Recommendations for Promotion: Active Status, Regular Faculty

Application Deadline: Friday, December 19, 2014

The review and assessment of candidates for promotion should be undertaken with the same rigorous documentation following the same general procedures as review of tenure cases. Letters of transmittal by Chair and Dean should address with equal specificity the criteria for promotion established by the school and department.

Because no set term exists for decisions concerning promotion, we have some leeway to allow for construction of the strongest possible dossier. Chairs who are in any doubt concerning the readiness of a particular case should consider a confidential consultation with their Dean to seek a tentative assessment of the probable response of the School 's tenure and promotion committee to the candidate 's record as represented in the curriculum vita. The Schools and Deans will normally consider tenure cases first and promotion cases second. To be assured of action during this academic year, the deadline for completed dossiers and recommendations for promotion to be received by Faculty Affairs is no later than Friday, December 19, 2014.

Application Process

The following items must be submitted to the SMHS Office of Faculty Affairs:

- One complete paper copy of the completed application with all appendices and attachments—*with the exception of the three journal articles*.
- One set of the three journal articles must be submitted by e-mail to Jeffrey Sich (jsich@gmail.com) *as a single PDF*. The three publications should be *the original PDFs from the journal* in which they were published and should not be scanned from a printed copy of the paper. An exception will be made for book chapters but care should be taken that high-quality, readable copies are submitted.
**Things to Remember**

- The application will not be sent to the School’s Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee until it is complete (all sections submitted and proper documentation on outside letters of evaluation is provided—see below). Because of the strict deadline established by the Provost’s Office for receipt of applications from the Dean, the complete application must be submitted by Friday, December 19 at the latest.

- Please be sure that the *Curriculum Vitae* follows the SMHS format (see Appendix 2).

- The Departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee must review the application before it is submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The Provost’s Office requires that a vote of the Committee be taken and that the vote is submitted as part of the Chair’s recommendation (number for; number against; number of abstentions; number of members absent or not voting).

- The Chair’s letter must follow the format in Appendix 6. The letter must include vote of the departmental APT Committee (as described above) plus three clearly labeled sections covering Evaluation of Teaching, Evaluation of Research/Scholarship and Evaluation of Service.

- Obtaining outside letters of evaluation is challenging and the process should begin as soon as possible. Be sure to follow the guidelines from the Provost’s Office. Sample letters and forms are provided in the Appendix.

- Because the Provost does not require them, submission of letters of recommendation is *optional*. If they are included, please insert them at the end of the application with a Title Page marked “Optional Letters of Recommendation.”
APPENDIX 1

Office of the Provost

Guidelines for the Tenure and Promotion Dossiers

The tenure and/or promotion process for faculty leads to major milestones in their careers, and these decisions, difficult as they are, are among the most important decisions we, as faculty and administrators, make. For this reason, it is important that the dossiers of the candidates be compiled carefully to facilitate what necessarily must be a very rigorous process, with the ability to reflect the diversity of accomplishments used as evidence of the quality of teaching, research, and service that are in different disciplines.

It is well known that we are systematically strengthening GW as a research university. At the same time we place a high value on teaching excellence. GW needs faculty members who can build strong teaching on a foundation of strong engagement in scholarship. In tenure decisions, we need evidence bearing on the faculty member’s commitment to, and capacity for, growth. For promotion to full professor, we look for a history of contributions and likelihood of continuing contributions to the field and to GW.

In 2010 in consultation with the school deans, a significant change was made in the number of external review letters each case should contain. Specifically, it is required that each case has letters from five external reviewers. Waivers of this requirement are allowed in situations where this requirement cannot be practically met. Waiver requests should come from the school dean to the provost for approval.

Ultimately, the dossier should be such that it allows all those involved in the review process, either as recommenders or decision makers, to draw informed conclusions. This is especially important once the dossier leaves the originating department and moves through the school’s tenure and promotion committee, to the dean, and finally to the provost. The key is having dossiers that are useful within and external to the originating department, especially in the sense that they are meaningful to reviewers outside the candidate’s discipline.

More and more of our departments now have extensive and rigorous review procedures in place. However, please read this guideline document carefully, and share it with your colleagues. You may find some aspects of your process that can be enhanced, or you may have a component in your process that you wish to recommend for sharing with others. As mentioned, we are striving to have
dossiers that have complete information and a process that is comparable across schools. As in the past, these guidelines are to serve as the *minimum standard* for a dossier that will withstand the rigors of review at all levels. Different departments may choose to provide additional information in their respect dossiers as long as this is done similarly for candidates in the same field. Finally, in instances in which there is not a consensus regarding the merits of the case, additional external assessments of the scholarly record are likely to be solicited.

Following review by the school’s promotion and tenure committee and the dean, the dean should prepare a letter of recommendation that transmits the dossier—including all relevant documents mentioned below—to the Office of Faculty Personnel. *Please hold any supplementary materials in the dean’s office.*

The importance of the tenure and/or promotion process at GW cannot be over-emphasized. Your close attention to these guidelines as well as any supplementary guidelines issued by your dean is greatly appreciated.

---

**Contents of Dossiers**

From the view of presenting a dossier to support a recommendation that a faculty member be tenured and/or promoted and to provide one that is easy to review and contains the key data and evaluations to underpin the recommendation, a dossier should contain six sections *in the order shown* below.

*(NOTE FROM OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS: We suggest that you insert a Title Page for each of the five sections in front of the required items. This significantly improves the ability of readers to find the appropriate sections during review).*

Detailed comments on each of the required elements follows the list of items.

1) **Transmitting Letters**
   - From the Dean
   - From the Chair of the School’s promotion and tenure committee (this will be added by the Office of Faculty Affairs prior to submission to the Provost)
   - From the Department Chair

2) **Curriculum Vitae of Candidate** *(MUST be in GW SHMS Format. See Appendices.)*
3) Teaching
- Teaching Statement and Reflection by Candidate (3 pages maximum; REQUIRED)
- Courses Taught
  - Courses taught during period of evaluation
  - Illustrative example
- Teaching Effectiveness
  - Internal peer reviews
  - Student feedback and comments provided by department.
  - Teaching awards or other special recognition related to teaching.
- Development, Continual Improvement and Pedagogical Innovations
- Impact on Department, GW, and the Discipline

4) Research/Scholarship
- Research Statement and Reflection by Candidate (3 pages maximum; REQUIRED—NEW IN 2015)
- Outside evaluations
  - Narrative from Chair describing the selection process for external evaluators, particularly which evaluators. This should include:
    - List of names recommended by the candidate
    - List of names recommended by the departmental APT committee or Division Chief.
    - List of evaluators to whom letters were sent but who did not reply.
  - Brief description of each evaluator’s credentials
  - Copy of materials submitted to external evaluators
- External evaluation letters

5) External/University/Departmental Service
- Service statement and reflection by candidate (3 pages maximum; REQUIRED—NEW IN 2015)
- Special recognition for service
- Evaluation summary. The SMHS had traditionally fulfilled this requirement by including Letters of Recommendation in the dossier. The requirements:
  - For Associate Professor a minimum of two letters of recommendation, one of which must be from outside the institution (Referees must hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher).
  - For Professor a minimum of three letters of recommendation, one of which must be from outside the institution. (Referees must hold the rank of Professor or equivalent).

6) Publications
Three recent publications. Please provide the PDFs of the papers available from the publisher of the journal.
- peer reviewed for tenure / tenure-track dossiers
- peer reviewed preferred for non-tenure track dossiers
Dual School Appointments
Recommendations for the tenure (and/or promotion) of faculty holding primary appointments in more than one School require the approval of both Deans. Thus, the Chair needs to assure that recommendations meet the criteria and the procedures of both Schools. Normally, copies of the dossier and letter of transmittal should be sent simultaneously to both Deans.

Detailed Description of Dossier Sections
In the following sections, guidance is provided on minimal expectations in the structure of portfolios, layout of curriculum vitae, letters from the department chair, chair of the school’s promotion and tenure committee, and the dean, and layout of the dossier itself.

1. Transmitting Letters
The transmitting letters set the tone of the dossier. It is expected that each of these letters will be intrinsically independent and written from the perspective of the responsibility level of the individual. For example, the Dean’s letter should convey clearly his/her concurrence or non-concurrence with the department’s recommendation and the basis for this conclusion. Moreover, the Dean has the perspective from across his/her school to provide background on the strength of the case or other pertinent information relevant to the recommendation.

The Dean’s conclusion benefits, many times significantly, from the due-diligence carried out by the School’s P&T committee, thus making that committee’s report important. Besides carefully conveying the analysis done by the P&T committee in their evaluation of the department’s recommendation, the P&T committee Chair should be sure to include the committee’s vote (including number of members absent or abstaining) as part of its recommending comments to the Dean.

Since this whole process begins with the Department Chair’s letter, this letter can be pivotal in the recommendations to the Dean. In some Departments, the personnel committee writes this letter, but in any case, it should be reviewed by all those who vote on the decision to assure it is as accurate and complete as possible. For ease of reading, the letter should begin with a statement or the recommendation along with the departmental vote underpinning it (including number of eligible voters absent or abstaining). After that, using the materials submitted by the candidate or collected by the department as the basis, a thorough written evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, research/scholarship, and service should follow. These latter three sections of the Department Chair’s letter set the stage and tone for reviewers outside the department. Finally, from the view of the strategic programmatic directions of the Department, it is of value to have the Chair comment on the candidate’s contributions to achieving those aims.
2. Curriculum Vitae
The candidate’s Curriculum Vitae gives the reviewer a quick snapshot of where the candidate stands.
See the template in Appendix 2.

3. Teaching
- Teaching statement and reflection: Past, Present, and Future. In no more than three pages, with specific examples from courses taught, the candidates will describe their approach to teaching, what they have learned from their teaching, how they have sought to improve their teaching, and how they will continue to develop their program of teaching.
- Courses taught during period of evaluation.
  - Course list. List of courses taught, the enrollment, whether graduate or undergraduate, and whether a new preparation or redesign was required.
  - Illustrative example. For at least one course from the list above and using no more than one page per course, candidate will list the learning objectives/outcomes and the topics, the teaching approach, some of the learning activities, and some example assessments of learning outcomes used.
- Teaching Effectiveness
  - Internal peer reviews. Departments are encouraged to provide reviews from more than one peer who observes the candidate’s teaching. Peer evaluations are especially valuable when they are done longitudinally over several years prior to the candidate’s year of review.
  - Student feedback, both numerical scores and comments, provided by department.
  - Teaching awards or other special recognition of teaching.
- Development, Continual Improvement and Pedagogical Innovations. Description of efforts taken to develop or apply new techniques in teaching to improve learning.
- Impact on Department, GW, and the Discipline. Description of the impact on curriculum development and pedagogy at the university and in the discipline.

4. Research Scholarship
In many respects, this is the part of the dossier that requires the most careful handling owing to its involvement of external evaluators.
- Research statement and reflection: In no more than three pages the candidates will describe their research focus and the contribution their research has made to their discipline or field.
- External letters: Independent letters of assessment (and not endorsement for tenure) by highly qualified, external evaluators should form a significant portion of the documentation concerning research and

---

1 For more details about describing the different aspects of teaching contributions, please reference the document: Evaluating Teaching for Tenure and Promotion: “What Should a Dossier Contain?” developed by the Faculty Advisory Board of the University Teaching and Learning Center, which can be found at: http://tlc.provost.gwu.edu/tenure-promotion.
scholarship, and professional service. The Department Chair’s transmittal letter to the external evaluator should be carefully worded in order to have the best possibility of obtaining a thorough and complete evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly work. It should be clear in the letter that all we seek from the evaluator is a thorough evaluation of the scholarly works submitted for review, not an opinion as to whether the candidate is tenurable and/or promotable, since the latter recommendation requires other evaluative input, in particular, teaching.

Having said the above, the number and nature of the external evaluators should be discussed. At a minimum, there should be five highly qualified referees. To the extent there are good reasons why obtaining five letters is not feasible, you can request waivers of this requirement in writing to the provost. The selection of external letter writers includes a mix of senior individuals proposed by the faculty candidate and some selected by the tenure committee (or whatever group in your school assembles the tenure case). There should be two lists of evaluators from which to select: one from the candidate and one from the department. Which list any particular letter comes from should be indicated in the tenure case.

In selecting evaluators, it should be rigorously followed that five of them are not the candidate’s dissertation director, a collaborator on scholarly work with the candidate (for example, co-author), or a colleague with whom the candidate works at a local laboratory or institution, except in rare cases that are explained in the tenure file. The key is to have a minimum of five letters from impartial evaluators. Once this requirement is fulfilled, other letters are welcome, but should be carefully identified. All letters received, of course, become part of the dossier.

Since this aspect is such an important part of the tenure and promotion process, deans may wish to supplement with even more detailed guidance.

5. External/University/Departmental Service

- Service statement and reflection: In no more than three pages the candidates will describe their service focus and the contribution their service has made to the department, school, university, and to their field.

- The detailed record may be part of the candidate’s vitae or submitted as a separate listing. This should include any awards or other recognition received for service.

- A key component of this section is the department’s evaluation summary of what is the record of the candidate. (NOTE: In the SMHS we meet this requirement by requiring a section in the Chair Letter that evaluates the candidate’s service).
APPENDIX 2

The George Washington University School of Medicine & Health Sciences

REQUIRED CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

1) Personal Data
   Name (first, middle, last)
   GWID# or Last 4 digits of SS#
   Home address, telephone
   Office telephone
   Fax number
   e-mail address
   Date and place of birth
   Citizenship

2) Education (List Institution, Dates and Degrees awarded. Please note and explain any periods during your educational years when your education was interrupted.)
   a) Undergraduate Education
   b) Graduate/Medical Education
   c) Post-Graduate Training (Post-Doctoral Fellowships, Internship, Residency)

3) Employment (List all employment in chronological order, specifying dates of employment. Include all academic [including academic rank] as well as non-academic positions held since completion of undergraduate education. Include military service, if any, as well as description of any sabbatical periods taken during years of employment.

4) Professional Registrations, Licenses, Certifications (Include Dates of Receipt)

5) Societies and Honors (Include any administrative duties or appointments)

6) Administrative Duties & University Activities (include voluntary committee service)
   a) Departmental
   b) SMHS/SPHHS
   c) University

7) Educational Achievements (Include Dates of participation for all categories.
   a) Courses Taught (Include role [course director, guest lecturer, etc.], numbers of lectures presented)
   b) New Courses or Programs Developed
   c) Students or post-doctoral fellows for whom you served as primary advisor
   d) Educational Awards
   e) Student or participant evaluations

8) Consultant Appointments (List all consultant activity to industry, private or public foundations. Also list all visiting professorships. Specify whether consultant activity was paid or unpaid)
9) **Grants Awarded or Pending**
   - Title of Grant
   - Funding Agency
   - Dates of Award
   - Yearly Direct Costs of Award
   - Role (PI, Co-PI, etc.)
   - % Effort

10) **Publications** (For each category, list all authors in order, journal or book reference, and complete pagination)
   - a) Papers in Refereed Journals
   - b) Papers in Non-Refereed Journals
   - c) Chapters in Books
   - d) Books Edited or Written
   - e) Abstracts
   - f) Invited Publications
   - g) Letters
   - h) Book Reviews
   - i) Any Other Publications

11) **Presentations** (List Titles and Dates of Presentations as well as Complete Authorship in order for each Category)
   - a) Regional Presentations
   - b) National Presentations
   - c) International Presentations

12) **Service to Community** (List agency, duration of participation, amount of effort and role on project. Specify whether involvement was paid or unpaid, and whether your involvement was at regional, national or international level.)
APPENDIX 3

E-mail request to prospective outside evaluator: Initial Request

Request to provide promotion evaluation for Dr. XXXXX YYYYY

1 message
Jeffrey Sich <jsich@gwu.edu> Thu, Dec 5, 2013 at 5:11 PM
Reply-To: jsich@gwu.edu
To: ProfessorZ@omeschool.edu

Dear Professor Z:

I am writing to request that you serve as an independent evaluator of Dr. XXXXX YYYYY.

Dr. XXXXX YYYYY is being considered to promotion to the rank of Professor of Pediatrics.

As part of the promotion review process we are seeking input from individuals, such as yourself, to provide an evaluation of Dr. YYYYY’s research and scholarly activity.

If you are willing to serve as an independent evaluator, I will send you a copy of Dr. YYYYY’s materials for review.

We would request that you provide a thorough evaluation of their research and scholarly activity. We would also welcome your evaluative comments on Dr. YYYYY’s professional service, stature, and leadership in the field.

Independent evaluators should not be close collaborators, mentors or personal friends of the candidate.

Please let me know of your willingness to serve in this capacity. Ideally, we would appreciate receiving your review within the next 1.5 to two months.

Thank you for considering this request, If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Dear Colleague:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an outside evaluator of Dr. XXXXX YYYYY.

Dr. YYYYY is being considered for promotion to associate professor and we are seeking input from individuals, such as yourself, to assist us in the promotion review process.

We would request that you provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate’s research and scholarly activity. We would also welcome your evaluative comments on their professional service, stature, and leadership in the field. I am attaching a copy of Dr.YYYYY’s C.V. and PDFs of three articles Dr. YYYYY has selected.

As a reminder, independent evaluators should not be close collaborators, mentors or personal friends of the candidate. It would be very helpful if you would include a description of any relationship you have with Dr. YYYYY in the first paragraph of your letter.

If possible, we would appreciate receiving your letter before November 1.

Thank you for your willingness to provide this important professional service, If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

AAAAA BBBBBB, Ph.D.
Chair
APPENDIX 5

Optional Form to Send to Outside Evaluators

CHILDREN’S NATIONAL HEALTH SYSTEM
Department of Pediatrics
Mark L. Batshaw, MD, Pediatrics-in-Chief

Referee: Please submit this form along with your letter of evaluation.

Name of Candidate:

Department:

Proposed for Promotion to:

SUBJECT: Relationship to Candidate

Please indicate which of these items describes your relationship to the candidate and your knowledge of his/her work.

Relationship to the candidate and his/her work:
Present or past colleague (at same institution as a student, postdoctoral fellow, or faculty member)  
Past mentor
Collaborator (co-investigator on grants and/or co-authored papers)
None of the above

Knowledge of candidate’s work based primarily on:
His/her publications and CV
Scientific presentations
Personal knowledge and discussions
Participation on review panels (study section, advisory boards, etc.)

_____________________________  ___________________________
Signature of Referee      Print Name

Date: ___________________________
APPENDIX 6

Required Format for Chair Letter in Support of Tenure and/or Promotion

Chair, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee
School of Medicine and Health Sciences
The George Washington University
Ross Hall, Room 719
Washington, DC 20037

RE: Appointment/Promotion/Tenure of ______(candidate name)_______________________ to the Rank of ________________ in the Department of ___________ (department name) — [tenure or non-tenure track].

Dear Dr. Katz:

It is a pleasure to recommend the appointment/promotion/tenure of _____ (candidate name) to the rank of ________________ — [tenure or non-tenure track] in the Department of ________________. The proposed effective date is July 1, 2015.

After deliberation and evaluation of the accomplishments and contributions of Dr. ____ (candidate name) the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee of our Department voted x- y-z [For-Against-Abstained] in favor of this promotion. The total number of committee members eligible to vote on this application is ____.

NOTE: The following three sections may be presented in any order.

Evaluation of Teaching. (heading required)

Evaluation of Research/Scholarship. (heading required)

Evaluation of Service. (heading required)

SUMMATION: Candidate’s contributions to the strategic programmatic directions of the department and the ability of the candidate help achieve those aims over the long term.