

PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE NARRATIVE GUIDELINES

List of Committee Members Here:

To: _____, Dean of the College of XXXXX

From: College of XXXX Promotion and Tenure Committee

Re: Candidacy of A.N. Other for Promotion to Full Professor/Assoc Pro/ For
Promotion to Associate Professor and re-appointment without term.

Date:

The following actions have been taken on the candidacy of Dr. A.N. Other for promotion to Professor/ for promotion to Prof/Associate Professor and re-appointment without term in the Department of.....

	In favor	Opposed	Abstained	Recused	Absent
Departmental P&T Committee, where applicable					
Eligible Department Faculty*					
Department Chair					
COS P & T Committee					
P&T Full Professors, where applicable					

Note: The Department Chair should **not** vote with the Department Faculty.

Career

1. Brief Career Description.

e.g. Dr. A. N. Other received his Ph.D infrom the University of Virginia in 1980. He was appointed Assistant Professor at Freedonia University from 1981-1984. He came to George Mason University as Assistant Professor in in 1984, and was promoted to Associate Professor of With tenure in 1990.

Research

1. Outline of Research Focus. Overview of Publications and research support.
2. Report containing overview of each external reviewer's comments, identifying areas of disagreement, emphasis, scholarly reputation etc.

The departmental affiliation of each reviewer should be noted and each should be identified. (The letter to the Dean includes the Reviewer's identity: the copy to the candidate conceals that identity.)

Teaching

1. Overview of items on teaching provided in the dossier.
2. List of all courses taught at U of XXXX, including role in development etc., as appropriate.
3. Description of evaluative comments provided in the dossier (e.g. from peer reviews, Chair's comment, student evaluations etc)

Research

1. Outline of Research Focus. Overview of Publications and research support.
2. Report containing overview of each external reviewer's comments, identifying areas of disagreement, emphasis, scholarly reputation etc.

The institutional affiliation of each reviewer should be noted and each should be identified thus: Reviewer A (Smith, Harvard). (The letter to the Dean includes the Reviewer's identity: the copy to the candidate conceals that identity.)

Service

1. Description of all internal and external service accomplishments
2. Description of evaluative comments provided in the dossier (e.g. from Chair's letter, external reviewers)

Committee Discussion

1. Identification of major points supporting the recommendation. [Note: Say the vote is close, or tied. The letter contents should reflect that?]
2. Formal recommendation.