

**PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES**

**FOR**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Approved in Final Form

August, 1997

Amended April 10, 2001

Amended November 30, 2005

Amended April 3, 2007 – Approved April 23, 2007

Amended February 1, 2008 – Approved May 17, 2008

Amended March 31, 2009 – Approved April 24, 2009

Amended December 10, 2013 – BOV Approved May 9, 2014

Amended April 12, 2016

Revised and approved by SOE Faculty and Dean 04/02/2024

## Table of Contents

1.1	<b>Goal</b>	38
	1.2 Objectives	39
	1.3 Relationship of Schools and Departments to University Promotion and Tenure Policy	39
	1.4 Appointing Authority	40
2.0	<b>Faculty Ranks and Appointments</b>	40
	2.1 General Criteria	40
	2.2 School of Education Criteria	41
	2.3 Documentation	61
3.0	<b>Defining Appointments</b>	65
	3.1 Tenure Appointments	66
	3.2 Probationary (Tenure-Eligible) Appointments	67
	3.3 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments	69
	3.4 Continuing Review of Faculty	69
	3.5 Honorary Titles	69
	3.6 Administrative Titles	69
	3.7 Notice of Appointments	70
	3.8 Joint Appointments with Non-University Agencies	70
4.0	<b>University Promotion and Tenure Policy Review Committee</b>	70
5.0	<b>School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SPTC)</b>	70
	5.1 Committee Membership and Term of Office	70
6.0	<b>University Appeal Committee</b>	71
7.0	<b>Academic Review Procedures for Promotion and Tenure</b>	71
	7.1 Promotion and Tenure Initiated at the Department Level (PRC)	72
8.0	<b>Administrative Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Actions</b>	77
9.0	<b>Appeal Process</b>	77
10.0	<b>The President and the Board of Visitors</b>	77
11.0	<b>Procedures for Termination of Employment of Tenured Faculty Members</b>	77
12.0	<b>Procedures of the Review and Amendment of this Document</b>	78
	Appendix A: <b>Format for Committee Reports</b>	79
	Appendix C: <b>Sample Email Correspondence for External Evaluation of Candidate</b>	82

## GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND AUTHORITY

### 1.1 Goal

The School of Education policies and procedures for faculty promotion and tenure are contained in this document. Its content is consistent with the revised *University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures* adopted by The Board of Visitors on May 10, 2013.

According to the goals of the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies:

Excellence is the original and continuing goal of Virginia Commonwealth University. A prerequisite of this goal is the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. This requires the appointment, promotion and tenure of a faculty in a way that encourages excellence in the creation, dissemination and application of new knowledge ... and fosters an atmosphere of free inquiry and expression.

Appointment, promotion, and tenure are based on the merit of the individual, consideration of comparable achievement in the faculty member's particular field, and the faculty member's value to the mission, needs, and resources of the University.

Promotion in rank reflects quality of performance in appropriate teaching, scholarship and service. Tenure shows the University's continuing commitment to the faculty member, whose position shall not be terminated without adequate reason. The promotion and tenure system at Virginia Commonwealth University is designed to foster:

- Academic freedom of thought, teaching, learning, inquiry, and expression
- Fair and equitable treatment for all individuals
- Appropriate participation by the faculty, the student body, the administration, and the Board of Visitors
- A normal succession and infusion of new faculty

The School of Education procedures and guidelines present policy and procedural variations consistent with the mission of the School and required by the University procedures. This includes promotion and tenure criteria, term and adjunct faculty appointments and promotion in rank, and the peer review system intended to compliment the policies in the University document. Variations in procedure, amplification of criteria, and definitions applying to the School of Education are identified in this document in accordance with the appropriate sections and format of the University document. This document establishes School of Education expectations, in addition to the applicable University goals, policies and procedures.

## 1.2 Objectives

According to the *University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies*, the objectives of the [University] system are:

- Promotion of an engaged, learner-centered environment that fosters inquiry, discovery and innovation in a global setting
- Faculty achievement to the highest attainable degree within the context and resources of the university
- Support of university goals and support of the diverse missions and characteristics of its individual academic units
- Commitment to administrative management which provides for fair and reasonable allocation of time and resources
- Assurance of the financial integrity of the institution
- Sufficient flexibility to permit modifications of programs, curricula and academic organizational units to meet changing academic, institutional and societal needs (p. 4).

## 1.3 Relationship of Schools and Departments to University Promotion and Tenure Policy

According to the University guidelines, each school and each department of a school where recommendations for academic appointments are initiated shall establish written guidelines for promotion and tenure. The policies and procedures for granting expedited promotion and tenure shall also be established at the unit level. Unit guidelines shall be consistent with the university-wide policies in this document, but shall also specify the details involved in meeting the particular goals and objectives of those units.

Promotion in rank and tenure are considered initiated wherever the budgetary and signature authority for Personnel Actions Forms resides. If promotion and tenure are initiated only at the school level, guidelines shall be written only for the school. If promotion and tenure are initiated at the departmental level, guidelines shall be written for both the department and the school. The guidelines for the procedures and criteria for a given department of a school may be identical to the guidelines of that school.

Guidelines shall define tenured, tenure-eligible, and term (non-tenure) faculty positions and the relationship of the unit's promotion and tenure system to the unit's work plan and individual faculty member work plans. The guidelines of each school and each department must be consistent with university policy but shall include procedural variations, composition of committees and criteria for promotion and tenure relative to the unit's mission. The guidelines shall include specific measures for evaluating faculty member performance.

The guidelines for all departments and/or schools shall be formulated and reviewed periodically by a committee of the department and/or school. The faculty shall elect the committee members, and the committee members shall be open to faculty recommendations. A majority vote of the faculty shall be required for the approval of all unit guidelines (p. 4).

#### **1.4 Appointing Authority**

Promotion and tenure of the faculty are made under the ultimate authority and with the final approval of the Board of Visitors, upon recommendation by the President. School of Education authority is vested in the Dean, who recommends faculty promotions and tenure to the Provost.

#### **2.0 Faculty Ranks and Appointments**

This document applies to the university faculty appointments at the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor whose responsibilities are primarily teaching or research. All faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), term (non-tenure), or adjunct (non-tenure). Section 3.0 defines these types of appointments.

#### **2.1 General Criteria**

The University general criteria for promotion includes appropriate credentials and experience, as described below, and demonstrated quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. The University criteria are included in each of the three areas in section 2.2.

**Appropriate credentials and experience.** Appropriate credentials and experience are expected. The candidate will be responsible for providing sufficient information for judging the adequacy of their professional background and experience for the particular requirements of their position

##### **2.1.1 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Tenured and Tenure-eligible Faculty**

Faculty member performance with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service shall be rated (in descending order) as excellent, very good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Credentials and experience shall be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. All written reports and evaluations of tenure and tenure-eligible faculty performance ratings shall use this terminology.

*Appointment or promotion to assistant professor* shall indicate the candidate can be expected to perform satisfactorily all required academic duties and holds promise for further professional development.

*Appointment or promotion to associate professor* requires a minimum rating of *excellent* in either scholarship or teaching and a rating of *very good* in the other of these two categories. Candidates also must achieve a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in service. Candidates must be effective researchers and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishment in scholarship that indicates progress toward a national or international reputation in their discipline.

*Appointment or promotion to professor* requires a minimum rating of *excellent* in either scholarship or teaching and a rating of *very good* in the other of these two categories. Candidates

also must achieve a minimum rating of *very good* in service. Candidates must be effective researchers and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishment in scholarship that indicates achievement of a national or international reputation in their discipline.

### **2.1.2 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Promotion for Term (Non-tenure) Faculty**

The policies and procedures for promotion of term (non-tenure) faculty shall be the same as those used for promotion of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty with consideration given to the special mix of duties assigned to faculty members holding term (non-tenure) appointments. The Position Description for Teaching and Research Faculty along with the individual work plans that guide each term (non-tenure) faculty member's effort relative to teaching, scholarship, and service activities shall guide the evaluation for promotion of each term faculty member. The criteria and definitions of criteria as specified in section 2.2 of this document shall apply to term (non-tenure) faculty to the extent that the criteria and definitions are consistent with the term (non-tenure) faculty member's assigned duties for the specific position held.

*Promotion to assistant professor* (e.g., Teaching Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor) requires a minimum rating of *very good* in their primary area (i.e., teaching, research, or practice) and a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in credentials and professional experience and service. Candidates who have a secondary focal area must receive a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in this area. If the candidate does not have a secondary focal area a rating of Not Applicable (NA) will be used.

*Appointment or promotion to associate professor* (e.g., Teaching Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor) requires a rating of *excellent* in their primary area (i.e., teaching, research, or practice). Candidates who have a secondary focal area must receive a minimum rating of *very good* in this area. Candidates also must achieve a minimum rating of *satisfactory* in service and a rating of *satisfactory* in credentials and professional experience. If the candidate does not have a secondary focal area a rating of Not Applicable (NA) will be used.

*Appointment or promotion to professor* (e.g., Teaching Professor, Research Professor) requires a rating of *excellent* in their primary area (i.e., teaching, research, or practice), a rating of *very good* in service, and a *satisfactory* in credentials and professional experience. Candidates who have a secondary focal area must receive a minimum rating of *very good* in this area. If the candidate does not have a secondary focal area a rating of Not Applicable (NA) will be used.

## **2.2 School of Education Criteria**

The general criteria for the School of Education are an amplification of the general criteria of the University. Their purpose is to assist in uniform and consistent evaluation within the School and to encourage excellence. The criteria also help direct faculty efforts for tenure and promotion and

provide organized and relevant documentation that reflects professional growth and contributions over time.

Performance criteria have evolved in the departments and School of Education and were developed to serve as identifiable evidence of performance, not as a set of binding contractual points. They are an explicit guide to all who plan to orient their performance toward successful tenure and promotion decisions. They serve as benchmarks for decision makers to reduce the bias of subjectivity. The criteria are intended to require the use of multiple sources of documentation and to be flexible enough to encourage diversity or uniqueness where it is warranted.

The criteria are intended to encourage faculty members to plan for their contributions and growth to exceed the minimum. Faculty who meet the minimum performance criteria shall be judged as *satisfactory*. Beyond the minimum, faculty are encouraged to pursue activities in areas where their talents will make the greatest contributions to the Program Area, Department, School, University, and their own professional development. Performances beyond the minimum level shall be awarded ratings of *very good* or *excellent*.

### **2.2.1 Evaluation Period**

The evaluation period considered in the promotion process, identified as time in rank, is generally defined as the time since one's last promotion. Documentation should emphasize accomplishments during the evaluation period; however, it is recognized that, especially in the area of scholarly work, accomplishments may need to be reviewed in light of an entire career. For tenure considerations, the candidate's entire career will be evaluated. Although output during the evaluation period may be emphasized, the intrinsic nature of scholarly activities requires its assessment over time. Issues such as impact on the profession and continuity of productivity cannot be assessed in particular time-bound segments. Assessment of teaching and service activities will generally be pertinent to the evaluation period itself. If a candidate believes that a broader view of those activities is necessary, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide a rationale for that view.

### **2.2.2 Context for Evaluation**

#### **a. School Perspective**

It is necessary in evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure to place performance in the context of school goals and structure. This is accomplished by the candidate in her or his narrative that establishes how the nature of activities and accomplishments are related to the mission and goals of the School.

#### **b. Department Perspective**

The activities and accomplishments of the candidate must be integrated with the requirements of the department and with the performance of other faculty in the department. The goals and expectations of the department may change over time. To ensure complete evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion, data are gathered to reflect the department expectations over the time period for which the candidate is reviewed. Using the

descriptive information provided by the candidate and the department information, the quality of a candidate's contributions and growth can be determined. This includes working collaboratively and responsibly with colleagues. From this perspective, merit is defined as the value of the candidate's contributions to the department.

**c. Program Area Perspective**

Each department will make a determination regarding the implementation of program areas within the unit, and candidates are expected to meet the expectation of the assigned program area, and with the performance of other faculty in the program area. The goals and expectations of the program area may change over time. To ensure complete evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion, data are gathered to reflect the program area expectations over the time period for which the candidate is reviewed. Using the descriptive information provided by the candidate and the program area data, the quality of the candidate's contributions and growth can be determined. From this perspective, merit is defined as the value of the candidate's contributions to the program area.

**d. Candidate Perspective**

While it is the responsibility of each faculty member to align personal expectations with the program area, department, School and University goals and expectations, it is nevertheless important that evaluators understand the candidate's individual goals and perspective for the specific time period under review, as well as over an entire career, particularly changes in focus during the period and effect of the candidate's perspective on individual performance. For example, a faculty member's focus on goals and activities in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service may have changed over the years. In such cases, the individual perspective should explain the rationale for these changes, and the documentation should reflect contributions to the different perspectives. It is the individual candidate's responsibility to organize documentation to highlight accomplishments and growth across the areas under review.

**e. Time Perspective**

Evaluation for tenure and promotion must take a broad time perspective. Growth over time is important to the interpretation of performance. Because faculty members begin their careers at different levels, there is no single standard for professional growth. By the same token, not all faculty members develop at the same rate. Likewise, some faculty members may focus their efforts on activities in one category for a concentrated period of time in order to apply later the findings or product toward significant contributions in more than one category. Failure to assess growth over time in these three situations could present a distorted view of professional contributions and growth. Evaluators shall review the documentation presented by the candidate and may seek other evidence to illuminate the individual's pattern of contributions over the period of time the evaluation covers, and over the candidate's entire career.



### 2.2.3 Appropriate Credentials and Experiences

Appropriate credentials and experience are expected of all faculty applying for promotion and tenure. Sufficient information for judging the adequacy of a candidate's professional background and experience for the particular requirements of their position is expected.

### 2.2.4 Demonstrated Quality in Teaching

According to the University *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, "Teaching shall be evaluated based primarily upon the impact of the faculty member's teaching in programs relevant to the mission of their academic unit. Faculty members must demonstrate mastery of their subject matter and at communicating this understanding to student learners; most fundamentally, faculty members should demonstrate that their students learn. There should be evidence of the candidate's sustained commitment to classroom instruction, to inclusion of advising and availability to students as a component of teaching, to sustained effectiveness as a contributor to the intellectual development of students through devices such as course design, course material, curriculum development, and attention to other mechanisms of enhancing student learning. Mentoring, and other forms of beneficial interactions between the candidate and learners, may be given appropriate weight as a part of the teaching criteria as determined by the academic unit. Demonstrated quality of teaching may include community-engaged teaching that connects students and faculty members with activities that address community-identified needs through mutually beneficial partnerships that deepen students' academic and civic learning. Examples are service-learning courses or service-learning clinical practica."

Demonstrating quality as a teacher is the cornerstone upon which evaluation in the School of Education is based and is one of the major considerations in the evaluation for tenure and promotion. Teaching consists of continuous development of instruction reflective of best practice, innovative teaching skills and techniques (including collaborative efforts and integration of technology), student advising and mentoring, contributing to program improvement and accreditation including faculty mentoring, and when applicable clinical supervision and/community engaged teaching. The evaluation of teaching shall be determined according to the criteria shown in Table 1 as they relate to the candidate's position, including allocation of effort over time and length of time in rank and/or time at VCU. This table is to be used as a guide and candidates are expected to meet criteria or components that are relevant to their responsibilities in the department; this means that candidates do not necessarily need to meet all criteria or demonstrate all components.

**Promotion to Associate Professor** requires a minimum rating of excellent in either teaching or scholarship and a very good in the other of these two categories.

**Promotion to Professor.** The criteria for teaching for promotion to professor are the same as for promotion to associate professor.

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion  
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Instruction reflective of best practice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular or continuous efforts are made to improve the quality of teaching.</li> <li>- Efforts are made so that courses reflect current knowledge, research-based information, and rigor.</li> <li>- Evidence is shown of teaching competence over time.</li> <li>- Syllabi are current and complete</li> <li>- Program and course objectives are met</li> <li>- Expectations are clear</li> <li>- Assessments are appropriate</li> <li>- Historical and contemporary perspectives are used where appropriate</li> <li>- Assignment enable students to apply new knowledge, skills, and dispositions where appropriate</li> <li>- Technology is integrated where appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Teaching demonstrates improvement.</li> <li>- Courses reflect current knowledge, research-based information, and rigor.</li> <li>- Evidence is shown to demonstrate teaching effectiveness over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Consistent high quality teaching is evident over time.</li> <li>- Courses reflect current knowledge, research-based information, and rigor over time.</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion  
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Advising</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advising is accurate, timely, and reflects current department, school, and university policies</li> <li>- Advising is professional and sensitive to the needs of students</li> <li>- Regular or continuous efforts are made to improve the quality of advising.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Advising demonstrates improvement.</li> <li>- Concerted efforts are made to seek needed information and solve problems related to advising.</li> <li>- Advising adequacy is recognized by students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Sustained efforts are made to improve the quality of advising or maintain its high standard.</li> <li>- Evidence is shown recognizing advising as excellent over time.</li> <li>- The candidate makes efforts to help find ways to improve the advising process.</li> </ul>
<b>Contributions to program improvement, evaluation, and accreditation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Curricular and program development</li> <li>- Evaluation and accreditation activities</li> <li>- Faculty mentoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Efforts are made to improve the quality of programs through development and revision.</li> <li>- Efforts are made to support accreditation activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Substantive contributions are made to program development for improvement.</li> <li>- Substantive contributions are made to support accreditation activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Initiative and leadership are shown in the improvement of programs.</li> <li>- Initiative and leadership are shown in the support of accreditation activities.</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion  
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<p><b>Clinical supervision and/or community engaged teaching/learning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clinical supervision</li> <li>- Internship and externship supervision</li> <li>- Community engaged teaching/learning (e.g., service learning, practica)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clinical supervision reflects successful efforts to improve the clinical competencies of students and to foster quality working arrangements with partnering schools and/or agencies</li> <li>- Work in clinical/community settings demonstrates regular or continuous efforts to improve effectiveness in working with students and agency needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Work in clinical/ community settings demonstrates improvement for student needs and the needs of the corresponding community.</li> <li>- Clinical supervision and community engagement are recognized as effective over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Sustained efforts are made to continue to improve the quality and effectiveness of clinical, field-based or other community-based activities.</li> <li>- Supervision of clinical experiences is recognized as excellent over time.</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Teaching Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion  
from Assistant to Associate Professor/Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<p><b>Involvement in student research activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mentoring graduate students, including graduate assistants, doctoral students, etc.</li> <li>- Externship, thesis, and/or doctoral committee participation</li> <li>- Mentoring student research initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular or continuous efforts are made to improve the quality of working with students on research activities.</li> <li>- Efforts are made so that courses that involve student research reflect current knowledge and research-based information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Working with students on research activities demonstrates improvement.</li> <li>- Courses that involve student research reflect current knowledge and research-based information.</li> <li>- Evidence is shown of recognized effectiveness of working with students on research activities over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Sustained efforts are made to improve the quality of working with students on research activities or maintain its high standard.</li> <li>- Sustained efforts are made to continue to keep knowledge in courses that involve student research current and reflective of research-based information.</li> <li>- Evidence is shown that working with students on research activities is recognized as excellent over time.</li> </ul>

### 2.2.5 Demonstrated Quality in Scholarship and Professional Growth

According to the University *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, “Faculty members should be continuously engaged in productive and creative scholarly activity in areas relevant to the goals and mission of their academic unit. They should make a substantive contribution to the body of knowledge in their discipline that reflects high standards of quality in creativity, scholarship and professional competence. They should demonstrate leadership and professional competence in independent scholarship and/or collaborative research that leads to the creation of new knowledge or creative expression. Scholarship can be in the form of research and discovery scholarship, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or community-engaged research. Research and discovery scholarship breaks new ground in the discipline and answers significant questions in the discipline. Scholarship of teaching and learning includes applied research regarding various pedagogies, student learning, and assessment practices; development and dissemination of materials for use in teaching beyond one’s own classroom. Community-engaged research is a collaborative process between the researcher and community partner at all stages of the research process. Examples are community-based participatory and action research.”

Several considerations are important in evaluating scholarship and professional growth:

- Scholarly activities may involve inquiry and research. Scholarly products can be empirical, theoretical, or philosophical.
- Scholarly accomplishments may focus on a single or a few areas, or may be more diverse, representing several different but related areas.
- Collaborative and individual scholarship is valued. Collaborations within and beyond discipline, department, or school are valued. In cases where there are multiple authors, first authorship is most highly valued and the amount of effort required to produce single authored works is recognized.
- Refereed products are more highly valued than non-refereed products.
- The quality and quantity of scholarly products shall be evaluated in relation to the impact of the product on the profession, on colleagues, on the field of study, and on the mission of the unit, School, and University. Quality is a professional judgment by peers, based on such factors as the rigor of the review process, the scope, and the recognized contribution to the field. Quantity is evaluated in relation to the volume of products, the time and effort required for completion and the candidate’s allocated effort over time
- Externally and internally funded grants are valued. The writing of the grant, irrespective of the nature of the grant, is considered scholarship. The evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship related to grant activity is based on the following factors:
  - the candidate’s role in developing and writing grant applications, and role on the project;

- the funding determination;
  - the grant competitiveness;
  - the amount and duration of the grant award.
- Professional growth is the development of scholarly expertise, and is demonstrated through activities such as involvement in agencies, schools, the community, continuing education, and other activities that maintain and keep current of important scholarly skills and knowledge in the field.

The evaluation of scholarship and professional growth shall be determined according to the criteria shown in Tables 2 and 3 as they relate to the candidate's position and length of time in rank and/or time at VCU. These tables are to be used as guides and candidates are expected to meet criteria or components that are relevant to their responsibilities in the department; this means that candidates do not necessarily need to meet all criteria or demonstrate all components.

**Table 2. Scholarship Components and Criteria for  
Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Publications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scholarly products have been developed and submitted for peer review.</li> <li>- A record of continuous scholarship and professional growth has been established.</li> <li>- Evidence is presented that establishes the candidate's expertise in conducting scholarly inquiry appropriate to their discipline.</li> <li>- A record of favorable peer evaluations of scholarship has been established.</li> <li>- The potential for and likely continuation of scholarship and professional growth has been established.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Scholarly products, including research, have been recognized for impact at the state/regional and national/international level.</li> <li>- Scholarly products, including research, have resulted in some recognition of contribution of the work to the discipline, field, and/or practice.</li> <li>- Evidence shows a pattern of emerging accomplishment that indicates progress toward a national/international reputation in their discipline, field, and/or practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Scholarly products have been recognized for impact at the national/international level.</li> <li>- Evidence shows a pattern of sustained accomplishment that indicates progress toward a national/ international reputation in their discipline, field, and/or practice.</li> </ul>



**Table 2. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Presentations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most or all presentations have been at the local, regional, or state level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Presentations have been recognized by peer-review at the state/regional and national/international level.</li> <li>- Presentations have resulted in some recognition of contribution of the work to the discipline, field, and/or practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Evidence shows a pattern of accomplishment, such as paper presentations, invited presentations, symposium and panel appearances, that indicates progress toward a national/international reputation in their discipline, field, and/or practice.</li> </ul>
<b>Grant Activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Grant activities have been developed and submitted for peer review, but not necessarily funded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Candidate has contributed significantly to grant activities (for example proposal writing, submission, co-PI, etc.) that have been developed, but not necessarily funded, and received favorable reviews.</li> <li>- Evidence shows a pattern of accomplishment that builds a trajectory toward a funded research or training program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Candidate has contributed significantly to funded grant activities (e.g., proposal writing, submission, co-PI, etc.) especially external agencies.</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Scholarship Components and Criteria for  
Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Community Engaged Research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is evidence that the scholar has engaged in this work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- The scholar is actively pursuing community engaged projects and there is systematic evidence of its potential impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- There is systematic evidence of the impact of the scholars' community engaged research on the collaborating institutions and/or through published work.</li> </ul>
<b>Other Forms of Scholarship</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is evidence that the candidate has engaged in other forms of scholarship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- The candidate's other forms of scholarship have been recognized for some impact at the state/regional and national/international level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- The candidate's other forms of scholarship have been recognized for impact and a pattern of accomplishment at the state/regional and national/international level.</li> </ul>

**Table 3. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Publications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's publications have resulted in national/international recognition of the contribution to the discipline, field, and/or practice.</li> <li>- The candidate's publication evidence suggests national/international recognition over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's publication evidence establishes a national/international recognition of significant contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> </ul>
<b>Presentations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's presentations have resulted in national/international recognition of the contribution to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> <li>- The candidate's presentation evidence suggests national/international recognition over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's presentation evidence establishes a national/international recognition of significant contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> </ul>

**Table 3. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	CRITERIA		
	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Grant Activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's funded grant activities have resulted in national/international recognition to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> <li>- The candidate's funded grant activity evidence suggests national/international recognition over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's funded grant activity evidence demonstrates national/international recognition of significant e contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> </ul>
<b>Community-engaged Research</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have met.</li> <li>- The candidate's evidence suggests impact of community engaged research over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's evidence suggests strong impact and significant contribution of community-engaged research over time.</li> </ul>

<b>Table 3. Scholarship Components and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor</b>				
	<b>COMPONENTS</b>	<b>CRITERIA</b>		
		<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<b>Other Forms of Scholarship</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <i>Very Good</i> standards for promotion to associate professor have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's other forms of scholarship have resulted in national/international recognition to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> <li>- The candidate's other forms of evidence suggest national recognition over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standards for <i>Very Good</i> have been met.</li> <li>- The candidate's other forms of evidence establish a national/international recognition of exemplary and/or outstanding contributions to the discipline, field, community, and/or practice.</li> </ul>

## 2.2.6 Demonstrated Quality in Service

According to the University *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, “Faculty members are expected to give of their time and expertise for the betterment of their department, School and University, their profession and/or the broader community. Service includes engaging in the application of learning and discovery to improve the human condition and support the public good at home and abroad. Demonstrated performance in service may include community-engaged service, which is the application of one’s professional expertise to address a community-identified need and to support the goals and mission of the university and the community partner.”

In the spirit of good citizenship, shared governance and active engagement, faculty provide service to their program area, department, School, University, profession and community. It is expected that the quality of service will reflect increasing leadership and contribution over time.

When evaluating service, the balance between quantity and quality should be considered. Quantity involves service time required by activities and number of activities. Quality of service involves effort and contribution. For example, if a candidate serves on numerous committees, the cumulative activity should be taken into account when determining rating. Similarly, when a candidate demonstrates significant commitment to a particular service activity over time, this should also be considered when determining a rating. However, it is also expected that the candidate will serve in diverse ways and engage in a range of activities.

The quality of service is on a continuum of impact, which generally starts with membership and progresses to active participation and leadership. Leadership is not restricted to formal leadership roles on committees (e.g., Chair) or in organizations (e.g., President); rather leadership is measured by degree of engagement and impact.

The evaluation of service shall be determined according to the standards shown in Tables 4 and 5 as they relate to the candidate’s position and length of time in rank and/or time at VCU. The examples are meant to serve an illustrative purpose only, and it is up to the candidates to explain the impact of a particular activity in which they are engaged. These tables are to be used as guides and candidates are expected to meet criteria or components that are relevant to their responsibilities in the department; this means that candidates do not necessarily need to meet all criteria or demonstrate all components.

**Table 4. Service Components, Example Activities, and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

COMPONENTS	EXAMPLE SERVICE ACTIVITIES (not exhaustive)	CRITERIA		
		Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Department Service</b>	Search committee member/chair, admissions committee, active involvement in department activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contribution in the program area, department, School and University.</li> <li>- Membership in professional organizations at the local, state or national levels.</li> <li>- Service and professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service that reflects favorably on the School and University.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Satisfactory</i></li> <li>- Demonstrated contribution and leadership in the program area, department, School and/or University. An important distinction between ratings of very good and satisfactory level performance is demonstrated leadership</li> <li>- Contribution to professional organizations at the local, state, or national level.</li> <li>- Service and professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service reflects recognition of leadership.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i></li> <li>- Record of recognized leadership and service in the program area, department, and School. University-level service is demonstrated.</li> <li>- Record of recognized leadership and service to local, state, or national professional organizations over time.</li> <li>- Service and professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service that reflects established leadership.</li> </ul>
<b>School Service</b>	School committee member/chair, active member of committee			
<b>University Service</b>	University committee member			
<b>Community Service</b>	Member of community organization, advisory board/advisory role			
<b>Professional Service</b>	<p>Conference proposal reviewer, active member in professional organization at state and national level, chair/program chair of AERA SIG or division</p> <p>Ad hoc reviewer, editorial board member, associate editor of a journal, guest editor of a special issue</p>			

**Table 5. Service Components, Example Activities, and Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

COMPONENTS	EXAMPLE SERVICE ACTIVITIES (not exhaustive)	CRITERIA		
		Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
<b>Department Service</b>	Active member/leadership role in department activities, search committee chair, PRC member/chair	The <i>Very Good</i> criteria for promotion to Associate Professor have been met.	The <i>Excellent</i> criteria for promotion to Associate Professor have been met.	Meets criteria for <i>Very Good</i>
<b>School Service</b>	Committee/task force membership, leadership roles on committees over time		Record of recognized leadership to professional organizations over time with emphasis at the national level and/or community-engaged service.	Recognition of quality and effective leadership to the program area, department, School and University, sustained over the time in rank.
<b>University Service</b>	Active member of University committees (e.g., Task Force, IRB, University Appeals), leadership role on University committees over time			Involvement with local, state, and national level professional organizations, with the emphasis at the national level has been recognized for quality and leadership effectiveness. This involvement should
<b>Community Service</b>	Member of community organizations, active involvement in organization activities (e.g., organize events initiatives), advisory board service			



<p><b>Professional Service</b></p>	<p>Active member and demonstrated leadership in professional organization at national level</p> <p>Editorial board service, Associate Editor/Editor service</p>			<p>be demonstrated over time.</p> <p>Quality service and sustained professional activity at the community level and/or community engaged service has brought recognition to the School and University, and demonstrates a record of quality and impact over time.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--	--	---

## **2.3 Documentation**

Documentation includes evidence presented by the candidate to support the case for promotion and/or tenure. Documentation must include a narrative, curriculum vitae, Final Activity Reports and yearly evaluations from the department chair, external evaluations (secured by the Peer Review Committee), documents related to teaching, documents related to scholarship including samples of publications, and documents related to service. The candidate shall supply all documents in electronic form to the Dean's office.

The School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee has the option, if necessary, to request additional information from a candidate, the Peer Review Committee, and/or the department chair(s) to further clarify the candidate's portfolio. This request will be made one time and by the SPTC chair with information requested provided by a designated date.

Documentation should:

- Describe major assigned duties and responsibilities for the evaluation period;
- Be selected for relevance between service and scholarly activities, with justification for placing an activity or product in one of these categories;
- Include only materials and activities directly related to one's professional role. Activities accomplished as a citizen rather than as a professional educator are not generally appropriate for inclusion.

### **2.3.1 Narrative**

Most activities to be evaluated fall into the three major categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Minimally, the narrative should specifically address each of these three major areas. The activities in the three categories are usually interrelated; therefore, the view of evaluators may be limited if the activities in a category are viewed in isolation. A more realistic evaluation may be achieved when the individual's professional contributions are viewed over time and across evaluation categories and within perspectives listed in Section 2.2.1. It is the candidate's responsibility to address the perspectives as part of the narrative.

The narrative should be used to clarify or explain the curriculum vita and the documentation to show change in direction or emphasis. It should help the evaluators distinguish among teaching, service, or scholarly activities at different levels of the profession. The narrative affords candidates an opportunity to clarify for evaluators their accomplishments, professional growth, and changing patterns. The candidate should not rely entirely on the curriculum vitae.

Whatever organizational decisions are made by the candidate, the narrative is vital in making a case for tenure and/or promotion. Explanations that may be appropriate could include, but are not limited to, the following examples: improvements in teaching; the candidate's role and contribution when not a first author; distinguishing service activities that involved more than cursory committee membership.

### **2.3.2 Curriculum Vitae**

It is the responsibility of the candidate to present a clear, updated, and standard curriculum vitae covering one's entire professional career (see Appendix A).

### **2.3.3 Final Activity Reports and Yearly Evaluations by the Department Chair**

The candidate should submit the Final Activity Reports and yearly evaluations by the Department Chair for time in rank.

### **2.3.4 Documentation for Background and Professional Experience**

The candidate's curriculum vitae provides the necessary documentation for this area, along with a specific statement in the narrative addressing this criterion. Transcripts that indicate the candidate's credentials should be on file in the Human Resources Office.

### **2.3.5 Documentation for Teaching**

The candidate's opening statement in the narrative should present an individual perspective about teaching in their faculty assignment. This should include an explanation of personal goals, an analysis of their approach to teaching and/or advising, a discussion of focus and contributions over time, an explanation of how one's teaching has contributed to the department and School, how technology has been utilized, how student learning has been documented, an explanation of the documentation covering the evaluation period, and explanations of course loads (e.g., number of courses, number of different courses, new preparations, numbers of students).

#### **a. Instruction**

##### ***Required:***

- A table showing the candidate's teaching schedule for the entire review period. Including the course number, title, enrollment, semester taught, level (undergraduate, masters, doctoral).
- *Selected* course syllabi. These materials should include a syllabus for each course taught and at least two syllabi, showing change over time, for each course taught multiple times.
- List of new courses or curricula developed.
- Student evaluations. The University student course evaluation form and results must be presented for every course and indicate response rates. A table showing *median* scores on each item should be prepared for each course for candidates seeking promotion to associate professor. Candidates seeking promotion to professor should include sufficient student evaluations to support the candidate's conclusions regarding their demonstrated quality in teaching. All student comments from the University course evaluations must be submitted.

- Evidence that establishes the appropriate level of rigor in the selected course.

***Optional:***

- Evidence of student learning for selected courses.
- Any relevant evaluations other than the University course/instructor evaluations included above.
- Faculty/peer observation letters of comment

**b. Advising**

***Required:***

- Number of advisees by degree program and year.
- Listing of dissertation and capstone committees, include student names, dates, and your role on the committee.
- Listing of Masters theses and/or externship proposals, include student names, dates, and your role.

**c. Contributions to program improvement, evaluation, and accreditation**

***Required:***

- Listing of program improvement, evaluation, and/or accreditations activities by year, indicating your role and contribution.

***Optional:***

- Faculty/peer observation letters of comment

**d. Clinical supervision and/or community engaged teaching/learning**

***Required:***

- Listing of all field-based instructional activities include: supervision of student teaching, practicum, supervision of clinical or career-oriented places. Listings should be organized in a useful manner and indicate the number of students involved and load assignments.
- Evaluations by students involved in the placements, as appropriate to the Department.

**e. Involvement in student research activities**

***Required:***

- Listing of the number and nature of student research activities each year not associated with course requirements.
- Sample student products

### 2.3.6 Documentation for Scholarship and Professional Growth

An explanation of the documentation should be included in the narrative to facilitate understanding of how scholarship and professional growth have developed and contributed to the missions of the Department, School, and University. In the narrative, the candidate could describe how scholarly activities have contributed to the discipline, community and practice.

#### a. Publications

***Required:***

- Table of all journal publications for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure, in chronological order by publication date, and including , author(s), title, name of journal, whether refereed, type of article (e.g., empirical research or conceptual analysis), and target audience.
- Five refereed products (e.g., journal articles, books, book chapters, non-print media materials, curriculum materials, and electronic media).
- Explanation of role in co-authored publications.
- Information about the journals in which the candidate has published, including, for example, impact factor, acceptance rate, number of citations, and circulation.

#### b. Presentations

***Required:***

- Table listing all professional presentations, indicating audience, whether refereed or invited, and whether accompanied by a paper.

#### c. Grants and Contracts

***Required:***

- Examples of up to two grant submissions and/or contracts for which the candidate was PI or Co-PI.
- Explanation of the nature and status of the grant (e.g., training, research or consultation; internal or external, funding agency, whether it is an original application or a continuation grant; and, whether or not it was funded).
- Grant and/or contract application abstracts and an explanation of the candidate's role in the development of grant or contract applications, when the candidate's role is other than PI or Co-PI.

#### d. Awards and Recognition

***Required:***

- Documentation of the nature of the award or recognition.

### **2.3.7 Documentation for Service**

***Required:***

- Table listing all service activities for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure, indicating level (e.g., department, program area, school, university, profession, community), duration, role, including leadership responsibilities.

### **3.0 Defining Appointments**

According to the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, all faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), term (non-tenure), or adjunct (non-tenure). Adjunct (non-tenure) appointments are part-time. All other appointments shall be full-time and either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), or term (non-tenure).

A tenured appointment is an appointment that continues until the faculty member either voluntarily leaves the university or is dismissed for cause as specified in Section 11 of the University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures. Tenure is conferred in accordance with the criteria and procedures established by this document and supplemented by appropriate school and department guidelines. Tenure is granted only at the rank of associate professor or professor.

A term (non-tenure) appointment is a full-time appointment to the faculty for a specified mix of duties and does not lead to tenure. Term (non-tenure) appointments shall always be at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor. Term (non-tenure) faculty members shall hold the same rights and responsibilities specified in the Faculty Handbook as tenured or tenure-eligible faculty except they shall not be afforded tenure or tenure eligibility. When appropriate to the duties assigned to the faculty member holding a term appointment, modifiers as defined by the unit (e.g., Clinical Professor, Visiting Professor, Research Professor or Teaching Professor) should be used. A term (non-tenure) appointment may be for a period of one to five years and may be renewable. Conditions and notifications for non-renewal are to be specified in the letter of appointment for term (non-tenure) faculty.

Faculty members who serve in positions identified by the School of Education to be non-tenure track positions will be designated as term faculty. Term appointments are reviewed annually by the Dean of the School of Education and are subject to different terms of notification of non-renewal than those of tenured appointments. Such terms shall be specified in the letter of appointment. A term faculty member is eligible to apply for a tenured or probationary appointment upon termination of an existing term appointment.

**Term faculty in the School of Education include:**

- a. affiliate appointments between the School of Education and other departments, schools, or agencies
- b. individuals who are full time coordinators of a center in the School of Education
- c. one hundred percent grant-funded positions
- d. faculty positions receiving salary reimbursement from the Virginia Department of Education.
- e. any position designated at the time of appointment as term faculty by the Dean of the School of Education.

The minimum academic preparation for term faculty is a Master's degree in the appropriate discipline. Term faculty with duties in areas other than teaching are evaluated consistent with their responsibilities. When appropriate to the duties assigned to the faculty member holding a term appointment, designations of teaching, research, and practice should be used such as clinical professor of practice, assistant professor of teaching, visiting professor of research. Ranks include professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor.

Adjunct faculty (non-tenure) appointments are granted to faculty members who serve the university part-time and are employed for specific activities. The rights and privileges of adjunct faculty shall be specified in the guidelines of the unit making the appointment, but they shall not participate in the evaluation of full-time faculty members for promotion or tenure. Recommendations for appointments or rank of part-time, non-tenured faculty shall not require academic review outside the school. These personnel actions shall be reviewed using guidelines established by the school and department and recommended by a letter from the department and/or school with the concurrence of the Dean.

### **3.1 Tenure Appointments**

According to the University guidelines, tenure is conferred based on the faculty member's demonstrated capabilities, academic achievement and the university's anticipated long-term academic needs.

A recommendation for a tenured appointment is initiated only by an academic unit of a degree-granting school or college. Typically, recommendations for tenured appointments are initiated in the department of a school, but in schools where recommendations for academic personnel actions are initiated at the school level, the recommendations for tenured appointments are also initiated at the school level. The guidelines for each academic unit where recommendations for tenured appointments are initiated shall specify written criteria and standards for recommending tenure in that unit. These criteria shall assure that recommendations are based on a record of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship appropriate to the discipline, professional growth and service to the university, the profession, and/or the public. These guidelines shall also specify each unit's procedures for consultation with external evaluators and how the use of external evaluators

is reported to the candidate. External evaluators shall be at a rank equal to or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being reviewed.

Faculty in the School of Education who are appointed to a tenure-track position are considered to be tenure-track faculty members and are eligible to be considered for tenure under these guidelines. Tenure-track faculty may be appointed at the Assistant, Associate, or Professor level.

### **3.2 Probationary (Tenure-Eligible) Appointments**

According to University guidelines, probationary appointments are granted to faculty members with suitable preparation and experience and are appointed in positions identified by the department and/or school as appropriate for tenured faculty.

The maximum period of probationary service for an assistant professor is typically six academic years. An initial appointment at the rank of professor or associate professor may also be probationary appointments. The maximum period of probationary service is typically two years as a professor and three years as an associate professor.

#### **3.2.1 Alterations of the Typical Probationary Period**

According to the University guidelines, there are some situations where alterations of the typical probationary period are warranted and may be established at the time of the initial appointment by the mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department chair and/or Dean. Following are situations where an altered probationary period is warranted and can be established:

1. Prior service at an academic institution at the rank of assistant professor or above warrants a reduced probationary period.
2. Prior service in a discipline unrelated to the present appointment, with the approval of the provost warrants a reduced probationary period.
3. Prior service while a candidate for a doctoral or equivalent terminal degree at any institution warrants a reduced probationary period.
4. In exceptional cases, when the special nature of a faculty member's scholarship or special mix of duties warrants an extended probationary period of time to meet the general criteria for tenure.

The agreed upon period of probationary service must be so noted in the notice of appointment. Faculty members reviewed for tenure before the end of their full probationary period shall not be subject to any extraordinary requirements and shall be required to meet the same standards required of them at the end of the full probationary period.



In no case shall such an altered probationary period exceed 10 years for an assistant professor, five years for an associate professor and three years for a full professor. Any altered probationary period must receive approval from the provost for faculty on the Monroe Park campus or from the vice president for health sciences for faculty from the medical campus.

At the end of this agreed upon probationary period, the faculty member must be given an appointment with tenure or a one-year terminal appointment.

### **3.2.2 Extensions of the Initially Agreed Upon Probationary Period**

According to University guidelines, a tenure-eligible faculty member may request an extension of the agreed upon probationary period when extenuating circumstances are projected to impede significantly normal progress. Such circumstances might include but are not limited to childbirth, adoption, care of terminally ill immediate relative, personal trauma, short-term disability as defined by the Virginia Sickness and Disability Program, natural disaster, major accidents, or other circumstances beyond the control of the candidate. Extensions may also be granted for public or appointed university service. Application for extensions must be made through the unit within one year of the onset of the extenuating circumstances. The faculty member's prior annual reviews shall be considered in making the decision about the extension of the initial probationary period. In no case shall an extended probationary period be granted based solely on lack of progress toward work plan goals.

Written approval of the extension by the Dean and the provost on the Monroe Park campus or the vice president for health sciences is required. All extensions of the initial probationary period shall be entered in writing in the faculty member's personnel file. In no case shall such an extension of probationary period exceed 10 years for an assistant professor, five years for an associate professor and three years for a full professor exclusive of extensions for leave or extenuating circumstances described above.

### **3.2.3 Evaluation of Probation for Tenure-Eligible Faculty**

According to University guidelines, probationary appointments at the rank of assistant professor shall be reviewed periodically by the academic unit where personnel actions are initiated. The guidelines for each such unit shall specify how this review shall be conducted and the criteria to be used to evaluate progress toward tenure. The guidelines shall specify the frequency of the review(s), how the individual work plan developed in accordance with the Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy shall be incorporated into the review process, and how the candidate shall be informed regarding progress toward meeting the standards and criteria for tenure in that unit. The guidelines shall specify the voting rights of the faculty regarding continued probation, terminal reappointment, or a recommendation to grant tenure.

The departmental chair, the reviewing faculty of the department or the candidate may request a review for a recommendation to grant tenure. A faculty member may be reviewed for tenure once

before the normal review occurring at the end of the probationary period. Faculty members reviewed for tenure before the end of their maximum probationary period shall not be subject to any extraordinary requirements and shall be required to meet the same standards required of them at the end of the maximum probationary period.

A decision to terminate a probationary appointment may be made during any year of the probationary period and need not wait until the end of the normal probationary period.

#### **3.2.4 Linkage**

Tenure-eligible assistant professors shall be reviewed in one process, with both promotion and tenure awarded or denied in a single decision.

Tenure-eligible associate professors may be reviewed for tenure alone or for promotion and tenure simultaneously. A decision to deny a promotion does not preclude a decision to award tenure.

### **3.3 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments**

A tenure-eligible faculty member on a probationary appointment may transfer to a term appointment with the concurrence of the provost or the vice president for health sciences, Dean, departmental chair where the academic personnel action is initiated, and the individual concerned. This transfer suspends the period of probationary service, but the faculty member retains rights consistent with other term appointment guidelines.

Transfers from term appointment to tenure track position must follow the VCU Guidelines for Faculty Transfers (see VCU Guidelines for Faculty Track Transfers). All policies outlined in the University document apply to tenure track positions that transfer from term appointments.

#### **3.4 Continuing Review of Faculty** - Refer to Section 3.4 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

#### **3.5 Honorary Titles** - Refer to Section 3.5 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

#### **3.6 Administrative Titles**

Administrative titles and responsibilities are held for specific terms or at the discretion of the Dean.

Individuals serve in the capacity of administrators at the discretion of the Dean of the School of Education and often return to full-time faculty status. Therefore, faculty members serving as administrators need to maintain a balance between administrative competence and academic credentials. A reasonable congruence should exist between the academic credentials of administrators and teaching faculty, and that congruence should be maintained throughout an

administrator's years of service. It is important that faculty serving as administrators adhere to the same criteria as faculty in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity for promotion and tenure. Administrators applying for promotion and/or tenure must be able to demonstrate that they possess the same qualities and have achieved similar accomplishments as other faculty members within their division of origin. It is in the area of quantity, not quality, that the expectations for administrators and faculty differ.

**3.7 Notice of Appointments** - Refer to Section 3.7 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

**3.8 Joint Appointments with Non-University Agencies** - Refer to Section 3.8 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

**4.0 University Promotion and Tenure Policy Review Committee** - Refer to Section 4.0 of the University document

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

**5.0 School Promotion and Tenure Committee (SPTC)**

**5.1 Committee Election and Term of Office**

**a. Committee Membership**

The SPTC shall be composed of at least 7 tenured faculty members from the School, two of whom must be at the rank of full professor; for promotion of a term faculty member, there shall be at least 1 promoted (associate or full) term faculty member added to the committee. No faculty member is eligible to serve on both the PRC and SPTC. Each member shall have voting rights and is required to vote on each candidate under review, with the exception of the circumstances described in section 5.1(b). Each department shall elect annually in the spring, one faculty member to the pool from which the Dean will select two faculty to serve 3-year terms. No member of the committee shall serve for their own review.

At the time of the committee selection, the Dean shall give consideration to the balance and representativeness of the committee. In unusual circumstances, the Dean may select a committee member from outside the elected pool to ensure balance. The Dean, or designee, shall keep the official list and terms of committee members. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of departmental chair or above.

**c. Terms of Appointment**

Faculty from the School of Education appointed to the SPTC shall serve for three years. No member of the faculty may serve two consecutive terms. The committee serves from July 1st to June 30th of the following academic year. A candidate may challenge, in writing to the Dean, any member of the committee for cause within five working days of the date on which the candidate is notified of the composition of the committee. If a candidate does challenge

the right of a member to serve on the committee and the challenge is upheld, the Dean, with the advice of the committee, shall appoint an alternate member from the elected pool. In the event that the challenge is upheld, but also has implications for the review of other candidates, the challenged SPTC member will be replaced by another tenured faculty member from the same department. If it is not possible for another faculty member from the department to serve on the SPTC, the challenged faculty member will not participate in the review, meetings, or vote for the candidate who initiated the challenge. Another faculty from outside the challenged-faculty member's department will be appointed to the committee, with consideration given to the STPC composition. If a member of the committee is unable to serve a complete term, the Dean shall appoint a person from the pool elected most recently to complete the expired term.

c. **Committee Chair**

The Committee shall elect a Chair annually. The Committee Chair is responsible for seeing that the Committee follows all University and School policies and procedures. The Chair cannot serve more than two consecutive years during their three-year term. The SPTC Chair convenes the committee for the review of any new faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion as a condition of hiring (see section 7.1.4).

**6.0 University Appeal Committee** - Refer to Section 6.0 of the University document:

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

**7.0 Academic Review Procedures for Promotion and Tenure**

- a. The candidate notifies the department chair of intent to submit for promotion and/or tenure by **April 1** in the year prior to the year of promotion and tenure review.
- b. In accordance with section 7.1 of the University Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, the department chair, in consultation with the Dean or their designee, shall form the Peer Review Committee(s) PRC(s) within five working days following the April 1 notification.
- c. The candidate may challenge the composition of the PRC within five working days of the announcement of the committee structure.
- d. The Dean appoints the School Promotion and Tenure Committee by **July 1**, and that committee serves until June 30<sup>th</sup> of the next year.
  - i. This committee will review all tenure and promotion candidates and issues during these dates.

- ii. In the event a member(s) of the Tenure and Promotion Committee cannot serve during the summer, the Dean will appoint a member(s) from a pool of candidates provided by the department chairs.
- e. The candidate, with the department chair, shall develop a file to be submitted by August 20. Candidates for promotion and tenure are invited to meet with representatives of the SPTC in the spring preceding submission of tenure related documentation to clarify any questions regarding what is to be submitted or how it is to be organized. This is at the election of the candidate. It is not a candidate interview.

### **7.1 Promotion and Tenure Initiated at the Department Level (PRC)**

For tenured and tenure-eligible faculty, the PRC shall be composed of no fewer than five tenured faculty members and one student. Make-up should include at least four faculty members from within the Department, at least one faculty member from outside the School, and one student. The student will be a non-voting member of the committee. If there is not a sufficient number of faculty members from the Department who can serve on the PRC, faculty from within the School will be selected. Each candidate may submit a recommended list of five faculty members who best know the work of the faculty member and its relevance to department and School goals. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will formulate all PRCs taking into consideration the request of the candidate. At least one committee member will be selected from the candidate's recommended list. Committees should be appointed with consideration for balance regarding race, rank, and gender. At least two people on the committee must be at a rank aspired to by the candidate(s). In instances where there are multiple candidates from one department, the tenured department faculty will determine if there will be individual peer review committees or if a single committee will be formulated to review all candidates from the department. The department chair will notify candidates of the structure of the Peer Review Committee(s).

For term (non-tenure) faculty, the formation of the PRC will follow the procedures described for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. The PRC shall be composed of no fewer than five faculty members, and may include one term faculty member at the rank aspired to by the candidate(s) and a minimum of three tenured faculty members, and one student (non-voting).

#### **a. Terms of Appointment**

Members of the committee shall serve for one year. No member of the committee shall serve for their own review. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of department chair or above. Tenured and term faculty in the School of Education may serve on more than one PRC during the academic year. The chair shall notify the candidate of the proposed PRC, and the candidate shall have the right to challenge any member of the committee for cause. (This should be done within five working days of the announcement of the committee structure.) The candidate's concerns will be shared with the Dean. If the candidate's challenge is upheld, the department chair, in consultation with the Dean, shall appoint a replacement for that person.

b. **Committee Chair**

The committee shall elect a chair from its members and is responsible for seeing that the committee follows all University and School policies and procedures.

7.1.1 **Peer Review Committee (PRC)**

a. **Duties and Responsibilities**

It shall be the duty of the committee to review for tenure and/or promotion persons holding primary faculty, term faculty or administrative appointments in the department and who have assignments of 50% or more with the department. The committee shall carry out its duties and responsibilities consistent with the University's *Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* and the procedures and criteria contained in this document. The final vote of the committee shall be by secret ballot. All information shall be considered confidential and handled accordingly. The report of the PRC, following the same format used by the School committee and specified in the Appendix, will be forwarded to the department chair.

The PRC will receive the credentials and supporting materials of the candidate(s) for promotion and tenure **by August 20**. The committee shall examine the evidence presented according to its published criteria and send a decision, along with a narrative report, to recommend or not recommend to the department chair by **October 1**.

b. **External Review Solicitation**

The PRC meets by **May 15** to select external reviewers, using information provided by the candidate about reviewers. Only the PRC shall solicit and receive external evaluations. External reviewers must be individuals with expertise in the candidate's field or a related scholarly field, be from outside of VCU, and be an individual who can provide an independent review of the candidate's work. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been institutional colleagues, or academic mentors/advisors of the applicant normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. Reviewers for external evaluations must be solicited both from persons suggested by the candidate and persons suggested by the committee. The file shall list all persons solicited for external review letters, identify each reviewer as either named by the candidate or named by the committee, and identify the relationship of the external reviewer to the candidate. The external evaluator must describe the nature of their relationship with the candidate in the review letter. The candidate shall develop a list of five potential reviewers who hold a rank at their institutions of Associate Professor or Professor, and provide the name, position, address, phone number, a rationale for the selection of each and a brief description of their relationship to each reviewer. This list will be submitted by the candidate to the department chair by **May 1**; the department chair then submits the list to the Chair of the PRC.

A minimum of three external letters must be received for review. For individuals hired after January 1, 2023, a minimum of five external letters are required. The committee shall select a minimum of one reviewer from the candidate's list and solicit a minimum of one reviewer from persons suggested by the PRC. All letters from external evaluators will be confidential unless disclosure is required by law. This policy will be conveyed to external reviewers when letters are solicited (see Appendix C for a sample correspondence to external reviewers).

Each external reviewer shall provide the PRC with a curriculum vitae. The reviewers shall be asked to review the candidate's scholarly work, and shall be provided a copy of the Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education criteria by which to evaluate it. Reviewers should be strongly encouraged to submit their reviews no later than **August 1** in order to be available for committee review. If the candidate is being reviewed as a full professor, the PRC should request that the reviewer address the issue of national reputation.

**c. Variations in Review Procedures Specific to the Faculty Serving as Administrators**

- **Variations for Administrators other than the Dean**

Any faculty member who is serving as an administrator in any capacity other than as the Dean of the School will follow exactly the same procedures and guidelines as regular faculty. These administrators will initiate their review with the Chair of the Department where they hold faculty status.

- **Variations for Department Chairs**

Department Chairs seeking promotion will initiate this process following the same procedures as in section 7.0 with the role of the Chair taken by the Dean. That is, the Chair will notify the Dean of their intent to submit for review and the Dean will appoint the PRC. The PRC appointed by the Dean will review only the Chair. Members of this committee may, however, also be members of a review committee for another candidate. The candidate (Chair) may challenge the composition of the PRC and the Dean of the School of Education will respond to this challenge.

The PRC will operate in the same manner as for other candidates. It will submit its report directly to the SPTC rather than to the Chair.

The SPTC will submit its review of any Chair to the Dean, and the procedure continues from that point the same as for regular faculty.

- **Variations for the Associate Dean**

If an Associate Dean seeks promotion, the Dean of the School Education will assume responsibilities for this promotion process.

- **Variations for the Dean**

If the Dean is seeking tenure and/or promotion, they will initiate the process with the Chair of the department of origin as specified in 7.0, Section A to C.

In any year that the Dean is seeking review, the PRC will be appointed by a committee consisting of all Department Chairs. In a similar manner as prescribed in section 7.1 (A), the Dean may challenge the membership of the PRC to the appointing committee.

The review procedure or the Dean proceeds from PRC to SPTC as prescribed for regular faculty. The SPTC will submit its review of the Dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs along with the reviews that preceded it.

### **7.1.2 Department Chair**

The department chair will not attend meetings of the PRC. The department chair will make a written analysis based on the candidate's credentials, the PRC report, and the chair's independent assessment of the candidate's performance. The chair's report together with the entire candidate's file (excluding copies of the confidential external review letters) and the PRC report will be shared with the candidate. The candidate shall have the option of attaching a written response. The file shall then be sent to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee by **October 15**. The department chair will communicate the need for expedited review of new hires with the chair of the SPTC.

### **7.1.3 School Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation**

The duty of the SPTC shall be to review for tenure and promotion all persons holding primary faculty, term faculty or administrative appointments in the School of Education and who have assignments of 50% or more with the school.

The SPTC will receive the candidate's credentials and supporting materials and reports from the PRC and department chair by **October 15**. The committee shall carry out its duties and responsibilities consistent with the University's *Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures* and the procedures and criteria contained in this document. Using the candidate's file and reports from the PRC and department chair, the committee shall conduct a substantive evaluation of the candidate's record and performance. The committee:

- will ensure that the peer level review is in good order from the standpoint of evidence presented, conclusions drawn and administratively the file is complete and in compliance with the University promotion and tenure committee guidelines;
- will ensure that the candidate's review illustrates that promotion and/or tenure is based upon academic accomplishments that contribute to University, School, and department level considerations, including perspectives, strategic goals, and interests.
- may require additional information from the candidate, the PRC, or the department chair.



The final vote of the committee shall be by secret ballot. All information shall be considered confidential and handled accordingly. The written recommendation of the school committee, including the vote, will be forwarded to the Dean by **December 1**.

By **February 1**, the SPTC will, as part of its duties, study the process and make suggestions to the Dean for revision. (Refer to section 12.0)

#### **7.1.4 Review of Potential Hires**

Anyone hired as an assistant professor is not eligible for consideration for tenure and/or promotion as a condition of being hired.

Only candidates tenured at another institution of higher education can be considered for tenure and/or promotion as a condition of being hired.

Candidates who are hired at the rank of associate or full professor, who have not been tenured at another institution of higher education can negotiate with the Dean for early review during the normal fall review process as a condition of being hired.

Whenever possible, the search committee for positions advertised at the associate, full, or open level should be composed of faculty who would be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

Candidates hired at the rank of associate or full professor who have held tenure at another institution of higher education and wish to be considered for tenure as a condition of employment should make this request to the department chair. If the department chair recommends to the Dean that the person be reviewed and the Dean concurs, tenured members of the search committee will be constituted as a Peer Review Committee as soon as possible after the completion of the search process. At this time the department chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the *School of Education Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* and notify the Chair of the SPTC that the PRC has been constituted.

The PRC is responsible for the peer-level review process and for obtaining the materials and documentation necessary to complete the review in accordance with the *School of Education Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* and University guidelines. The documentation submitted for expedited review should be as similar as possible to those normally submitted as part of the promotion and/or tenure review, including: (1) a complete and detailed curriculum vitae, (2) letters from at least three external reviewers, (3) documentation of teaching practice and performance (e.g., teaching evaluations and select syllabi), (4) a statement describing the candidate's research interests, scholarly accomplishments, and service activities. The letters from the external reviewers may be the same as the reference letters used as part of the hiring decision process provided the letters address the candidate's suitability for the faculty rank and tenure.

If there are fewer than four tenured members on the search committee, additional members may be selected by the Dean from the pool of candidates for the School Promotion and Tenure

Committee that has been provided by the department chairs (see Section 7.0, d). The Peer Review Committee submits its report and recommendation, and the normal review procedures/steps are followed. The timeline for the expedited tenure review of candidates as a condition of hiring is as follows: The PRC submits their report by **April 15**; the department chair submits their report by **April 30**; the SPTC submits their report to the Dean by **June 1**; the Dean submits their recommendation to the provost. Whenever possible, all expedited reviews of new hires will occur during this timeframe. Exceptions may be granted by the Dean under unusual circumstances. Otherwise the standard timeline for tenure and/or promotion review is followed.

## **8.0 Administrative Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Actions**

### **8.1 The Dean of the School of Education shall:**

Convene and charge the School Promotion and Tenure Committee each year. The SPTC committee should be convened no later than **October 1**. The Dean will not attend meetings of SPTC except to convene and charge the committee.

Verify that the recommendations of the PRC, the SPTC, and department chair are consistent with the candidate's file. If the Dean determines that there is some inconsistency with the candidate's file, the Dean may refer the file back to any or all of the appropriate levels by **December 15**, for further consideration, specifically identifying the inconsistency that should be addressed. All correspondence reflecting a referral back to a previous level of review for any review for any reason shall be maintained as a permanent part of the candidate's file.

Make a written analysis with a recommendation which, together with the entire file (excluding copies of the confidential external review letters), shall be made available to the candidate by **January 7**. The candidate shall have the option of attaching a written response.

The candidate has the option of withdrawing their name from consideration at any time up to **January 15**.

The file shall then be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by **January 15**.

## **9.0 Appeal Process - Refer to Section 9 of the University document**

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

## **10.0 The President and the Board of Visitors -Refer to section 10 of the University document.**

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

## **11.0 Procedures for Termination of Employment of Tenured Faculty Members -- refer to Section 11 of the University document**

<https://policy.vcu.edu/doctract/documentportal/08DA32A740D2F58CFC29E0DA4FD8B934>

## **12.0 Procedures of the Review and Amendment of this Document**

The SPTC will, as part of its duties, study the process and make suggestions to the Dean for revision. In the event that there are suggestions and/or specific recommendations for revision. Revisions suggested by the SPTC will follow the process outlined in Section Twelve to gain approval from the Faculty Organization, SOE Faculty, and the Dean. With regard to approved suggestions, the Dean must take necessary steps to see that the revisions are made as quickly as possible but no longer than one year later.

### **Appendices**

A. Format for Committee Reports	45
B. Example External Review Invitation Letter	49

Appendix A: Format for Committee Reports

**School of Education Tenure and Promotion Committee Report/Peer Review Committee Report**  
**(Candidate's Name Here)**  
**Date**

Using the criteria established in the School of Education's *Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*, members of the School of Education's (Year) Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluated (Name) candidacy for (*tenure and promotion, or promotion*) to (*Rank*). The committee examined (Name) curriculum vitae and supporting documentation, as well as reports of the Peer Review Committee and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. A table summarizing the results of this Committee's votes is set forth below, followed by the Committee's recommendations. The attached report includes a narrative for each of the four-evaluation areas.

Area	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory		
Credentials and Experience				
Area	Excellent	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Teaching				
Scholarship				
Service				

**FINAL VOTE**

**RECOMMEND [tenure with promotion to (rank) or promotion to (rank)]** \_\_\_\_\_

**DO NOT RECOMMEND [tenure with promotion (rank) or promotion to (rank)]** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Name

---

Name

---

Name

*Running head with candidates name here*

*Page 2 of 3*

**CREDENTIALS AND EXPERIENCE**

**Evidence**

**Conclusion and Evaluation**

Based on the School of Education criteria for Credentials and Experience, the Committee members voted as follows:

Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

**TEACHING**

**Evidence**

**Conclusion and Evaluation**

Based on the School of Education criteria for teaching, the Committee voted as follows:

Excellent \_\_\_\_\_  
Very Good \_\_\_\_\_  
Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

**SCHOLARSHIP**

**Evidence**

**Conclusion and Evaluation**

Based on the School of Education criteria for Scholarship, the Committee members voted as follows:

Excellent	_____
Very Good	_____
Satisfactory	_____
Unsatisfactory	_____

**SERVICE**

**Evidence**

**Conclusion and Evaluation**

Based on the School of Education criteria for service, the Committee voted as follows:

Excellent	_____
Very Good	_____
Satisfactory	_____
Unsatisfactory	_____

## Appendix B: Sample Email Correspondence for External Evaluation of Candidate

DRAFT

Dear Dr. XXXX:

I am writing to inquire about your availability to review the research dossier of Dr. XXXX, Assistant Professor of XXXX, as part of their candidacy for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure at Virginia Commonwealth University. In our review of potential evaluators, your name was advanced as someone who would be well-qualified to review Dr. XXXX's research record. I have attached a current CV to this email.

If you accept this request, the research dossier will be sent to you from Virginia Commonwealth University on XXXX. The dossier will include examples of Dr. XXXX's published research for your review and evaluation. You will be provided a copy of the relevant portion of the School of Education P&T policy. In soliciting your evaluation, we are particularly interested in your views on the quality of the research and its impact or potential impact on the field(s) of XXX and XXXX.

Should you agree to review Dr. XXXX's work, we will ask that you return your review by XXXX to the Department of XXXX (address). In your review, please describe the nature of your relationship with the candidate and provide an updated Curriculum Vitae or bio-sketch. Your evaluation will be distributed to the internal review committees including the chair and Dean, if applicable; however, all letters will be confidential unless disclosure is required by law. Following the conclusion of the review, all copies of your letter will be kept in a sealed file in the Dean's office and will not be used again.

I appreciate the time and energy necessary to prepare these important reviews. Accordingly, I appreciate your consideration of this request. Please respond by email: [XXXX@vcu.edu](mailto:XXXX@vcu.edu) (XXX-XXX-XXXX).

Sincerely,

PRC Chair