire at Mason; dates for any prior appointments; dates of fellowship years; etc.
- A copy of the candidate’s curriculum vitae.
- Research and teaching statement including future plans in the candidate’s area of excellence, to a maximum of eight pages total (standard margins and font, single spaced)
- Service statement, and optional supportive documents, up to a maximum of four pages total (standard margins and font, single spaced). This statement should include program, department, college, university, and professional service as per department norms.
- Documentation of the candidate’s pedagogical activities, which must include evidence of (at a minimum) highly competent classroom teaching and of teaching experience in a

variety of classes. Candidates who reduce their teaching load (or number of years of FT teaching) through course buyouts or fellowships should consult with their departments to ensure that they are teaching enough classes to provide sufficient evidence of teaching quality. The following items should be included:

- A table of all student course evaluations since arrival at George Mason, identifying by semester the courses taught and number of students enrolled, as well as the median ratings for both “Teaching Overall” and “Course Overall.” Faculty coming up for promotion to full need only provide ratings for courses taught since promotion. If the faculty member has taught at Mason for fewer than three years, but has course evaluations from other institutions, these should be included in the dossier.
- All student course evaluations (summary page only). Faculty coming up for promotion to full need only provide evaluations for courses taught since promotion.
- A minimum of four peer teaching observations from at least three different observers, reflecting teaching at different levels and of distinct courses during three different semesters; included should be at least one that has been performed during one of the three most recent teaching semesters. At least one of these observations must be undertaken by the department chair.
- For promotion to full, three new letters since tenure has been granted, from different courses and at least two different terms, are required. One should be from the chair. Faculty are not required to resubmit the letters from the tenure dossier.
- At a minimum, candidates are also required to submit other evidence of teaching quality (selecting two from the list below):
 - Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - Design, implementation and assessment of teaching innovations
 - Engagement in curricular initiatives, including – but not limited to – participation in Mason’s strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
 - Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment
- When applicable, a list of theses and dissertations supervised and committees served on, or other mentoring and advising activities
- Copies of published research, including hard copies of any books or edited collections already in print. It is up to individual candidates and departments to determine whether

all materials should be provided or only a representative sampling. However, the CHSS P&T Committee may request to see all materials. Additionally, if the external reviewers were only sent a selection of the candidate's scholarly materials, which items were included should be made clear.

- Scholarship designed for use and presentation in a non-print medium, submitted and evaluated in the specific native environment in which it was produced.
- A certificate documenting successful completion of all required Compliance, Diversity and Ethics training.

3. Timeline

Below is a timetable of actions relating to tenure and promotion cases. Some dates will vary depending on departmental procedures. Although the timeline does not explicitly address the instance of promotion to full, it may be taken as a template for a comparable set of actions. Candidates should refer to the yearly memo from the dean's office for more specific dates in these ranges.

February—Dean's Office and at least one member of the CHSS P&T committee host a meeting to discuss CHSS promotion and tenure processes with faculty and department chairs/directors.

March 1—Candidate provides list of at least three external reviewers. Two reviewers will be chosen from that list. The remaining reviewers (at least three, for a total of five reviewers) will be selected by the department. Please note that if the candidate is seeking promotion or tenure/promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching and high competence in scholarship, additional external letters are required to evaluate the scholarship in addition to those in support of the teaching. In that case, the candidate should provide the names of at least two external reviewers for the scholarship as well as the three for the teaching.

March through May—Department will identify a minimum of three external reviewers and solicit their participation in the review process, along with two of the three identified by the candidate. For the candidate seeking promotion/promotion and tenure on the basis of excellence in teaching and high competence in scholarship, the department will solicit at least two more external letters in support of the review of scholarship, in addition to the one chosen from the candidate's list. (Note this will make for a total of eight letters.)

May 1—Candidate provides a CV and publications to the department for review by external reviewers.

May through June—Department sends out candidate's CV and publications to external reviewers.

Late August (departments may specify an earlier deadline)—Candidates submit the following materials to their department for the purposes of departmental review. The candidate will have submitted some of these materials in May, but can revise CV and provide additional publications before submitting:

- CV and publications
- An employment chronology that includes the date of conferral of the PhD; the date of initial hire at Mason; dates for any prior appointments; dates of fellowship years; etc.
- Research and teaching statement including future plans in area of excellence, to a maximum of eight pages total (standard margins and font, single spaced)
- Service statement, and optional supportive documents, up to a maximum of four pages total (standard margins and font, single spaced)
- Evidence of teaching quality
 - Student course evaluations – summary page only
 - A table of all student course evaluations since arrival at George Mason (and other institutions if the candidate has had fewer than four years of teaching at Mason), identifying by semester the courses taught and number of students enrolled, as well as the median ratings for both “Teaching Overall” and “Course Overall;”
 - Peer teaching evaluations (see guidelines in preceding section)
 - For peer teaching evaluation of online courses, departments should have appropriate guidelines or use publicly available guides to best practices
 - Mandatory additional evidence of teaching quality (selecting two from the list below)
 - Syllabi, assignments, and other course materials
 - Student learning assessment (e.g., feedback on student work, rubrics)
 - Design, implementation and assessment of teaching innovation;
 - Engagement in curricular initiatives, including – but not limited to – participation in Mason’s strategic initiatives (e.g., Mason Impact, OSCAR/Students as Scholars, Writing Intensive courses, Active Learning Classrooms, etc.)
 - Online program, curricular, and course development, implementation, and assessment
 - A list of theses and dissertations supervised, and MA/thesis committees served on (when applicable); evidence of other mentoring and advising activities
- A certificate documenting successful completion of all required Compliance, Diversity and Ethics training.

September 15—Deadline for receipt of external reviewer letters. At their discretion, departments may request an earlier date.

No later than mid-November—Departmental faculty, departmental promotion and tenure committee, and department chair conduct review of tenure case. Committee and department chair produce letters of evaluation to be shared with the candidate, which also become part of the dossier. Full dossiers are submitted through Interfolio.

Early to mid-December—Liaison from College Promotion and Tenure Committee meets independently with the candidate and the department chair/program director. This meeting gives the candidate a chance to explain anything not in the dossier, to add additional information, and to ask questions about the process. The liaison may also seek clarifications on the record or other information gathering. The liaison meets with the chair for a similar purpose. The liaison prepares a presentation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee

December through January—College Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts review of tenure case; the candidate receives formal notification of the vote and a summary report.

No later than January 11—College Promotion and Tenure Committee submits evaluation letter to CHSS dean. Upon finalizing the second level review letter (CHSS P&T committee letter), the faculty candidate's CHSS P&T Liaison will communicate the vote of the committee to the candidate and the chair/director. The CHSS P&T committee chair will forward all final letters to the Associate Director for Operations and Initiatives in the CHSS Dean's Office for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and Dean's review. The Associate Director for Operations and Initiatives will send a redacted copy of the CHSS P&T committee letter to the candidate and the chair/director. Chair/Director will communicate the vote of the CHSS P&T committee to the faculty involved in the first level of review.

By early February—CHSS dean submits evaluation letter to Provost, with copies to the candidate and the department chair/program director.

4. Criteria for Tenure Specifying Genuine Excellence

Genuine excellence is defined as per the Faculty Handbook. Faculty may elect to be assessed for excellence in research, or else in teaching. At a Research 1 University, genuine excellence in research must be based on evidence of external reputation. The same is true of excellence in teaching; although many excellent scholars are also superb teachers, excellence in teaching does not rest solely on classroom efforts (e.g., good evaluations). CHSS standards expect all faculty to engage in regular sustained service before tenure, certainly at the departmental level but on occasion at the college or university level.

I. Excellence in research:

The [Faculty Handbook](#) (Section 2.4.2) defines scholarly work broadly. It states, "Scholarly achievement is demonstrated by original publications and peer reviewed contributions to the

advancement of the discipline/field of study or the integration of the discipline with other fields; by original research, artistic work, software and media, exhibitions, and performance; and by the application of discipline- or field-based knowledge to the practice of a profession." This definition accommodates the wide variety of scholarly work produced in CHSS. Given the range of disciplines and standards for research in this college, excellence in research should be determined by the standards of the individual department and its discipline(s). In almost all cases, however, material published through the peer review process constitutes the default standard for acceptable promotion and tenure publications. Peer review is understood to occur in a range of contexts, including pre-publication, grant funding, awards, and post-publication review. What follows are some typical guidelines, which are not to be taken either as rules or guarantees.

The following categories recognize that some departments may house scholarly programs that allow for book or article focus, or some combination of the two. Candidates should be sure to have regular discussions of their research programs with the relevant personnel in order to ensure understanding of how particular programs relate to these guidelines.

In all cases, it is the responsibility, first of the candidate, and then of the department to provide information about the impact factors, reputation or other indices of the quality of a venue (e.g. journal or book press) for scholarship.

A. For a largely book-based research program, the following are considered usual components of a promotion-and-tenure case based on excellence in scholarship:

- A book that is either published or in press (meaning that no more substantive changes are required) at a well-regarded scholarly publisher, or the equivalent in a creative discipline: these may include, but are not limited to, monographs, book-length critical/academic translations, or the equivalent in a creative discipline. "In press" means that the manuscript has cleared every stage in the review process and is in process of production (which is understood to include the copy-editing process). An advance contract from a publisher at the time of tenure is by itself insufficient, since such contracts are often granted before the manuscript has cleared the review process and are therefore neither a guarantor of publication nor evidence of the timely development of a scholarly career. Candidates or department chairs must secure a letter from the book publisher that describes the book's status in the production cycle at the time the dossier is submitted. For faculty doing creative work, different criteria for publication may apply, especially since writers and poets are often not considered for academic jobs until they have established a substantial publication record. Such faculty are expected to continue their publishing activity upon assuming a university position and prior to coming up for tenure and promotion.

- Book disciplines have some subfields (public humanities and digital humanities being two prominent examples) in which books are not the principal means of presenting scholarship. In those fields, candidates may submit, in lieu of a book, major scholarly work appropriate to those subfields, e.g. digital projects, museum exhibitions, or software. In those cases, candidates must be prepared to explain why that work should be considered as scholarship, and external reviewers should be asked to evaluate that work according to standards accepted within those fields. Candidates and evaluators must also be prepared to demonstrate the quality and significance of the scholarship through modes of peer review appropriate to that field (grants, external awards, data regarding use and engagement with the scholarly work in question, etc.). Since work in such fields is often created for a broader, non-academic audience, it should be evaluated in relation to the intended audience--whether that scholarship is communicated appropriately for the intended audience and in ways that encourage readers to develop nuanced understandings of the content.
- Translations may count as the equivalent of a book (see above), but do not always do so. The particulars of how a certain translation will count should be discussed with the relevant personnel well in advance of the tenure process.
- Additional publications (e.g. articles, book chapters, edited volumes), which may contain material in the book, and/or editorship or co-editorship of an edited collection. Note that book reviews and encyclopedia entries usually do not weigh heavily in the promotion and tenure assessment, so candidates should be encouraged not to devote too much energy to such activities.
- Other evidence of substantial national recognition for research endeavors, such as grants; sponsored research; the development of widely-adopted research tools or software, etc.
- Documentary evidence of a second substantial research project. This evidence, which should go beyond a candidate's sketch of the next project in the dossier, may include articles or book chapters, conference papers, grants awarded or external funding sought via a formal application in support of that project.

B. For an article-based research program, the quantity and quality of articles--and authorship order--are determined by the conventions of the discipline. However, it is important to acknowledge that the value that should be placed on collegial, collaborative work, and on the fostering of research by advisors among graduate students, can occasionally be in tension with overly strict qualitative assessments based on those conventions: in other words, the order of authors may not be a simple reflection of whose work predominated in the publication. Additionally, some co-authors make valuable methodological contributions to publications, but are never in a position to serve as lead authors. It will be important, therefore, for promotion and tenure cases in an article discipline to strike an appropriate balance between disciplinary conventions regarding authorship and the equally valuable evidence of scholarly generosity and

collaboration when it comes to the presentation of the case. The following are considered usual components of a promotion and tenure case based on excellence in scholarship:

- Regular publication in highly ranked journals. Since rates of publication vary by fields, candidates should discuss with their department chairs the usual expectation for their field. In addition, this number may vary depending on their impact on the field. In general, quantity does not trump quality: even if the rate of production has been extraordinary, the question of promotion and tenure should rest on the originality and impact of the research, not merely on acts of enumeration. Book chapters and other peer-reviewed publications such as conference proceedings may provide additional evidence of scholarly productivity. Candidates should discuss with relevant personnel how these kinds of publications will count in their field and department.
- For disciplines in which multiple authorship is the norm, the candidate's authorial statuses on papers should be appropriate to his or her research specializations. Often, but not always, there will be a mix of lead and supporting authorships.
- Evidence that scholarship/research has increasingly pursued an independent path from work that may have begun in graduate school and early in the career under the aegis of a faculty supervisor.
- Other evidence of substantial national recognition for research endeavors, such as grants; sponsored research; the development of widely-adopted research tools or software, etc.
- Evidence of ongoing productivity in myriad stages of development, e.g. conference papers, articles under submission, book chapters commissioned, etc.

High competence in teaching:

A faculty member coming up for promotion and tenure is generally considered to have met the standard for high competence in teaching based on myriad forms of assessed activity:

- Strong teaching evaluations
- Clear, and well-thought-through syllabi reflecting knowledge of and engagement with ongoing research protocols in the discipline
- Frank and descriptive peer evaluations in the number prescribed above
- When relevant, evidence of successful supervision of independent work, usually with graduate students, but also including such activities as undergraduate honors theses, work in OSCAR, advising, and research mentoring on preparation of articles for publication.

High competence in service:

In general, it is advisable for departments to avoid giving probationary faculty extraordinary supervisory or programmatic responsibilities, since doing so will not advance their tenure cases as such and the time this work takes often comes at the expense of scholarship. That said, untenured faculty are expected to show evidence of consistent service, usually in the form of committee service within the department. However, departmental expectations about service can

vary, so candidates should discuss the departmental service expectations with the relevant personnel.

II: Excellence in teaching:

As noted above, evidence of strong teaching (e.g., quality of syllabi, laudatory peer reviews, strong student evaluations) constitutes the standard for high pedagogical competence and as such is generally expected of every candidate for tenure. Those seeking promotion and tenure on the basis of excellence in teaching should be prepared to present a substantial case regarding the impact and reputation of the candidate's pedagogy beyond Mason and the Mason classroom. This case should be based on forms of evidence such as the following (please see the Provost's guidelines for other recommended criteria for evaluating genuine excellence in teaching; https://provost.gmu.edu/faculty-matters/faculty-appointments#tenure_track_faculty):

- Significant refereed publications in the scholarship of teaching, equivalent in number and kind to either the protocols of a book or article discipline
- Other evidence of substantial national recognition for classroom endeavors, such as a national award for pedagogical work; grants; sponsored research; related program development that has led to national rankings (e.g., Writing Across the Curriculum); the development of widely-adopted pedagogical tools or software, etc.

High competence in research:

Whether in a book or article department, the candidate coming up for excellence in teaching must also demonstrate high competence in research in a manner consistent with that department or discipline's scholarly protocols. The material to be considered in support of high competence in research should be separate from the material evaluated for demonstrations of genuine excellence in teaching. In a book discipline, for instance, the scholarly profile for high competence in scholarship might present multiple refereed articles in the relevant discipline rather than a book per se. Similarly, in an article discipline, the number of refereed articles published per year might be adjusted downwards. By academic convention the quality of scholarship is evaluated through external review: in addition to the five external letters in support of teaching, the file of the candidate coming up for excellence in teaching and high competence in scholarship should also contain three external letters evaluating research/scholarship, with one letter coming from a scholar of the candidate's choosing and two from the department, for a total of eight.

High competence in service:

In general, it is advisable for departments to avoid giving untenured faculty extraordinary supervisory or programmatic responsibilities, since doing so will not advance their tenure cases as such and the time such work takes often comes at the expense of scholarship. That said, untenured faculty are expected to show evidence of consistent service, usually in the form of

committee responsibility within the department. Conduct of professional service to the field should be consistent with departmental expectation, and probationary faculty are enjoined to discuss these expectations with the relevant personnel in their department.

5. Criteria for Promotion to Full

An associate professor may elect to come up for promotion on the basis either of excellence in research or in teaching, regardless of the basis on which tenure and promotion were achieved. The following are typical portfolios for CHSS faculty coming up for promotion.

Note: As with tenure and promotion, these are only guidelines, not rules or guarantees.

A. For a largely book-based research program, the following are generally required components of a promotion case based on excellence in scholarship/research:

- A second book in print (for more detail on what counts as a “book,” see the bullet points under 4.A).
- Additional peer-reviewed publications since tenure, such as articles, book chapters, introductions to edited collections; editorship or co-editorship of an edited collection
- Other evidence of substantial national recognition for research endeavors, such as grants; sponsored research; the development of widely-adopted research tools or software, etc.
- Evidence of a vital ongoing engagement with the field through attendance and presentation at conferences. While invited talks, lectures, and plenaries are good indices of prominence in the field, in themselves they are not sufficient as a basis for promotion. There must be a concomitant publication record since tenure.
- Book disciplines have some subfields (public humanities and digital humanities being two prominent examples) in which books are not the principal means of presenting scholarship. In those fields, candidates may submit, in lieu of a book, major scholarly work appropriate to those subfields, i.e. digital projects, museum exhibitions, software. In those cases, candidates must be prepared to explain why that work should be considered as scholarship, and external reviewers should be asked to evaluate that work according to standards accepted within those fields. Candidates and evaluators must also be prepared to demonstrate the quality and significance of the scholarship through modes of peer review appropriate to that discipline (grants, external awards, data regarding use and engagement with the scholarly work in question, etc.). Since work in such fields is often created for a broader, non-academic audience, it should be evaluated in relation to the intended audience--whether that scholarship is communicated appropriately for the intended audience and in ways that encourage readers to develop nuanced understandings of the content.

B. For an article-based research program, the quantity and quality of articles--and authorship order--are determined by the conventions of the discipline. However, it is important to acknowledge that the value that should be placed on collegial, collaborative work, and on the

fostering of research by advisors among graduate students, can occasionally be in tension with overly strict qualitative assessments based on those conventions: in other words, the order of authors may not be a simple reflection of whose work predominated in the publication. Additionally, some co-authors make valuable methodological contributions to publications, but are never in a position to serve as lead authors. It will be important, therefore, for promotion and tenure cases in an article discipline to strike an appropriate balance between disciplinary conventions regarding authorship and the equally valuable evidence of scholarly generosity and collaboration when it comes to the presentation of the case. The following are considered usual components of a promotion case based on excellence in scholarship:

- Continued regular publication in highly ranked journals, with additional evidence of growing reputation in the field. Since rates of publication vary by fields, candidates should discuss with their department chairs the usual expectation for their field. In addition, this number may vary depending on their impact on the field. In general, quantity does not trump quality: even if the rate of production has been extraordinary, the question of promotion and tenure should rest on the originality and impact of the research, not merely on acts of enumeration. Book chapters and other peer-reviewed publications may provide additional evidence of scholarly productivity.
- Further development of a research agenda substantially different from that originating in graduate school and evinced by initial post-graduation publications.
- Other evidence of substantial national recognition for research endeavors, such as grants; sponsored research; the development of widely adopted research tools or software, etc.
- Evidence of a vital ongoing engagement with the field through attendance and presentation at conferences. While invited talks, lectures, and plenaries are good indices of prominence in the field, in themselves they are not sufficient as a basis for promotion. There must be a concomitant publication record since tenure.

High competence in teaching:

This is defined much as it was in the probationary period—in other words, the candidate coming up for promotion must supply continued evidence of serious commitment to teaching. Although teaching obligations are often in tension with sponsored research, the successful candidate for promotion to professor must demonstrate that teaching continues to constitute a central part of the career.

In departments with terminal degrees or otherwise substantial graduate enrollments, it is appropriate for faculty to have taken on a greater degree of independent and supervisory work, as with directed readings, fields, theses, and dissertations.

High competence in service:

Faculty past their probationary period should be expected to take on substantial service responsibilities in the college or university while continuing their commitment to departmental

service. The provost's guidelines indicate the desirability for post-tenured faculty to assume roles as institutional leaders. Rather than define it as a separate category, CHSS considers leadership a key component of service for those coming up for promotion to full, as well as for those who have achieved that rank. Practically, this means the candidate for promotion needs to demonstrate a consistent and conscientious role in college or university committees that meet frequently and do the real work of the institution (e.g., Senior Leadership; Long-Range Planning Committee; College Promotion and Tenure), as opposed to those with light charges and infrequent meetings. Leadership at the departmental level, as with faculty who serve as chairs, associate chairs, or program directors, also counts as highly substantial service for the purposes of promotion but should not exempt one entirely from college- or university-level service.

The commitment to increased service needs to be inaugurated shortly after tenure is achieved and is to be sustained, rather than initiated a year or two before the intention of coming up for promotion. The CHSS Promotion and Tenure Committee will take into account the leadership demands of service work presented at the time of promotion when it makes its determination.

Many departments will also expect candidates for promotion to full to demonstrate professional service, such as journal editorships, journal editorial board membership, reviewing books and journal manuscripts, reviewing cases for promotion and tenure for other universities, or leadership positions within relevant professional organizations.

II: Excellence in teaching:

As noted above, evidence of strong teaching (e.g., thoughtful syllabi, laudatory peer reviews, strong student evaluations) constitutes the standard for high pedagogical competence and as such is generally expected of every candidate for promotion. To receive promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching, the following additional evidence is typical of what is required (beyond whatever in this nature was submitted at the time of promotion and tenure):

- Significant refereed publications in the scholarship of teaching, equivalent in number and kind to either the protocols of a book discipline or article department, again not counting any materials already evaluated for tenure
- Other evidence of substantial national recognition for classroom endeavors, such as a national award for pedagogical work; grants; sponsored research; related program development that has led to national rankings (e.g., Writing Across the Curriculum); the development of widely-adopted pedagogical tools or software, etc.

High competence in research:

Whether in a book or article department, the candidate coming up for promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching must also demonstrate high competence in research/scholarship, in a manner consistent with that department or discipline's scholarly protocols. The material to be considered in support of high competence in research should be separate from the material

evaluated for demonstrations of genuine excellence in teaching. In a book discipline, for instance, the scholarly profile for high competence in scholarship might present multiple refereed articles beyond those presented at the time for tenure, rather than a second book per se. Similarly, in an article discipline, the number of additional refereed articles published per year would be adjusted downwards, although the same expectations for quality and authorship should obtain. By academic convention the quality of scholarship is evaluated through external review: in addition to the five external letters in support of teaching, the file of the candidate coming up for excellence in teaching and high competence in scholarship should also contain three external letters evaluating research/scholarship, with one letter coming from a scholar of the candidate's choosing and two from the department, for a total of eight.

High competence in service:

Faculty past their probationary period should be expected to take on highly substantial service responsibilities in the college or university while continuing their commitment to departmental service. The provost's guidelines indicate the desirability for post-tenured faculty to assume roles as institutional leaders. Rather than define it as a separate category, CHSS considers leadership a key component of service for those coming up for full, as well as for those who have achieved that rank. Practically, this means the candidate for promotion needs to demonstrate a consistent and conscientious role in college or university committees that meet frequently and do the real work of the institution (e.g., Senior Leadership; Long-Range Planning Committee; College Promotion and Tenure), as opposed to those with light charges and infrequent meetings. Leadership at the departmental level, as with faculty who serve as chairs, associate chairs, or program directors, also counts as highly substantial service for the purposes of promotion (but should not exempt one entirely from college- or university-level service).

The commitment to increased service needs to be inaugurated shortly after tenure is achieved and to be sustained, rather than initiated a year or two before the intended date of coming up for promotion. The CHSS Promotion and Tenure Committee will take into account the leadership demands of service work presented at the time of promotion when it makes its determination.

Many departments will also expect candidates for promotion to full to demonstrate professional service, such as journal editorships or reviewing, or positions within relevant professional organizations.

6. External Reviewer Qualifications

External reviewers will be solicited at the department level (e.g., by a liaison working with the candidate) according to the following guidelines:

- Suggestions for external reviewers should continue to come from both the candidate and the department, with no more than 40% of the letters supplied by reviewers on the candidate's list. Candidate may also include up to two individuals to exclude from serving as an external reviewer.
- External reviews from the following would constitute a conflict of interest and therefore cannot be submitted for consideration: the candidate's dissertation advisor and committee members; graduate school professors; co-authors; co-editors; co-principal investigators on grants/contracts, and faculty or administrators that are part of the same center/institute with which the candidate is professionally affiliated. External reviews from the following would not be considered conflicts of interest: editors of books or special editions of journals to which candidates have provided a chapter or an article; co-panelists at professional meetings; co-members of advisory boards. External reviewers should include a statement in their letters indicating whether they have had any prior professional or personal contact with the candidate, and if so the nature and extent of that contact.
- When a candidate's research dossier reflects a multidisciplinary focus, external reviews ought to come from each discipline represented in the dossier. Units should also strive to find reviewers who can comment upon and evaluate research across disciplines. Units may also ask reviewers to comment specifically on those discipline-based research topics and methods they are most comfortable evaluating in their reviews.
- In most cases, external reviewers should hold, at a minimum, the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

7. Appeals

Appeals to tenure or promotion decisions will be addressed according to the process described in the latest Faculty Handbook.
