

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES: MID-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

Final: May 2020

I. INTRODUCTION

This document is an appendix to the guidelines for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure at the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS), setting forth the principles and procedures for mid-tenure reviews. These principles and procedures are meant to support high academic standards and ensure a comprehensive, objective review of candidates. Active engagement of SMHS tenured faculty, department chairs and deans in the mid-tenure review process is integral to successful implementation of these guidelines. This document has been reviewed by the Office of the Provost for compliance with University's policy, bylaws, and published guidance.

II. MANDATORY MID-TENURE REVIEW

In addition to the required annual reporting and evaluation process for faculty, we will require a review of all full-time, tenure-track assistant professors no later than their third year on the tenure clock. The candidate submits the same set of materials required in a tenure review. These materials are reviewed by a subcommittee (preferably no less than 3-tenured faculty appointed by the chair of the departmental Promotion & Tenure (APT) committee), which will assess the candidate's achievements, identify any areas in need of improvement, and produce a report of its findings and recommendations. In doing so, the subcommittee is expected to follow the criteria/guidelines outlined in the *'Summary of Overall Impact'* listed below. The subcommittee should discuss their assessment with the departmental APT committee. At this point, the chair of the departmental APT committee will summarize the discussion and the assessment of the subcommittee to produce a final report which will be provided to the chairperson of the department, who will in turn forward it to the SMHS Office of Faculty Affairs. The chairperson of the department will also meet with the faculty candidate to provide fair and balanced feedback that describes his or her competitiveness for tenure. If progress toward tenure is unsatisfactory, the department leadership should intervene appropriately (e.g. guidance for making satisfactory progress to be competitive for tenure, counseling off the tenure track, or consideration for a terminal contract). This process is elaborated further below.

III. PROCEDURES & SCHEDULE

Promotion and tenure (P&T) review and recommendation occurs through a multilevel process of detailed evaluation by independent external evaluators; review within the department, including a departmental P&T sub-committee ("the sub-committee") and all faculty of rank equal or higher to the rank that the candidate is being considered for promotion to ("the departmental APT committee"); review by the school-wide P&T committee ("the SMHS APT committee"); review by the dean of the school; and finally review by the university provost. Throughout the process, iterative interactions between the department chair and faculty candidate for tenure are integral to determining optimal timing for a tenure application, preparing a comprehensive tenure dossier, identifying highly qualified external evaluators, and submitting a competitive

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

bid for tenure. The mid-tenure review does not require solicitation of external letters or involve the latter three steps, instead it includes following steps:

- The candidate submits the formal P&T dossier—CV, research, teaching, and service narrative statements, teaching portfolio, and samples of three recent publications (within four weeks from the end of the third year of the tenure track academic appointment).
- The departmental APT committee chair forms a sub-committee for the mid-tenure review (typically immediately after receiving the P&T dossier). This could be composed of the members of the departmental APT committee.
- The sub-committee reviews the materials and prepares its report (within 4 weeks from receiving the P&T dossier).
- The departmental APT committee meets to discuss the case, finalize the report, and the committee chair submits it to the department chair (within 3 weeks after receiving the subcommittee report).
- The department chair submits the report to the Dean’s Office/Office of Faculty Affairs for review by deans (within 1 week after receiving the departmental APT committee report)
- Deans (faculty affairs, research, SMHS) review the report and the Office of Faculty Affairs provide a brief email feedback to the department chair (within 3 weeks of receiving this report)
- Final recommendations are shared and discussed with candidate by the department chair (within 1 week of receiving dean’s feedback).

Summary of Overall Impact

<i>Assistant</i>	<i>Associate</i>	<i>Full Professor</i>
Promise of a regional and national reputation as an emerging leader in a well-defined area; evidence of sustained efforts and pattern of growth is demonstrated through the contributions to the fields of teaching, scholarship, and/or service.	Strong regional, and most often national, reputation as a leader in a well-defined area; evidence of impact is demonstrated through significant contributions to the field in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Documenting excellence requires demonstration of accomplishments that are public, subject to critical review and analysis of outcomes, and useful to others in the community beyond the SMHS.	Sustained national, and in some cases international, reputation as a leader and innovator - where expertise is demonstrated through high impact contributions that influence the field in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Documenting excellence requires demonstration of accomplishments that are public, subject to critical review and analysis of outcomes, and useful to others in the community beyond the SMHS.

References: [SMHS Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure](#); [SMHS Faculty Guide for Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure](#)