I. General Guidelines

This document describes the criteria, policies, and procedures to be used in evaluating faculty candidates for renewal, promotion, and tenure at the School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (S-CAR). It follows the criteria, policies, and procedures outlined in the current version of the George Mason University Faculty Handbook and the relevant material provided by the Office of the Provost.

The S-CAR Promotion and Tenure Committee (S-CAR P&T Committee), a Standing Committee of the S-Car Faculty Board, comprises all tenured faculty members of S-CAR. The S-CAR P&T Committee serves as the review committee for all faculty seeking renewal, promotion, or tenure at S-CAR, including term faculty seeking promotion to associate or full professor. P&T Committee members under review shall recuse themselves from participating in all deliberations and from voting on their own case. A committee member who has any special connection past or present to a person under review for promotion or tenure shall recuse themselves from the case. Such connections include, but are not limited to, domestic, familial, or intimate relationships; extended research or practice partnerships that are outside of ordinary collaborations among or between faculty members of S-CAR; joint financial interests; and prior history of grievances.

Only committee members with the rank of full professor may review, vote on, and make recommendations on promotion cases from associate to full professor. With the exception of cases involving promotion to full professor and cases in which a specific committee member has recused themselves from considering a particular case for cause, all members of the S-CAR P&T Committee are expected to participate in person or electronically in all deliberations and to vote on all cases. Approval requires a simple majority of those voting. In this document the S-CAR P&T Committee’s work on a case is called the “first tier” review.

Each year the S-CAR Dean appoints a “second tier” committee of at least three persons to review cases for promotion and tenure following the first tier review conducted at the unit level. Second tier committee members are faculty from George Mason University who have familiarity with the interdisciplinary field of conflict analysis and resolution. Cases for promotion from associate to full professor will be reviewed by full professors, although associate professors can serve on the second tier committee.

Candidates for renewal, promotion, and tenure should regularly seek guidance from the Dean, the Chair of S-CAR P&T, and other faculty who are willing to serve as mentors, particularly when faced with requests related to teaching and service. Candidates can pursue tenure and promotion on the basis of Genuine Excellence in Research or Genuine Excellence in Teaching, or both, and must identify their preference to the Dean and the Chair of the S-CAR P&T at the beginning of the Spring semester in the AY prior to the review process but ideally well before that time.
II. Dossier Guidelines

The dossier submitted by a candidate should comply with the Provost’s Promotion and Tenure Casebook Template, which can be found in Appendix A. The dossier should be prepared for electronic submission. The Chair of S-CAR P&T can advise on the form that the dossier should take and the S-CAR Director of Knowledge Management can assist with any technical questions. The candidate should submit the following items, which include several beyond those indicated in the Provost’s Casebook Template:

1) a curriculum vita;
2) a statement about teaching, research, and scholarship (including practice) that also addresses future plans (not to exceed 8 pages);
3) scholarly publications (See Section IV.B.3 below for guidance as to the most highly valued publications and organize them accordingly). Works in progress should be submitted only if they are significant contributions to the potential publication record, such as a book manuscript under review;
4) letters from co-authors or co-editors that establish the extent of the candidate’s contribution to co-authored or co-edited publications and from co-practitioners on significant practice activities;
5) grants and awards (e.g., abstracts, letters of award, a list of all grants submitted, and other material may be included);
6) evidence of teaching quality, including
   a) student course evaluations for every course taught during the previous 8 semesters;
   b) other evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., syllabi; communications from students or peers);
   c) evidence of educational work with students outside the classroom;
   d) evidence related to advising;
   e) a list of theses and dissertation committee participation, including chair and reader duties);
   f) evidence of support for undergraduate research;
   g) course syllabi and evidence of curricular development;
   h) honors and awards related to teaching;
7) evidence of multidisciplinary collaborations in teaching, research, and scholarship (including practice);
8) other supporting evaluative materials (e.g., testimony about service, outreach, or practice; evidence of academic entrepreneurship, etc.) (Candidate narratives of accomplishments should not exceed 8 pages).

III. Timeline

Each year the Provost issues a timeline for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion, and Term Promotion cases, and the deadlines provided therein will determine the schedule for S-CAR P&T activities. The timeline in Appendix B sets out the internal S-CAR deadlines, taking into account the deadlines generally set annually by the Provost’s Office. The candidate shall be informed in a timely manner of the recommendation made at each stage of evaluation process.
Occasionally, the School may be asked to approve a candidate for a tenured appointment outside the normal timeline and usually at the nomination of the Provost or the Dean. The Dean and P&T Chair shall determine an appropriate schedule for review of the candidate in strict adherence with the criteria for judging the quality of the dossier.

IV. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

These criteria, adopted in Spring 2014, by the S-CAR Tenure and Promotion Committee, are guidelines reflecting the Committee’s understanding of the criteria that should apply when considering a candidate’s qualifications for tenure or promotion with regard to his or her teaching, scholarship and/or practice, and service. These criteria supplement, and do not replace, those stated in the George Mason University Faculty Handbook, as amended, and are not intended to create any contractual rights or duties as between the University and the candidate for tenure or promotion.

The order of presentation of the criteria discussed below does not imply any weighting of these criteria by the Committee. The Faculty Handbook makes it clear that the University requires tenure-track candidates to achieve a standard of “genuine excellence” in either teaching or scholarship and at least “high competence” in both for tenure track promotion. In evaluating term faculty for promotion, the Committee follows the guidelines offered in the GMU Faculty Handbook: “Candidates for promotion to associate professor must demonstrate at least high competence in the focus area (teaching, research, or clinical) by the standards developed locally and approved by the Provost. Candidates for promotion to full professor must demonstrate genuine excellence in the focus area (teaching, research, or clinical) by the standards developed locally and approved by the Provost” (Section 2.3.3). The Handbook also makes it clear that academic achievements related to “the practice of a profession” are to be considered in evaluating the candidate’s dossier. Finally, the Handbook describes the general criteria to be applied in cases of promotion to associate or full professor. The criteria described below are intended to flesh out the Committee’s understanding of these terms in the S-CAR context. With respect to the

A. Criteria with Respect to Teaching

One of the factors considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee in making recommendations with regard to tenure is the quality of the candidate's teaching. The Committee's recommendations will generally be based upon the criteria and data described below. The Provost’s Guidelines for Genuine Excellence in Teaching will serve as a guide for determining whether a candidate’s teaching merits the designation of genuine excellence (see Appendix C). It is assumed that the candidate will provide the Committee with a dossier including, inter alia, all relevant course syllabi and references to or copies of instructional materials, as well as a statement describing her/his perspective on classroom teaching and a description of the teaching methods used. The extent to which the candidate has made contributions to the curriculum in the form of new courses, revised courses, innovative teaching methods, etc., should be made clear in the statement. The candidate may also provide rationale for scores obtained on University’s student evaluations of teaching. The Committee will gather
additional materials for evaluation of teaching, such as peer evaluations based on classroom observation and co-teaching, letters solicited from students and alumni, and surveys and/or focus groups with students.

(1) **Quality of course design and instructional materials.** The Committee will examine the relevant syllabi and instructional materials to determine whether the course design and instructional materials are well-suited to fulfill the purposes of the courses taught and include up-to-date perspectives. The evaluation will consider the extent to which the courses taught contribute to the development of the S-CAR curriculum in welcome and significant ways, such as developing courses in new topic areas or significantly revising existing courses.

(2) **Creativity and effectiveness of teaching methods.** The Committee will examine the relevant syllabi and instructional materials, student evaluation forms, peer observation reports, student work, teaching statement to determine whether the teaching methods used have been creatively and effectively employed to fulfill the purposes of the course. Collaborative and experiential approaches, if effective, will be considered strengths. In addition, the Committee will solicit input from students and alumni who will be offered an opportunity to write letters describing their experiences as a student or advisee of the candidate and will consider other appropriate items included in the dossier, such as unsolicited student letters or student work (with permission),

(3) **Responsiveness and availability to students.** The Committee will examine student evaluation forms, and will solicit input from students and alumni, to determine whether the applicant is considered to be sufficiently responsive to legitimate student needs and available to students for advising and consultation.

(4) **Extent and quality of mentorship, service on doctoral dissertation committees, master’s thesis committees, and supervision of research and practice projects (including undergraduate).** The Committee will take into account contributions made by the candidate to the S-CAR academic program by way of providing quality service as a chair or member of doctoral dissertation and master’s thesis committees, and by way of mentoring students at all levels in their quests for academic and professional achievement, including supervision of field-based research and practice projects.

(5) **Extent and quality of contributions to the University’s academic development.** The Committee will take into account contributions made by the candidate to the University’s academic development by way of teaching, extra-S-CAR thesis and dissertation supervision, service on committees related to teaching and curriculum, participating in teaching workshops and conferences, and other academic activities performed for the benefit of the University outside S-CAR.

**B. Criteria with Respect to Research and Scholarship**

According to the GMU Faculty Handbook (Section 2.4.2), 2013 revision, for purposes of promotion and tenure the following general criteria apply to the area of research and scholarship:
"Scholarly achievement is demonstrated by original publications and peer-reviewed contributions to the advancement of the discipline/field of study or the integration of the discipline with other fields; by original research, artistic work, software and media, exhibitions and performance; and by the application of discipline- or field-based knowledge to the practice of a profession."

These criteria are broadly suitable to the mission of scholars and researchers at S-CAR, insofar as they mention integration of discipline-based research and scholarship with other fields (say, sociology or anthropology to conflict resolution); and insofar as they recognize the validity of the application of such research and scholarship to practice. The Handbook also mentions criteria of “(high) competence and genuine excellence” to be applied to assessment of a candidate's full dossier (that is, one that includes teaching and service). With these in mind, we add three more criteria to be used in the assessment of research and scholarship:

(1) **Degree of Significance.** The research or scholarship should advance the field in some way. “Highly competent” work should make original and solid contributions to existing areas of interest or research agendas. “Genuinely excellent” work should push the borders of the field, redirecting or restructuring it, and creating new research agendas.

(2) **Quality of Methodology.** Given the multi-disciplinary nature of faculty and work at S-CAR, we recognize the validity of a range of methodologies typically used in the social sciences and the humanities. Research should be well designed and suited to the project questions. In other words projects should be methodologically sound.

(3) **Degree of Relevance to the Field.** Given the multi-disciplinary nature of our field, a wide variety of publication venues are acceptable at S-CAR, including disciplinary-based journals and those focused on conflict studies, peace studies, and conflict resolution. Certain categories of publication are valued more highly than others, as is indicated in the lists below. Distinctions as to quality are also made with each category. Candidates should seek advice from mentors, the chair of P&T, and the Dean to discuss the relative merits and worth of particular presses or journals.

Highly valued forms of publication include:

(a) Peer-reviewed books  
(b) Peer-reviewed edited books  
(c) Peer-reviewed journal articles  
(d) Peer-reviewed book chapters (including ones where the candidate is the volume's editor)

Other venues are evaluated to the extent that candidates can make the case that they satisfy the main criteria listed in the Faculty Handbook and items (1)-(3) above. Such venues include:

(e) Books (no peer review)
(f) Edited books (no peer review)
(g) Journal articles (no peer review)
(h) Book chapters (no peer review)
(i) Review essays or articles
(j) Encyclopedia articles
(k) Book reviews
(l) Popular media essays or articles

With respect to (a) through (k) above, the candidate should provide evidence of any publications that have had broad influence on public discourse, as the committee may consider such work a highly valued contribution to the field.

As per the Faculty Handbook, a candidate’s dossier can include evidence of “the application of discipline- or field-based knowledge to the practice of a profession.” The definition of practice in the field of conflict resolution has broadened in recent years to include a wide variety of interventions in conflict situations, ranging from classical “third-party” practices (e.g., mediation, problem-solving workshops) to community dialogues, policy-oriented forums, media appearances intended to shape public discourse, engaged or participatory action research, scholarship as praxis, and many other forms of facilitated intervention. This being said, practice conducted within an academic institution should distinguish itself from practice conducted in community mediation centers or advocacy organizations by self-conscious and systematic efforts to found practice on relevant theory, to critique theory in the light of the discoveries and outcomes of practice, and to publish or otherwise circulate the results of these inquiries in forms available to practitioners, theorists, students, and other interested parties.

Practitioners seeking tenure or promotion should be able to present a written form of documentation of their practice activities that can be discussed by others. Scholars who practice conflict resolution at academic institutions are expected to develop research agendas based on empirical and normative criteria for what constitutes an effective practice. Scholarly publications that result from research will be evaluated using the three criteria above, along with those in the Faculty Handbook. Such documentation should be prepared with the following criteria in mind:

(4) Quality of the Description of the Practice and Goals. Practitioners should be able to describe the content and methods of their practice, the skills employed, the goals of the practice, and how the particular design they use is best suited to achieve these goals.

(5) Quality of the Explanation of How and Why the Practice Works. Practitioners should be able to anchor their practice and the skills derived from it in theory, whether from the field of psychology, communication, sociology, religious studies, peace studies, conflict resolution, or any relevant field. The methodologies for developing modes of practice and practice skills should be articulated in light of this theoretical background, and the validity of the theories employed should be assessed in light of the discoveries made and outcomes obtained in practice.

(6) Quality of the Practice Evaluation. Practitioners should be aware of the latest developments in the growing field of practice evaluation and produce evidence relating to the impact or effectiveness of the practice.
(7) **Significance of Impact.** If possible under the circumstances, the practice should be described in a way that makes it possible to evaluate its effectiveness and to assess the relationship between types of skills and processes, practice outcomes, and relevant circumstances with the proviso that the practice can have effects on multiple constituencies and in various contexts (e.g., an effect on the practice field, on the parties to the conflict, or on public discourse, among other possibilities).

(8) **Extent of Innovation.** Highly valued forms of practice will offer novel approaches to project design, implementation, or evaluation. Moreover, pushing the borders of the field, redirecting or restructuring it, and creating new practice agendas and standards will be considered strengths.

Evidence of practice can take multiple forms, including the following:

(a) Description of practice activities by the candidate in the Statement on Research, Scholarship, and Practice.

(b) Project-related documents, such as proposals, workshop materials, project design descriptions, and evaluation design, etc., with the proviso that these be used by the candidate to illustrate the description of the practice.

(c) Solicited and unsolicited reviews of the practice by
   i) participants in the practice activities
   ii) co-practitioners
   iii) individuals recognized in the broader field as experts in practice

(d) Publications about the practice written by scholars and/or practitioners other than the candidate

(e) Media accounts of the practice

NOTE: Some material related to practice may need to be kept confidential, which might limit the candidate’s ability to write in a detailed manner about the practice. To the extent possible the Committee should be made aware of any constraints related to confidentiality. Confidential material should be clearly marked as such, and outside reviewers will be alerted to its status.

Writing proposals and raising funds for research and practice are inherent in the process of scholarly work. Evidence of proposal writing will be an additional strength in evaluation of research, particularly when the tenure-track faculty members require funds for their research and practice. Achieving funds to support their research and practice will be considered as a strength. If the tenure-track faculty member is working in an area where funding is unnecessary, however, that will not be regarded as an indication of any weakness in the record of research and practice. It is not expected that tenure-track faculty will write proposals for more general institutional funding or development. Securing funds for most other non-research or teaching activities will not be of any particular value in the tenure dossier, although securing funds to build the field will be considered a strength.

**C. Criteria with Respect to Service**

The Committee recognizes several types of service that candidates for tenure or promotion may cite in demonstrating their fulfillment of this criterion. In the case of a highly interactive
organization (internally and externally) like S-CAR, it is expected that the candidate will have made substantial contributions in her or his chosen fields of service.

(1) **Service to S-CAR and the University.** It is assumed that the candidate will attend faculty board meetings regularly and fulfill his or her committee assignments. Additional service activities recognized by the Committee include, but are not limited to, chairing S-CAR committees; supervising S-CAR working groups; organizing lectures, forums, workshops, or other in-house projects; mentoring faculty colleagues; participating in the activities of the Centers; serving on University committees or bodies; organizing University projects; and making public appearances on behalf of S-CAR and/or the University.

(2) **Service to the field.** Service to the field of conflict analysis and resolution and related fields that is recognized by the Committee includes, but is not limited to, activities such as attending conferences and workshops (particularly when presenting a paper or participating in a panel discussion); assisting a relevant NGO or other practice- or field-based organization; mentoring non-S-CAR colleagues and students; editing a journal in the field; and making public appearances as a representative of the field.

(3) **Service to the community.** Service to the community recognized by the Committee include, but are not limited to, speaking at or otherwise serving relevant community-based organizations, volunteering conflict resolution services of the kind that would not be defined above as “Practice,” and serving the community in connection with a University-based program (e.g., mentoring high school students) or as an S-CAR or University representative. As used here, “community” refers both to the Greater Washington, D.C., area and to any other geographical or human community of which the candidate feels a part.

**V. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

The criteria for promotion in section IV above apply to candidates seeking promotion to full professor. Moreover, a candidate seeking promotion to full professor is expected to have added significantly to the record of achievement post-tenure. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to achieve Genuine Excellence in either Research and Scholarship (including practice) or Teaching and no less than High Competence in the other areas under evaluation. With respect to the assessment of Research and Scholarship, the criterion Degree of Significance (under Scholarship and Research in Section IV.B.1 above) and/or the criterion Significance of Impact (under Scholarship and Research in Section IV.B.7 above) should include a determination that the candidate has achieved national and/or international recognition. Candidates seeking promotion to full professor are expected to have demonstrated leadership in all areas under evaluation, namely Research and Scholarship (including Practice), Teaching, and Service. Evidence of leadership in Research and Scholarship (including Practice) can include, for instance, editing a significant journal or book series, advancing an innovative approach in research, scholarship, and/or practice that gains broad acclaim, or securing external funding as measured by the prestige of the granting agency and/or the amount of research expenditure. Evidence of leadership in Teaching can include, for example, significant examples of curricular development and innovation, influential publications related to teaching. With respect to leadership in Service, candidates are expected to have contributed actively and significantly to
the governance of the unit through, for instance, mentoring junior colleagues and serving on important unit committees and/or representing S-CAR on major university committees.

VI. External Reviewer Selection

In the case of a candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, professional reviews of a candidate’s dossier will be solicited from outstanding individuals in the candidate’s field and area of scholarship. A majority of the outside reviewers shall be tenured faculty members. External reviewers should not have conflicts of interest, meaning no co-authors, no dissertation committee chairs, no family members or intimate partners, and no one with a financial interest in the candidate’s career.

As per the University Handbook, each case must have a minimum of five letters, with no more than 40% of the reviewers chosen by the candidate. The candidate will be asked to provide up to four names of individuals who would be suitable as reviewers, in ranked order in a sealed envelop delivered to the chair of the S-CAR P&T Committee. The candidate may also name several individuals to exclude as reviewers. These names will be held confidentially until the S-CAR P&T Committee creates a ranked list of at least eight possible reviewers. Upon looking at the names provided by the candidate, committee members will consider any duplicate names to be committee choices, not candidate choices. As reviewers are contacted, the aim will be to receive six to eight letters total, with four to six letters from individuals chosen by the committee, depending on the total.

The Chair of P&T will contact reviewers via a letter that conforms to guidance from the Provost. An electronic copy of the dossier will be provided to each reviewer and copies of books, if they so request. Reviewers are asked to include a C.V. along with their review.

Every effort will be made to keep the list of reviewers, their affiliations, and their letters confidential and shared only with the relevant faculty committees and administrative offices involved in promotion and tenure decisions. Under no circumstances should the candidate be apprised of the final list of reviewers or provided with the reviewers’ letters.

VII. Revision of these Guidelines

Revisions of these guidelines in the future may be accomplished through a simple majority vote by the S-CAR P&T Committee members, within the parameters of the most recent version of the Faculty Handbook and any guidance from the Provost’s Office.
APPENDIX A

Promotion and Tenure Casebook Template:

(Additional Items and Supplementary books should be submitted, only if requested.)

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

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

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

3. Candidate’s employment chronology, particularly at GMU to include: date of hire, date when appointed to a tenure track position and tenure and promotion dates, prior to full professorship.

4. Candidate’s vita, including clear evidence about research – publications, grant and contract awards, conferences and invited talks, etc. Evidence of relevant entrepreneurial activities may also be provided for consideration toward promotion or tenure.

5. Candidate’s statement about teaching and research, including future plans (not to exceed 8 pages).

6. Outside letters:
   a. Minimum of 5
   b. This section should also contain the letter sent to the referees, and evidence of referee credentials.
   c. Units may allow candidate to suggest up to 40% of the outside referees; they may also allow candidate to name one or two individuals to exclude; candidates in no case will see the final list of referees.

7. Evidence of teaching quality:
   a. Student course evaluations
   b. When applicable, theses and dissertations supervised; mentoring and advising activity
   c. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as:
      (1) Class visits by peers
      (2) Random sample letters
(3) Student comments based on the whole population, not selected samples

(4) Alumni letters

(5) Student focus groups.

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

PLEASE NOTE: An electronic copy of the procedural checklist for Promotion and Tenure Cases can be found on the Office of the Provost website.
## APPENDIX B

### S-CAR Promotion and Tenure Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure and Promotion (Associate)</th>
<th>Promotion to Full</th>
<th>Term Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By February 1 of AY before review Dean, Chair of P&amp;T, and candidates agree that a review will take place in the coming AY.</td>
<td>By February 1 of AY before review Dean, Chair of P&amp;T, and candidates agree that a review will take place in the coming AY.</td>
<td>By February 1 of AY before review Dean, Chair of P&amp;T, and candidates agree that a review will take place in the coming AY.</td>
<td>By February 1 of AY before review Dean, Chair of P&amp;T, and candidates agree that a review will take place in the coming AY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 1 of AY before review P&amp;T Chair meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines, timeline, and procedures.</td>
<td>By May 1 of AY before review: P&amp;T Chair meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines, timeline, and procedures; candidate submits sealed list of possible peer reviewers to P&amp;T Chair.</td>
<td>By May 1 of AY before review: P&amp;T Chair meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines, timeline, and procedures; candidate submits sealed list of possible peer reviewers to P&amp;T Chair.</td>
<td>By May 1 of AY before review: P&amp;T Chair meets with candidates to review dossier guidelines, timeline, and procedures; candidate submits sealed list of possible peer reviewers to P&amp;T Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 15 candidate sends dossier to P&amp;T Chair; review begins.</td>
<td>By May 30 selection and confirmation of external peer reviewers is complete.</td>
<td>By May 30 selection and confirmation of external peer reviewers is complete.</td>
<td>By May 30 selection and confirmation of external peer reviewers is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 15, P&amp;T Chair forwards dossier and review to Dean.</td>
<td>By July 1 candidate submits dossier to P&amp;T Chair, who distributes dossier to external reviewers.</td>
<td>By July 1 candidate submits dossier to P&amp;T Chair, who distributes dossier to external reviewers.</td>
<td>By July 1 candidate submits dossier to P&amp;T Chair, who distributes dossier to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By March 1 Dean sends dossier and reviews to Provost.</td>
<td>By September 15 letters have been received from external reviewers; first tier review begins.</td>
<td>By September 15 letters have been received from external reviewers; first tier review begins.</td>
<td>By September 15 letters have been received from external reviewers and P&amp;T review begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By November 30 first tier sends dossier and review to second tier committee.</td>
<td>By November 30 first tier sends dossier and review to second tier committee.</td>
<td>By October 15 P&amp;T Chair sends dossier and review to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By January 15 second tier sends dossier and all reviews to Dean.</td>
<td>By January 15 second tier sends dossier and all reviews presented to Dean.</td>
<td>By November 1 Dean sends dossier and all reviews to Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By February 1 Dean sends dossier and all reviews to Provost.</td>
<td>By February 1 Dean sends dossier and all reviews to Provost.</td>
<td>By mid-Spring Provost reviews cases and issues recommendation.</td>
<td>By mid-Spring Provost reviews cases and issues recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By mid-Spring Provost reviews cases and issues recommendation.</td>
<td>By mid-Spring Provost reviews cases and issues recommendation.</td>
<td>By mid-Spring Provost reviews cases and issues recommendation.</td>
<td>By mid-Spring Provost reviews cases and issues recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By late-Spring President and Board of Visitors review cases and issue recommendations.</td>
<td>By late-Spring President and Board of Visitors review cases and issue recommendations.</td>
<td>By late-Spring President and Board of Visitors review cases and issue recommendations.</td>
<td>By late-Spring President and Board of Visitors review cases and issue recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Recommended Criteria for Evaluating Genuine Excellence in Teaching

1. Outstanding classroom teaching and learning outcomes, as evidenced by the usual measures, including but not limited to student evaluations. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness includes peer observations; letters of support from students, alumni, and colleagues (solicited and unsolicited); student comments based on the whole population, not selected samples; and/or student focus groups. Thoughtful reflection on teaching will be sought in the teaching statement.

2. Effective teaching is demonstrated by the clarity, appropriateness, and efficacy of course materials, methods and presentations, and by successful learning outcomes. Example syllabi, other course materials created by the candidate, and student work used with permission can be used as sources of evidence.

3. When applicable, evidence of educational work with students outside the classroom. For example, supervising undergraduate research, master’s theses, and dissertations; advising and mentoring activities; and/or clinical and field supervision of students.

4. Faculty leadership in promoting student learning and teaching excellence. For example, developing successful and innovative curricula and programs; developing instructional materials; teaching-related training, supervising, and mentoring of other faculty and graduate students; developing teaching innovations (e.g., the use of technology); leading team-teaching initiatives; and/or building support for educational partnerships within and across institutions.

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

6. Maintenance of at least highly competent research, evidenced by the usual measures, including outside letters.

7. Evidence of teaching and learning impact beyond the classroom. This involves some combination of conference presentations, workshops, performances, or exhibitions; invitations to other places; texts or teaching materials, including electronic; or articles on teaching and/or learning outcomes (see also #3 above). External funding for curricular development, piloting teaching methods, or advising could serve in this category also.

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

(Office of the Provost, 3-2-2009)