



**Guidelines for Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure
for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
of the College of Public Health**

Effective: May 20, 2026

Preface

This document, referred to as the *College RPT Manual*, governs the renewal, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process for tenure-line faculty in the College of Public Health (CPH). In all cases, the George Mason University (GMU) *Faculty Handbook*, referred herein as *Faculty Handbook*, takes precedence over this Manual. Promotion of term faculty is addressed in a separate *CPH Term Promotion Policy and Procedures* document.

Throughout this Manual, "LAU" refers to any department or the School of Nursing within CPH; "Chair" refers to the head of an LAU; and "Dean" refers to the head of CPH. Each LAU's RPT guidelines, along with this Manual, are posted on the CPH website. The LAU RPT guidelines contain the specific criteria for RPT for faculty in each LAU, and this document is designed to supplement the LAU guidelines. LAU guidelines are revised as needed and revisions must be submitted to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs by December 1 each year. Faculty going up for renewal, promotion, and tenure will follow the approved guidelines that were in effect in the spring in which they declared their candidacy for renewal, tenure, or promotion.

This Manual is intended to be dynamic. It should be reviewed regularly and updated at least every five years, in collaboration between the College RPT Committee and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. Clear and responsive guidelines are essential for transparency, equity, and a healthy work environment.

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	2
<i>1. GENERAL GUIDELINES</i>	1
1.A. Application Timing and Scheduling.....	1
1.B. Applicant Responsibilities.....	1
1.C. RPT Committee Structure and Procedures.....	2
<i>2. DOSSIER GUIDELINES</i>	6
2.A. Research and Teaching Statement.....	6
2.B. Major Contributions Summary.....	7
2.C. Service Statement.....	7
<i>3. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</i>	7
3.A. Research.....	8
3.B. Teaching.....	10
3.C. Service.....	11
<i>4. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO (“full”) PROFESSOR</i>	12
<i>5. TENURE AT THE TIME OF APPOINTMENT</i>	13
<i>6. RENEWAL</i>	13
<i>7. EXTERNAL REVIEWER QUALIFICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS</i>	14
<i>8. GOING UP FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO FULL</i>	15
<i>9. POST TENURE REVIEW</i>	15
<i>APPENDIX</i>	16
<i>Table A.1.</i> CPH Schedule for Promotion and Tenure.....	16
<i>Table A.2.</i> CPH Schedule for Third-year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty.....	18
<i>Table A.3.</i> Example Publications Summary Table (“Top 5 Most Cited”).....	19

1. GENERAL GUIDELINES

1.A. Application Timing and Scheduling

Specific submission deadlines for each review type are listed in the schedule tables in the Appendix and in the *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart* on the CPH Faculty Resources [webpage](#). When College and University deadlines differ, materials are due on the earlier date.

Third year renewal. Third-year renewal dossiers are submitted no later than after the end of the second year on the tenure-track. External review is not required for renewal; see Section 7 for renewal evaluation criteria.

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Applications for promotion to “without term” (tenured) status are submitted no later than after the end of the fifth year on the tenure-track. Faculty hired with prior tenure-track experience at another institution or with an exceptionally strong performance may be considered for early tenure under the conditions described in *Faculty Handbook* Section 2.1.2. Tenure clock extensions for qualifying circumstances (including parental leave, serious illness, and military service) are governed by *Faculty Handbook* Section 2.7.4; requests must be submitted to the LAU Chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs per Provost Office deadlines. Additional details on tenure clock extensions are also available on the Provost’s [website](#).

Promotion to full Professor. Associate Professors should review the criteria in the *Faculty Handbook* and their LAU’s RPT guidelines before applying. If an application for promotion to full Professor is unsuccessful, the candidate must wait two years before applying again.

Tenure at the time of appointment. When a candidate is reviewed for tenure upon hire, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and the College RPT Committee Chair will establish an expedited review schedule. All such decisions must be approved by the Provost’s Office and the President’s Office before going to the Board of Visitors.

Consequences of unsuccessful reviews. Candidates who do not receive tenure will be given a one-year terminal appointment as a term Assistant Professor following the sixth year, unless other arrangements are agreed upon with the LAU Chair and the Dean. Candidates with an unsuccessful tenure bid in CPH are not eligible for tenure in CPH in the future, and candidates who received an unsuccessful tenure decision at another Mason college are not eligible to apply for tenure in CPH.

1.B. Applicant Responsibilities

Candidates for RPT are responsible for undertaking the following actions by the deadlines specified on the *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart* (see Appendix and CPH Faculty Resource [webpage](#)):

1. Notify the LAU Chair and the Dean of intention to apply for promotion or tenure.

2. For promotion, submit up to five names of eligible potential external reviewers to the LAU Chair.
3. Optionally, submit the names of up to two individuals to exclude as potential external reviewers to the LAU Chair.
4. Optionally, submit the names of up to two eligible collaborators external to the University, who can be contacted by the College's Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs to provide additional letters, to the LAU Chair.
5. Submit a dossier containing the required information and materials, as specified in the Provost's memo located on the Provost's [website](#) under "Tenure-line Faculty Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure" and the LAU's RPT guidelines.

1.C. RPT Committee Structure and Procedures

Level 1: LAU RPT Committee

The LAU RPT committee provides a *first-level review* for tenure-line faculty seeking RPT.

Membership: All tenured faculty of a LAU are required to serve as active members of their LAU RPT committee, unless the LAU's bylaws specify other membership rules. A LAU RPT committee must have a minimum of three members. LAU Chairs and administrative faculty (such as the Dean and Associate Deans) are not eligible to serve. Committee members must disclose and recuse for any conflict of interest (COI) per *Faculty Handbook* Section 2.3.11.

When fewer than three eligible tenured faculty are available within a LAU, the committee is supplemented by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in collaboration with the LAU Chair, with tenured faculty from substantively related areas per Mason's Faculty Handbook Section 2.7.3.2. Ad hoc committee composition for each scenario is governed by **Table 1**. In all cases, ad hoc members must meet the same eligibility requirements as regular members — including the requirement that members hold the rank of Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to full Professor. Regardless of how the ad hoc committee is composed, the Level 1 committee evaluates the candidate using the LAU's established criteria.

When no tenured faculty are available in the LAU, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will convene an ad hoc Level 1 committee of three tenured GMU faculty, at least two of whom must be from within CPH. To help identify qualified reviewers, the candidate may submit to the Associate Dean a list of up to three tenured Mason faculty — from inside or outside CPH — with expertise in a substantively related area. The Associate Dean, in collaboration with the Dean, may draw on the candidate's list when selecting committee members but is not required to do so. All prospective committee members are subject to standard COI requirements.

Chair: The LAU committee shall have a process for the selection of a Chair to oversee the review process. The Chair of the committee: (1) schedules meetings, (2) chairs the meetings, (3) maintains meeting minutes that document attendance and the results of any committee votes, and (4) ensures submission of the committee’s letters to the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs as outlined in the Appendix and on the document, *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart*, located on the CPH Faculty Resources [webpage](#).

Table 1. Ad hoc Level 1 Committee Membership

Eligible* LAU Member	Additional Members	Committee Chair
None	3 qualified faculty, at least 2 from CPH	CPH faculty (required)
One	2 from CPH	LAU faculty (if possible)
Two	1 from CPH	LAU faculty (if possible)

*Eligible faculty in cases of (full) Professor promotion must be at rank of Professor.

Procedure: Each LAU is responsible for developing its own guidelines for selecting a Committee Chair, defining a quorum, and voting. Each LAU is also responsible for developing its own guidelines regarding criteria for RPT as it relates to research/scholarship, teaching, and service. The LAU guidelines are more specific on what counts as evidence in each category than what is described in the *College RPT Manual* and the *Faculty Handbook*. The LAU guidelines are sent to external reviewers.

Quorum: For the LAU RPT committee to officially act on a candidate’s request for RPT, the committee must meet its defined quorum. This means either the LAU’s defined quorum for its standing committee or all members of the ad hoc Level 1 review committee must be present, either physically or by teleconference, to discuss and vote on the dossier. The letter documenting the final recommendation of the committee must list the committee members in attendance. The letter must also document the committee’s deliberations on each of the individual criteria (research/scholarship, teaching, and service) as well as the overall recommendation regarding final action.

Letters: The final recommendation of the committee will have one of the following formulations:

- “The Committee recommends (X for, X against) ...” if a majority of the committee members voted in favor.
- “The Committee recommends against (X for, X against) ...” if a majority of the committee members voted opposed or there are an equal number of votes for and against.

The letter must explicitly state the number of committee members who voted in favor and the number of committee members who opposed (even if 100% in favor). A candidate must receive affirmative votes from the majority of voting committee members (i.e., all members in attendance minus those abstaining from voting) to be recommended for promotion and/or without term (tenured) status.

Committee deadlocks will result in the candidate not being recommended in favor. A rationale needs to be given if a committee member is abstaining from voting.

The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that letters must state “the recommendation of the departmental [LAU] committee with appropriate justifications” (Section 2.7.3.2). The final version of the recommendation letter must be approved by the full committee. All committee members must sign the letter with the specific understanding that their signature does not imply agreement with the decision. The signature indicates that the members who were present participated in the discussion and deliberations and agree that the committee’s process and decision are accurately represented in the letter. The Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs is responsible for ensuring that a copy of the letter is provided to the candidate and is forwarded to the LAU Chair.

An additional purpose of the Level 1 letter is to clarify the context and criteria for excellence in the discipline of the candidate. Specific judgments about genuine excellence in research/scholarship or teaching are expected to be based on criteria outlined by the LAU and the *College RPT Manual*. The relative importance of external funding, journal impact factors, books, and number of publications will vary by LAU discipline. Specific judgments about genuine excellence in teaching are expected to be based on criteria outlined by the LAU and the *College RPT Manual* and applied appropriately to the candidate’s discipline and field of study.

Level 2: College RPT Committee

The College RPT Committee is the peer-elected, *second-level review* committee for tenure-line faculty in CPH who seek RPT. Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to achieve genuine excellence in research or teaching, and the specific metric for evaluating these achievements varies across LAUs. The College RPT Committee is tasked with conducting an independent evaluation of the candidate dossier, and will carefully consider the differing expectations concerning research, teaching and service between departments and programs. The CPH RPT Committee utilizes the LAU guidelines in applying criteria for RPT, and is guided as well by the policies and procedures outlined in this CPH RPT guidelines document. While the CPH RPT Committee respects the first-level review and the discipline-specific criteria established by the LAU, it retains the authority to reach a different conclusion than the LAU, and may do so to ensure consistency, procedural rigor, and equitable application of RPT decisions across the College. The College RPT Committee may reach a determination that does not concur with the Level 1 committee’s initial recommendation. This lack of concurrence may arise under several circumstances, including but not limited to: cases where the broader committee determines the evidentiary record does not fully substantiate the LAU's internal assessment, instances where independent external evaluations diverge from the local recommendation, the identification of procedural inconsistencies, or a finding that differs from the LAU recommendation with regard to whether the candidate's record satisfies the LAU's approved criteria across all required areas of evaluation.

Membership: The College RPT Committee is composed of one tenured faculty member elected by each LAU serving a term of two academic years in duration, as defined by the CPH bylaws. Unless the

LAU's bylaws specify otherwise, each LAU RPT committee will elect a representative to serve as a member of the College RPT Committee.

In the case of promotion to (full) Professor, if there are fewer than three (3) tenured (full) Professors sitting as regular members of the College RPT Committee, the College RPT Committee Chair will select (full) Professors from within the College to serve as *ad hoc* committee members in consultation with the LAU Chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. Any RPT member with a conflict of interest related to a promotion or tenure candidate must disclose it upon being assigned to review the candidate's portfolio, and well in advance of the RPT meeting.

Chair: The previous Chair of the RPT Committee serves *ex officio* as the Chair at the beginning of the next academic year to call the first meeting and to administer the selection of a new Chair. The Chair of the committee: (1) schedules meetings, (2) chairs the meetings, (3) maintains meeting minutes that document attendance and the results of any committee votes, and (4) ensures submission of the committee's letters to the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs as outlined in the Appendix and on the document, *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart* (located on the CPH website under faculty resources/tenure and promotion resources). The Chair may appoint a secretary to record the meeting minutes and assist with other committee business. The committee may also select a Vice Chair to manage the discussions about candidates for whom the Chair is not eligible to vote.

Quorum: An academic-year quorum is defined by the presence, either physically or by teleconference, of a majority of the committee members eligible to vote on a particular candidate (i.e., excluding the committee member from the home LAU of the candidate and others who may have a conflict of interest) *or* a minimum of three committee members, whichever number is greater. For cases of promotion to (full) Professor, a quorum requires the presence, either physically or by teleconference, of at least three (full) Professors eligible to discuss and vote on the case *and* a minimum of three committee members. If a candidate for tenure must be considered during the summer months, every effort will be made to ensure a quorum of the committee is present, either physically or by teleconference.

Voting: Committee members should not be present for the discussion or the vote on the candidates from their own LAU. Only (full) Professors can review the dossiers of, be present for the deliberation of, and vote on candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to (full) Professor.

Letters. The final recommendation of the committee will have one of the following formulations:

- “The Committee recommends (X for, X against) ...” if a majority of the committee members voted in favor.
- “The Committee recommends against (X for, X against) ...” if a majority of the committee members voted opposed or there are an equal number of votes for and against.

The letter must explicitly state the number of committee members who voted in favor and the number of committee members who opposed (even if 100% in favor). A candidate must receive affirmative

votes from the majority of the voting committee members (i.e., all members in attendance minus those abstaining from voting) to be recommended for promotion and/or without term (tenured) status.

The final version of the recommendation letter must be approved by all members of the committee who voted on the case. All committee members will sign the letter with the specific understanding that the signature does not imply agreement with the decision. The signatures will indicate that the members were in attendance, participated in the discussion and deliberations, and agreed that the committee's process and decision are represented accurately in the letter. The committee Chair is responsible for ensuring a copy of the letter is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs according to the Appendix and the schedule listed on the *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart* (located on the CPH website under faculty resources/tenure and promotion resources).

2. DOSSIER GUIDELINES

The candidate's dossier must be submitted electronically to the Dean's office per University protocol according to the schedules listed on the Appendix and the *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart* (located on the CPH website under faculty resources/tenure and promotion resources). Promotion and/or tenure candidates may also submit an updated CV prior to the Level 1 (LAU) review.

In addition to any required content outlined in the [Provost's webpage](#), the dossier may also include additional evidence supporting research productivity (such as grant review summaries) and additional evidence supporting teaching effectiveness. Letters of support from colleagues, students, and others shall not be included in the dossier, except for reports based on formal peer and student review processes.

2.A. Research and Teaching Statement

The Research and Teaching statement shall not exceed eight pages and needs to include future plans in the candidate's area of excellence. Once submitted by the candidate in their dossier, statements cannot be amended or updated during the review process.

Research Narrative: The research portion of the candidate's personal statement should provide an overview of their line of research/scholarship, including a theoretical or conceptual framework from which lines of inquiry and sequential progression of projects and publications are implemented and disseminated. For candidates seeking tenure based on genuine excellence in research/scholarship this narrative should include a detailed description of the overall impact of the work to date and the scientific and practical significance of achieving their foreseeable research goals. Additionally, the candidate should describe how their manuscripts and projects, planned and underway, contribute to their overall research program and its future direction. The candidate should discuss the contribution of research grants and external funding, where they are principal, co-principal, or coinvestigator, to their specific line of research and connect specific publications to current and future grant applications. For unfunded grant submissions, the candidate may incorporate a summary of reviewer feedback (when

available) to provide context within their research statement, specifically outlining how this input informs their future research trajectory.

Candidates shall clearly describe their intellectual contribution to co-authored publications and collaborative grants. Where authorship conventions vary (e.g., senior author, last author, middle author), candidates must explain the significance of their role consistent with disciplinary norms.

Teaching Narrative: The teaching portion of the candidate's personal statement should provide an overview of their teaching philosophy. For candidates seeking tenure based on genuine excellence in teaching, this overview should include a theoretical or conceptual framework for their pedagogical approach, from which course materials or publications arise and are disseminated. It should also provide a detailed description of the overall impact of their work to date, as well as the significance of achieving their foreseeable teaching goals. Innovative teaching methods and participation in professional teaching activities at the national or international level can be included. Furthermore, the candidate should describe how their work is recognized by the discipline as having national/international impact in a manner parallel to that required for genuine excellence in research.

The candidate may also discuss the contribution of training or conference grants, or other external funding, on which they are principal, co-principal, or coinvestigator, and connect these to specific teaching artifacts or publications.

2.B. Major Contributions Summary

The full dossier must include a summary of major scholarly contribution with discipline-appropriate indicators of quality and impact, consistent with evidence described in section 4.B. An example table is provided in the Appendix.

2.C. Service Statement

The dossier should include a separate service statement, limited to one page, to support evidence of service. For promotion to (full) Professor, this evidence should demonstrate high competence in service. The service statement should encompass program, LAU, college, university, community/local, regional, and national and/or international professional service, in accordance with LAU norms. Candidates may describe their specific, individual contributions to committees.

3. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria and procedures for evaluating faculty for promotion and/or tenure are detailed in the *Faculty Handbook* in Sections 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, and 2.10.2. Faculty promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor while on tenure track at GMU must meet the qualifications for appointment without term (tenured).

Only candidates who are simultaneously promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, or who have initial appointments as Associate Professor on the tenure track, can be awarded "without term" or

tenured status as Associate Professor in CPH. Candidates applying for without term (tenured) status must demonstrate genuine excellence in either teaching or research, and at least high competence in teaching and research. They must also show evidence of service.

3.A. Research

For purposes of college-level review, a ‘focused research program’ shall be understood as a sustained, systematically developed line of inquiry that demonstrates intellectual coherence, progression over time, and identifiable contribution to a defined area of scholarship. Candidates must articulate their intellectual independence and clarify their role in collaborative or interdisciplinary research teams. Evidence of independence may include first or senior authored publications, leadership roles on grants, and/or clear documentation of unique methodological, theoretical, or substantive contributions.

Genuine excellence. Genuine excellence in research requires evidence that the candidate’s contributions have an emerging national or international reputation. ‘Emerging’ at the Associate Professor stage shall be evidenced by externally validated recognition beyond George Mason University. Evidence of emerging reputation may include, but is not limited to: invited presentations at conferences; ad hoc peer review for competitive grants; citation or adoption of the candidate's work by scholars or practitioners at other institutions; recognition through awards or fellowships from professional or scientific organizations; or coverage of the candidate's work in professional or policy venues beyond the University. It should be noted that these are examples of evidence and it is not expected that the candidate show evidence for each item listed.

While external funding remains a strong indicator of research excellence, evaluation shall consider disciplinary norms, types of funding mechanisms (e.g., federal, state, foundation, contracts, community-based funding), and the candidate’s documented efforts to secure extramural support.

High Competence. While high competence in research does not require the demonstration of external reputation needed for genuine excellence, it necessitates significant contribution to research, publication, and/or novel scholarly work.

Evidence of Impact. A RPT committee’s assessment of research/scholarship is more comprehensive than evaluating only peer-reviewed publications. All candidates should present a dossier with diverse evidence of research impact and peer-review. Furthermore, each LAU will offer its own clear, written criteria for the evaluation of genuine excellence and high competence in research, within the context of the parameters laid out by the College, the Provost, and the *Faculty Handbook*.

CPH particularly recognizes the evidence listed in *Table 2* as potential examples of high levels of research. The quality and quantity of the evidence will determine whether it reflects genuine excellence or high competence, commensurate with rank. The types of Specific Evidence listed are illustrative and should not be construed as a checklist of requirements.

Table 2. Examples of evidence demonstrating high levels of research

Category	Specific Evidence
Publications	• Peer-reviewed, academic journals. • Well-respected, ranked, or top journals in candidate's discipline. • Lead or senior authorship, as customary in the candidate's discipline. Peer-reviewed conference proceedings, depending on discipline
Research	• Principal Investigator (PI) or Multiple Principal Investigator (MPI) role. • Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) or Co-Investigator (Co-I) role, where the candidate's contribution significantly enhances the value and scientific impact of the research.
Funding	• Internal award/seed funding to support the candidate's research program (evidence of emerging program of research). • Receipt of external funding to support the candidate's research program. • Active pursuit of external research funding as PI, MPI, Co-PI, or Co-I as evidenced by grant submission(s). • Serving on grant review panels. Training grants, if there's an active research component with a clear link to the candidate's research.*
Presentations	• Peer-reviewed professional research conferences. • Invited scholarly presentations.
Other	• Evidence of social impact (e.g. research to inform guidelines, practice, or policy).

* Funding from training grants is generally considered as evidence of teaching.

The College recognizes that, depending on discipline, scholarly contributions may also include: peer-reviewed conference proceedings, policy or standard-setting white papers; government or technical reports; scholarly books or monographs; nationally recognized digital or electronic media development; community-engaged research outputs; patents or intellectual property; and externally validated datasets or software tools. Candidates must demonstrate peer review, external validation, or documented impact appropriate to the form of scholarship.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to provide discipline-appropriate journal rankings, impact metrics (e.g., h-index, SCImago, impact factor, field-specific rankings), or alternative indicators of influence. The College recognizes that journal prestige and authorship conventions vary by discipline. Candidates are responsible for contextualizing the significance of publication venues and author order within their sub-disciplinary norms. For candidates engaged in community-based, applied, or translational research, evidence of impact may include sustained community partnerships, implementation of findings into practice or policy, documented changes in guidelines or systems, public engagement, or other forms of demonstrable societal impact. Such work must still meet standards of peer review and scholarly rigor.

3.B. Teaching

Assessment of teaching shall include multiple forms of evidence beyond student evaluations, including peer review of teaching, curriculum development leadership, mentorship of graduate students (including doctoral committee service or chairing), accreditation-related contributions, and/or dissemination of pedagogical scholarship. Departments may require structured evidence such as syllabi, course maps, summaries of quantitative course evaluation trends, and documentation of mentoring activities.

Building on Faculty Handbook Section 2.4, CPH defines influence beyond the classroom to include Candidates should demonstrate influence of their pedagogy beyond the University. Those seeking genuine excellence in teaching are expected to present evidence of national and/or international engagement and/or reputation for their teaching and curricular expertise. Genuine Excellence in teaching does not rest solely on classroom efforts (e.g., good student evaluations); candidates should be prepared to present a substantial case regarding the impact and reputation of the candidate's pedagogy beyond George Mason and its classrooms. Criteria for evaluating genuine excellence and high competence in teaching are available on the Provost's [website](#).

While high competence in teaching does not require the demonstration of external reputation needed for genuine excellence, it necessitates clear, appropriate, and effective course materials, methods and presentations, mentorship, and evidence of successful student learning outcomes. A RPT committee's assessment of teaching is more comprehensive than evaluating only, or primarily, student evaluation of teaching scores. All candidates should present a dossier with diverse evidence of teaching effectiveness; the Provost's [website](#) provides examples of such evidence. Furthermore, each LAU will provide its own clear, written criteria for evaluating genuine excellence and high competence in teaching, within the context of the parameters laid out by the College, the Provost, and the *Faculty Handbook*. Candidates are encouraged to consult the [Stearns Center for Teaching and Learning](#) for further guidance on demonstrating effective teaching.

CPH particularly recognizes the evidence listed in *Table 3* as potential indicators of high levels of teaching. The quality and quantity of the evidence will determine whether it reflects genuine excellence or high competence, commensurate with rank. The types of Specific Evidence listed are illustrative and should not be construed as a checklist of requirements.

Table 3. Examples of evidence demonstrating of high levels of teaching

Category	Specific Evidence
Teaching Practices	• Development and dissemination of novel and creative instructional materials. • Evidence of new courses and active participation in curriculum development. • Assessment of teaching impact and subsequent adjustment of practices.

Dissemination	• Peer-reviewed publication of pedagogical materials or mentorship approaches. • Textbooks and textbook materials that make novel contributions in the candidate's discipline. • Presentations at national or international conferences on pedagogical methods.
Funding	• Internal award/seed funding to support the teaching activities. • Receipt of external funding to support teaching activities (e.g., training, conference, or student impact grants). • Active pursuit of external funding to support teaching activities as PI, MPI, Co-PI, or Co-I as evidenced by grant submission(s).
Recognition	• Receipt of teaching awards. • Evidence of leadership in professional education.
Other	• Mentorship/supervision on doctoral dissertation committees, master's thesis committees, and other student research and practice projects (including undergraduate).

3.C. Service

All tenured faculty and those on tenure track are expected to provide service to their LAUs, the College, and/or the University by serving on standing and/or special committees or task forces, commensurate with their rank. Faculty are also expected to be active participants in their professional and/or community organizations related to their areas of expertise. As candidates progress toward higher ranks within the College, there should be a demonstrated, commensurate level of engagement with service at all levels. According to the *Faculty Handbook*, candidates seeking promotion to Associate Professor without term (tenured) “must also show evidence of service” (Section 2.4).

CPH particularly recognizes the evidence listed in *Table 4* as potential indicators of high levels of service. The quality and quantity of the evidence will determine whether it reflects high competence, commensurate with rank. The types of Specific Evidence listed are illustrative and should not be construed as a checklist of requirements.

Table 4. Examples of evidence demonstrating high levels of service

Category	Specific Evidence
Academic	• Active engagement in LAU committee(s). • Participation on college and university committees. • Participation in other LAU, college, or university special events and activities.
Professional	• Election to professional societies and academies. • Service on advisory boards or expert panels. • Organizing scholarly events in the candidate's discipline (e.g., special conferences).

Peer-review	• Peer reviewing for a scientific journal and/or serving on a journal editorial board. • Serving as ad hoc or standing members on grant review committees. • Invited to review external tenure/promotion dossiers. • Invited to review LAUs or programs inside or outside of Mason.
Leadership	• Leadership role(s) in professional societies. • Elected leadership positions within professional societies and academies. • Membership on editorial review board(s).
Other	• Activity in the local community.

Service expectations increase by rank. For Associate Professor, candidates must demonstrate meaningful participation and emerging leadership at the department, College, and professional level. For Professor, candidates must demonstrate sustained leadership in several of the following: institutional governance, professional societies, editorial boards, advisory panels, or community-engaged initiatives with documented impact.

4. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO (“full”) PROFESSOR

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, successful candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must provide “clear and convincing evidence” of “an established external reputation in the primary field, based on consequential achievements in teaching, research and scholarship, or professional activities directly related to teaching and research and scholarship” (Section 2.4). Established national or international reputation for promotion to Professor shall reflect sustained leadership and influence, including high impact publications, leadership roles in professional societies, external funding as PI, MPI, Co-PI, or Co-I with substantial contribution, editorial leadership, prestigious national or international awards, invited keynote addresses, and/or other measures of demonstrable policy, research or practice impact. Candidates seeking promotion to Professor must therefore demonstrate maintained “genuine excellence” in either teaching or research, and at least “high competence” in teaching, research, and service. Generally, such evidence is provided by work performed since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or since receipt of tenure.

4.A. Research

Candidates for promotion to Professor under “genuine excellence” in research must have a substantial record of scholarly achievement and an established national or international reputation that far exceeds that expected for the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates are expected to have a track record of external funding to support their sustained research trajectory and a higher proportion of peer-reviewed manuscripts with lead or senior authorship. Additionally, candidates will be expected to provide evidence of successful teaching and mentorship consistent with at least “high competence” in teaching. Such candidates must also sustain a “high competence” level of service. The type of evidence used to support the assertion of genuine excellence or high competence is similar to that used to support promotion to Associate Professor.

4.B. Teaching and Education

Candidates for promotion to Professor under “genuine excellence” in teaching must have a substantial record of achievement in educational leadership and an established national or international reputation that far exceeds that expected for the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates are expected to have a track record of curriculum or program innovation, leadership in accreditation processes, and/or national recognition in the scholarship of teaching and learning, as well as a demonstrated impact on teaching practices beyond the University.

Additionally, candidates will be expected to provide evidence of successful research consistent with at least “high competence” in research. Such candidates must also sustain a “high competence” level of service. The type of evidence used to support the assertion of genuine excellence or high competence is similar to that used to support promotion to Associate Professor.

5. TENURE AT THE TIME OF APPOINTMENT

If a candidate is to be appointed without term (tenured), the appointment procedure is conducted as specified in the *Faculty Handbook* for competitive or non-competitive appointments. Following an affirmative decision to appoint, the eligible LAU faculty considers whether to recommend tenure in a Level 1 review in conformance with *Faculty Handbook*’s “Procedures for Promotion and Tenure” (Section 2.7.3.2). This recommendation is then sent by the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs to the LAU’s Chair, the College RPT committee, and then to the Dean. The remainder of the process continues according to the *Faculty Handbook*.

For candidates with or without tenure from another institution, at least five independent external letters from recognized experts in the candidate’s field must be requested. The candidate may propose up to 40% of the experts and may also name up to two experts who should not be selected. A letter of recommendation submitted as part of the position application materials may count toward one of the external letters. The candidate shall provide a statement, not exceeding eight pages, regarding research and teaching/mentoring, including future plans; a curriculum vitae; five publications; and an employment chronology. These materials will be shared with external reviewers. A one-page service statement is also required. Candidates appointed without term (tenured) are held to the same standards as other candidates in the LAU.

6. RENEWAL

The third-year renewal process differs from that for promotion and tenure in that affirmative decisions can be based on a candidate’s scholarly productivity trajectory and documented evidence of the candidate’s likelihood of achieving promotion to Associate Professor without term (tenured) at the designated time. Renewal dossiers will be similar to promotion dossiers, except that renewal will not require external review. Candidates receiving an unsatisfactory review will generally be given a terminal year of employment on a term contract during the fourth year, unless other term arrangements are made with the LAU Chair and Dean. The third-year renewal has different due dates than the

promotion and tenure review, which are available in the Appendix and on the *CPH RPT Timelines/Due Dates Chart* (located on the CPH website under faculty resources/tenure and promotion resources). Candidates must declare their intentions to pursue excellence in either research or teaching to their LAU Chair no later than the end of their second year.

Third-year review is formative and developmental. Evaluation shall emphasize trajectory, coherence of scholarly direction, documented progress toward external funding, and likelihood of meeting tenure standards within the probationary period. Full demonstration of genuine excellence is not required at the renewal stage.

7. EXTERNAL REVIEWER QUALIFICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

At least five recommendation letters will be included in the dossier for review by the LAU's RPT Committee, LAU Chair, College RPT Committee, and Dean. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (or their selected representative) will solicit external reviewers from tenured personnel at other universities, providing each external reviewer with a link to the faculty candidate's LAU RPT Guidelines. The majority of the reviewers should hold the rank of Professor, although Associate Professors may be included as external reviewers for candidates being considered for promotion to Associate Professor without term (tenured). The external reviewers must provide a CV demonstrating national or international recognition in the candidate's field of study or a closely aligned field. Efforts will be made to ensure that external reviewers for candidates pursuing genuine excellence in teaching are also expert leaders in pedagogical research and scholarship.

Candidates may submit to their LAU Chair the names of up to five recommended reviewers. External reviewers must not have collaborated or published manuscripts with the candidate. These recommended referees will account for no more than 40% of the total number of external reviewers. Candidates may also submit to the Chair the names of up to two individuals to exclude as potential external reviewers. External reviewers are expected to provide an independent judgment of the candidate and should not have a vested interest in the success or failure of the candidate. Mentors, advisors, collaborators, co-authors, and family members are ineligible. The Dean may request nominations for reviewers from Chairs and RPT committees. These recommendations will be considered confidential.

In addition to the five external reviewers, candidates may include up to two letters from collaborators external to the University as part of their dossier. These collaborators' letters, solicited by the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, cannot count toward the required 5 external reviews. The collaborators will be directed to document the extent and nature of the candidate's individual contributions to the collaborative work, rather than to evaluate the quality and importance of a shared work. The relationship to the candidate and their work must be clearly articulated. No more than two of these letters will be allowed.

The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will ensure that all letters are received per dossier protocol. Candidates must attest, at or prior to the time the dossier is submitted, that they will not receive copies

of the letters submitted by external reviewers nor know the reviewers' names. The dossier will not be accepted or reviewed without this signature.

8. GOING UP FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO FULL

In certain circumstances, a tenure-line faculty member may be hired as an Associate Professor with term. Examples of such circumstances include being an associate-level research-focused faculty member at another university prior to coming to Mason, but not being eligible for tenure (e.g., Research Associate Professor, Associate Research Scientist, Faculty Research Associate, etc.). In such circumstances, the candidate may choose to apply for both tenure and promotion to full professor at the same time. These decisions should be discussed with the candidate's LAU chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. If the decision is to move forward with an application for both tenure and promotion to full professor, the candidate's dossier will be reviewed by only tenured full professors at the unit and college levels.

9. POST TENURE REVIEW

The primary objective of post-tenure review is to provide appropriate sanctions for faculty whose performance remains unsatisfactory. Tenured faculty members who receive two overall unsatisfactory annual evaluations by their LAU within any four-year period will be required to undergo a peer evaluation proceeding as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*. The College RPT Committee will serve as the Evaluation Committee in the event of a post-tenure review. Details of the post-tenure review procedures are outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (Section 2.6.2).

APPENDIX

Table A.1. CPH Schedule for Promotion and Tenure

Responsible Person	Action	Deadline*
Candidate	Candidate declares intent to apply for RPT to LAU Chair and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	March 31 of calendar year dossier is to be submitted; normally during 5 th year for CPH Assistant Professors on tenure-track.
Candidate	Candidate submits list of possible external peer reviewers and collaborators (if appropriate) to LAU Chair.	April 15
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Selection and confirmation of external peer reviewers is complete.	May 15
Candidate	Candidate submits dossier electronically for external review, per university protocol.	June 15
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Dossier is made available to external reviewers.	Approx. June 16
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	If applicable, candidate is notified that there are less than 3 tenured faculty in LAU.	July 1
Candidate	Candidate submits remaining full dossier electronically for internal reviewers, per university protocol.	August 15
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Full dossier, including external review letters, is made available to LAU (Level 1) RPT committee.	September 1
LAU (Level 1) RPT Committee Chair	LAU (Level 1) RPT committee recommendation letter is due to Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	October 15
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Copy of LAU (Level 1) RPT committee letter is provided to candidate. Full dossier, including LAU (Level 1) RPT committee letter recommendation, is made available to LAU Chair.	Approx. October 16
LAU Chair	LAU Chair's recommendation letter is due to Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	November 1

Responsible Person	Action	Deadline*
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Copy of LAU Chair committee letter is provided to candidate and LAU (Level 1) RPT review committee. Full dossier, including the LAU (Level 1) RPT committee and LAU Chair's recommendation letters, is provided to College (Level 2) RPT Committee.	Approx. November 2
College (Level 2) RPT Committee Chair	College RPT (Level 2) Committee's recommendation letter is due to Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	December 1
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Copy of College (Level 2) RPT Committee's recommendation letter is provided to candidate, LAU Chair, and LAU (Level 1) RPT review committee. Full dossier, including the LAU (Level 1) and College (Level 2) RPT committees' and LAU Chair's recommendation letters, is provided to the CPH Dean.	Approx. December 2
CPH Dean	Dean's recommendation letter is due to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	February 1 **
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Dean's recommendation letter is submitted to the Provost. Copy of CPH Dean letter is provided to candidate, LAU Chair, and LAU (Level 1) and College (Level 2) RPT review committee.	Approx. February 2 **

Note: CPH=College of Public Health; LAU=local academic unit which includes all departments and the School of Nursing in CPH; RPT=Promotion, tenure, and review

*When a due date falls on weekend/university holiday, materials will be due the next university business day; this will be communicated directly to affected candidates and/or reviewers.

**Dean-level due dates are set by Provost, vary from year to year, and can be later (see Provost [website](#) for due dates for current cycle).

Table A.2. CPH Schedule for Third-year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

Responsible Person	Action	Deadline*
Candidate	Candidate declares their intent to pursue either genuine excellence in research or teaching to LAU Chair and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	April 15 of 2 nd year on tenure-track in CPH
LAU Chair	LAU Chair meets with candidate to review dossier guidelines and timeline.	April 15 of 2 nd year on tenure-track in CPH
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	If applicable, candidate is notified that there are less than 3 tenured faculty in LAU.	July 1
Candidate	Candidate submits full dossier electronically, per university protocol.	September 15 of 3 rd year on tenure track in CPH
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Full dossier is made available to LAU (Level 1) RPT committee.	October 1
LAU (Level 1) RPT Committee Chair	LAU (Level 1) RPT committee recommendation letter is due to Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	November 1
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Copy of LAU (Level 1) RPT committee letter is provided to candidate. Full dossier, including LAU (Level 1) RPT committee recommendation letter, is made available to LAU Chair.	Approx. November 2
LAU Chair	LAU Chair's recommendation letter is due to Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	December 10
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Copy of LAU Chair letter is provided to candidate and LAU (Level 1) RPT Committee. Full dossier, including the LAU (Level1) RPT and LAU Chair's recommendation letters, is provided to College (Level 2) RPT Committee.	Approx. December 11
College (Level 2) RPT Committee Chair	College (Level2) RPT Committee's recommendation letter is due to Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.	February 1
CPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Copy of College (Level2) RPT Committee's letter is provided to candidate, LAU (Level 1) RPT Committee, and LAU Chair. Full dossier, including the LAU (Level1) and College (Level 2) RPT committees' and LAU Chair's recommendation letters, is provided to the CPH Dean.	Approx. February 2
CPH Dean	Dean's recommendation letter is due to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	March 10**

CPH Associate Dean for Faculty	Dean's recommendation letter is submitted to the Provost. Copy of Dean's letter is provided to candidate, LAU Chair,	Approx. March 11**
Affairs	and LAU (Level 1) and College (Level 2) RPT review committee.	

Note: LAU=local academic unit which includes all departments and the School of Nursing in CPH; RPT=Promotion, tenure, and review

*When a due date falls on weekend/university holiday, materials will be due the next university business day; this will be communicated directly to affected candidates and/or reviewers.

**Dean-level due dates are set by Provost, vary from year to year, and can be later (see Provost [website](#) for due dates for current cycle).

Table A.3. Example Publications Summary Table ("Top 5 Most Cited")

Peer-reviewed Articles	Journal Impact Factor	Number of Citations	Author Contribution (1 st , Senior, Coauthor...)	GMU Faculty at Time of Publication? (Yes, No)
<i>(Brief citation and/or reference # in CV)</i>				
Candidate's total <i>h</i> -index value:				