

---

# THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

---

School of Medicine & Health Sciences  
Office of Faculty Affairs

## Recommendations for Tenure and/or Promotion

### Tenure

The Office of Faculty Affairs will provide a list of faculty who are due for tenure review this year to Chairs in late July. Final decisions regarding tenure must be announced to faculty by June 30 so it is critical to strictly adhere to all deadlines in this process.

Please recall that, except in the most extraordinary and well-documented circumstances, a recommendation for the award of tenure prior to the conclusion of the indicated probationary period—a date specified in each candidate's initial letter of appointment—will not be accepted.

Similarly, a recommendation for promotion to associate professor prior to the award of tenure will not be approved except under very rare circumstances.

Chairs contemplating making a recommendation for early tenure, or appointment to associate professor before tenure, should consult with their Dean before initiating any action. The Dean is then required to consult with the Provost.

Please see Appendix 1 for the Provost's guidelines.

### Promotion of Regular Faculty

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 the published deadline.

Please see Appendix 1 for the Provost's guidelines.

### ***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—*but without the three journal articles*.
- An electronic copy of the completed application with all appendices and attachments— *but without the three journal articles* —must be submitted by e-mail to Dena Robinson (drobinso@gwu.edu) *as a single PDF*.
- One set of the three journal articles must be submitted by e-mail to Dena Robinson (drobinso@gwu.edu) *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 the stated deadline 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). *Please remember that only tenured faculty may vote on tenure cases and committee members must hold the same rank or higher when voting on an application for promotion.*

- 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 in the Service section with a Title Page marked "Optional Letters of Recommendation."

# APPENDIX 1

---

## THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

---

### Office of the Provost

### Guidelines for the Tenure and Promotion Dossiers

The criteria of sustained excellence required for promotion and tenure as stated in the Faculty Code language approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2015 is the standard for promotion and tenure. Specifically, it states that promotion and tenure decisions should be for those who “achieved excellence in their disciplines through their contributions to research, scholarship, or creative work in the arts (hereinafter scholarship), teaching, and engagement in service, and who demonstrate the potential to continue to do so, so that the university may advance its mission of scholarship, higher education, and service to the community.” It is incumbent that schools and Departments putting candidates up for tenure or promotion demonstrate that the candidate has met this standard. The preparation of the file, the solicitation of letters, and the decision of the faculty (either a department’s decision or the school as a whole in non-departmentalized units) should be made with the goal of assessing the candidate in terms of this excellence standard.

The tenure and/or promotion process for faculty leads to major career milestones, and these decisions, albeit difficult ones, are among the most important decisions that we, as faculty and administrators, make. For this reason, it is important that the dossiers of the candidates be compiled carefully to facilitate what is a necessarily rigorous process. In particular, these dossiers must thoroughly and accurately convey evidence of accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as appropriate for the candidate’s discipline.

Thus, the dossier should be such that it allows all those involved in the review process to assess whether the candidate has met a standard of excellence in scholarship, teaching and service. Further, the dossier must demonstrate that the candidate has the strong potential to continue to be productive in those three areas. This is especially important once the dossier leaves the originating department and moves through the school’s promotion and tenure committee, to the dean, and finally to the provost. The key is to put forth 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.

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 to 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 respective dossiers, and this is fine 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Please hold any supplementary materials in the dean's office. Consistent with University process efficiency and sustainability efforts, paperless submissions are highly preferred. Many schools have adopted the practice of submitting PDF copies of dossiers either via email (small volume) or via thumb- or zip-drives (large volume). You are strongly encouraged to submit your materials in electronic format only. Electronic tenure and promotion materials should be delivered directly to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

**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**

In order to provide dossiers that are easy to review and contain the key data and evaluations to underpin the recommendations, a dossier should contain five sections in the following 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
- From the Department Chair of departments in which the faculty member holds an appointment

### **2) Curriculum Vitae of Candidate (MUST be in GW SHMS Format. See Appendix.)**

### **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)
- 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.

## **Non-Departmental Solicitation of Additional Information**

According to the revised Faculty Code, "The School-Wide Personnel Committee may request and gather additional information, documentation, or clarification regarding recommendations they are considering." While not a code requirement, prior to collecting additional information, the Chair of the School Wide Personnel Committee may consult with the Department to better understand the field. And, any additional information solicited by the School-Wide Personnel Committee should be identified in the transmittal letter and added to the file. In the event of a non-concurrence, the chair of the originating department should review the material so that they can reflect upon it in his or her consultations with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

## 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.

NOTE: The SMHS *Faculty Guide for Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure*\* provides guidance and suggestions to assist faculty in the preparation of their dossier.

\*<https://smhs.gwu.edu/sites/default/files/apt%20handbook.pdf>

### 1. Transmitting Letters

The transmittal letters from the Department, the School-Wide APT Committee and the Dean set the tone of the dossier. It is expected that each of these letters will be analytical in nature and assess the candidate in terms of the School and University criteria for tenure or promotion. Letters from all three are required in all cases – regardless of whether there is a concurrence or non-concurrence with the recommendation of the faculty, and regardless of whether tenure or promotion is being recommended. And, if there is any information that the Department or School is aware of that is not self-evident in the dossier and may impact the assessment of the record, this should be revealed in the transmittal letters. Because transmittal letters (along with the reports produced by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in instances where there is a non-concurrence) may contain a discussion of the divisions that exist within the faculty and cite the evaluations of the external reviewers, these letters are confidential and should not be shared with the candidate.

The school wide Promotion and Tenure committee's or dean's letter should convey clearly their concurrence or non-concurrence with the faculty's recommendation and the basis for this conclusion. Moreover, the school P & T committee and dean have the perspective from across the school to provide background on the strength of the case or other pertinent information relevant to the recommendation. Both the Department and School P&T committee letters should include information on the votes that took place related to a particular case (including number of members absent or abstaining).

Since this whole process begins with the department chair's letter revealing the recommendation of the faculty (in departmentalized schools), this letter is pivotal in the decisions of the school P & T committee, the Dean, and the Provost to concur or not. In some departments, the personnel committee writes this letter, but in any case, all who vote on the decision to recommend tenure or promotion should review it. For ease of reading, the letter should begin with a statement of the recommendation along with the departmental vote underpinning it. 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<sup>1</sup>

- **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 scores and comments, provided by department. Taking scores into account can provide validation of the internal feedback and written comments of the students. Broad based questions such as "My Overall Assessment of the Instructor" may be useful for identifying those who are particularly strong or weak instructors. However, the interpretation of these scores should be viewed in the context of research showing that evaluations vary predictably with teaching quality, gender and race, the nature and size of the course being taught, and the rigor of the grading. The accomplishment by students of the learning objectives of a course should also be considered in the evaluation teaching effectiveness.
  - Teaching awards or other special recognition of teaching.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>.

- **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 scholarship, and professional service. External letter writers are not expected to assess the teaching strength of the candidate. 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 should be tenured and/or promoted, 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. Under extraordinary circumstances, such a request will be granted. However, such requests should be made prior to the review of the file. 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, five of them **may not include** the candidate's dissertation director, a collaborator on scholarly work with the candidate (for example, co-author), or a colleague from a different institution (current or former) with whom the candidate has worked or continues to work. 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 become part of the dossier.

Letter writers should be informed that the university's standard for tenure requires the candidate to have: "achieved excellence in their disciplines through their contributions to research, scholarship, or creative work in the arts (hereinafter scholarship), teaching, and engagement in service, and who demonstrate the potential to continue to do so..." And, they should be told that the letters are normally considered confidential and not shared with the candidate unless required by a legal or administrative process. Since this aspect is such an important part of the promotion and tenure process, deans may wish to supplement with even more detailed guidance, including school specific criteria that are consistent with the university standard.

#### **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.
- 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).
- 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.

# 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 appointments--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) Scholarly Publications** (Should be listed in the appropriate category. 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

**5) 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

**6) Professional Registrations, Licenses, Certifications** (Include Dates of Receipt)

**7) Grants Awarded or Pending**

Title of Grant  
Funding Agency  
Dates of Award  
Yearly Direct Costs of Award  
Role (PI, Co-PI, etc.)  
% Effort

**8) Societies and Honors** (Include any administrative duties or appointments)

**9) Administrative Duties & University Activities** (include voluntary committee service)

a) Departmental  
b) SMHS  
c) University

**10) 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. Include title of thesis or dissertation (for students), name of student/trainee, and years.  
d) Educational Awards

**11) 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)

**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 tenure 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@someschool.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 with continuous tenure.

As part of the tenure 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 her 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.

# APPENDIX 4

## Letter to outside evaluator: Formal Invitation

### School of Medicine & Health Sciences

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Dear Colleague:

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

Dr. YYYYYY is being considered for promotion to associate professor with continuous tenure and we are seeking input from individuals, such as yourself, to assist us in the tenure 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.YYYYYY 's C.V. and PDFs of three articles Dr. YYYYYY 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. YYYYYY 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 BBBB BB, Ph.D.  
Chair

# APPENDIX 5

## Form to Send to Outside Evaluators

The George Washington University

### EVALUATOR STATUS REQUEST

Candidate's Name:

Proposed for Promotion to:

*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

*If your response is not "None of the above", please explain:*

**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. XXXX:

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.