

# **BYLAWS FOR THE GLOBAL AFFAIRS PROGRAM GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY**

**April, 2025**

## **Article 1. Aims**

- 1.1. Purpose. These Bylaws specify the procedures by which the Global Affairs Program (hereinafter the Program or GLOA) will conduct its business. These Bylaws supplement those policies contained in the Faculty Handbook of George Mason University (hereinafter GMU or the University ). Any actions taken under these Bylaws must be in compliance with the George Mason University Faculty Handbook (hereinafter the Faculty Handbook) and other official policies of GMU.
- 1.2. Goal. The goal of these Bylaws is to ensure that the Faculty and leadership of the Program have equitable and effective influence on the governance of the Program and that the Program may conduct its business in an orderly and efficient manner in accordance with its guiding principles.
- 1.3. Guiding principles. The Global Affairs Program is an interdisciplinary academic unit focused on research and teaching on globalization and its consequences; international and multinational issues; and the ways that global dynamics affect a range of societies and groups within them, taking into account their political, economic, societal, and cultural contexts. The Program strives for academic rigor and promotes a diverse faculty including a wide scope of regional and interregional expertise, methodological approaches, and disciplinary or theoretical backgrounds.

## **Article 2. Global Affairs Faculty**

- 2.1. Global Affairs Faculty Membership. The Program's faculty (hereinafter "Faculty") consists of:
  - 2.1.1. The Program Director (hereinafter "Director" or "Program Director").
  - 2.1.2. Full-time, tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty with FTE assigned to the Program.
  - 2.1.3. Full-time, tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty whose membership in the Global Affairs faculty is detailed in a memorandum of understanding (MoU), or equivalent, between the Program and another unit of the University.
- 2.2. Faculty Affiliates. GMU faculty who do not meet the criteria for membership in the Faculty may be appointed as Faculty Affiliates.
  - 2.2.1. Prospective Faculty Affiliates may self-nominate or be nominated by any member of the Faculty.
  - 2.2.2. Prospective Faculty Affiliates must be approved by a simple majority vote of the Faculty Affairs Committee before being forwarded for approval by the full Faculty by a two-thirds majority vote at a Faculty Meeting.
  - 2.2.3. Affiliation lasts for three years after granted and may be renewed for a subsequent three year term by a majority vote at a Faculty meeting. There are no limits on the number of terms for a Faculty Affiliation.
  - 2.2.4. A Faculty Affiliate may terminate their affiliation with a written notice to the Director. The Director shall apprise the Faculty of such terminations at the next Faculty meeting.

- 2.2.5. A Faculty Affiliate's affiliation may be terminated prior to the end of their three-year term upon the recommendation of the Director and a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Director must report any such removals of status at the next Faculty Meeting.
- 2.2.6. Transitional provision. Upon the adoption of these Bylaws, all current Program and Affiliated Faculty will be invited to self-nominate to be Faculty Affiliates.
  - 2.2.6.1. Affiliate status under this sub-paragraph will be granted with a two-thirds vote of the Faculty.
- 2.3. The Director is responsible for maintaining an accurate list of all Faculty and Faculty Affiliates. The Director shall submit this list with the agenda of the first Faculty Meeting of each year.
- 2.4. Faculty Responsibilities.
  - 2.4.1. The Faculty serves as the decision-making faculty for the Global Affairs Program with the authority to set and change the curriculum of the undergraduate and graduate programs (subject to the approval of relevant college, university, and state-level committees and authorities) and to adopt Program specific policies and guidelines in accordance with these Bylaws.
  - 2.4.2. The Faculty votes on changes to the overall direction of the program including curricular changes, policy changes, and changes to Bylaws or program structure.
  - 2.4.3. The Faculty makes recommendations for the hiring of faculty and appointment of faculty to administrative responsibilities in accordance with applicable procedures in these Bylaws, the Faculty Handbook, and other applicable University procedures.
  - 2.4.4. Members of the Faculty are expected to engage in service to the Program commensurate with their rank, position, and applicable Program guidelines. This service includes but is not limited to serving on Program committees (including Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure committees); representing the Program at recruitment events, orientations, and open houses; and supporting the Program Administration as defined in these Bylaws in matters such as assessment and curriculum planning.

### Article 3. Global Affairs Faculty Meetings:

- 3.1. Scheduling: Regular meetings of the Faculty will be called by the Program Director at least once a month during the academic year unless extenuating circumstances arise.
  - 3.1.1.1. If extenuating circumstance arise so that a monthly meeting is canceled, the Faculty shall be notified via email as soon as feasible but no less than 48 hours ahead of the original meeting time.
  - 3.1.2. Members of the Faculty shall be notified via email of a regular meeting at least one week in advance of the meeting. The meeting notice shall specify the location, time, and modality for the opening and closing of the meeting.
  - 3.1.3. Extraordinary meetings may be called by the Program Director or shall be called if one third or more of the Faculty make a written request to the Program Director for such a meeting. Members of the faculty must be notified of an extraordinary meeting at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting.
- 3.2. Agenda. The Director will provide the Faculty with a written agenda for a Faculty meeting at least 48 hours before the meeting.

- 3.3. Rules of Conduct. Faculty Meetings will be run in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order unless otherwise provided for in these Bylaws.
- 3.4. Quorum. Half of the Faculty shall constitute a quorum. No business may be conducted at a regular or extraordinary meeting unless a quorum is present.
- 3.5. Presiding Officer. The Program Director (or a substitute appointed by the Program Director from the Faculty) will be the Presiding Officer at all meetings of the Faculty. If the Director does not appoint a substitute, the chair of Faculty Affairs Committee will be the presiding officer.
- 3.6. Secretary and Minutes. At the first meeting each semester, a Secretary will be appointed by the Presiding Officer. The Secretary shall serve in this capacity for the remainder of the semester.
  - 3.6.1. The Secretary will take minutes. The minutes will be reviewed and adopted at the next Faculty meeting.
  - 3.6.2. The Program Director, or appropriate administrative staff to which this responsibility is delegated, will maintain a copy of the minutes of all Faculty Meetings in a format and location accessible to any member of the Faculty.
- 3.7. Voting: Decisions on motions shall be based on a simple majority of votes of the Faculty present at a meeting unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws.
  - 3.7.1. Modifications in the core curriculum of any Global Affairs degree program must be read at two successive Faculty Meetings and approved by a two-thirds majority of those Faculty voting in a mail or electronic ballot.
  - 3.7.2. Voting on all personnel recommendations shall be by secret ballot.
  - 3.7.3. The outcome of all votes shall be recorded in the minutes of that meeting or, in the case of mail or electronic ballots, in the minutes of the next regular meeting following the vote.
  - 3.7.4. Mail or electronic ballots must be returned to the Program office within two weeks of receipt to be considered valid.
  - 3.7.5. Program Director Voting. As a member of the Faculty, the Director shall have the right to vote except on matters when the action of the Faculty is a recommendation to the Director or when the Director has an independent vote on the outcome of the issue through other means.
- 3.8. Faculty Affiliates may participate in meetings as non-voting members upon a written invitation from the Director.
- 3.9. Student representation. Two student representatives elected by a duly constituted group of students in the Program and representing the undergraduate and graduate programs respectively can, but are not required to, attend Faculty meetings, upon written invitation of the Director.
  - 3.9.1. If a duly constituted student group does not exist, the Program Director determines how the student representatives are elected.
  - 3.9.2. Student representatives do not have a vote and will be recused from any personnel, finance, or privacy related matters, discussions of individual students, or any matters that the Director determines to be confidential.
  - 3.9.3. Student representatives will be recused from the meeting if three Faculty members object to their presence and provide a reason for their recusal.

#### Article 4. Program Administration

- 4.1. Program Director. The principal administrator of the Program is the Program Director. The director is appointed by the Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences on the recommendation of a search committee appointed according to the Faculty Handbook, and in close consultation with the Global Affairs faculty. The Director reports to the Dean.
  - 4.1.1. The Director is responsible for overall management of the Global Affairs Program including but not limited to: enrollment, course and teaching schedules; personell recruitment and evaluation, representation of the Program at college, university, or external events; budget, marketing, fund raising and alumni relations; and strategic planning.
  - 4.1.2. The responsibility for hiring part-time and restricted faculty shall rest with the Program Director.
  - 4.1.3. The Director may delegate responsibilities to the Director of Undergraduate Programs and the Director of Graduate Programs in accordance with applicable contracts and procedures.
- 4.2. Director of Undergraduate Programs. The Director of Undergraduate Programs is the director of the Global Affairs BA, the Global Affairs minor, and other minors under the purview of the Global Affairs Program, with duties assigned by the Director in consultation with the Dean.
  - 4.2.1. The Director of Undergraduate Programs is also the Assistant Director for purposes of these Bylaws.
- 4.3. Director of Graduate Programs. The Director of Graduate Programs is the director of the Global Affairs MA and other graduate programs under the purview of the Global Affairs Program, with duties assigned by the Director in consultation with the Dean.

#### Article 5. Committees.

- 5.1. The Program will have standing and ad-hoc committees to ensure effective Faculty inclusion in the management of the Program.
- 5.2. Unless specifically provided for in these Bylaws, committee membership shall be open to tenured, tenure-track, and term Faculty members.
  - 5.2.1. Faculty Affiliates may serve on Program committees but shall not constitute a majority of a committee's members.
- 5.3. Each standing committee member's term shall be three (3) academic years and expires by the first Faculty meeting of the applicable academic year.
- 5.4. Elections to committees are normally conducted at the first faculty meeting of the academic year. Any member of the Faculty eligible to serve on a committee may self-nominate at a Faculty meeting. If there are multiple nomnations for a seat, the seat is filled by simple majority vote of present Faculty members.
- 5.5. In case of a vacancy, the Program Director shall appoint a replacement no later than a month after the vacancy occurs unless otherwise provided for in these Bylaws.
  - 5.5.1. If the vacancy is temporary, the replacement shall serve in this position for the remainder of the vacancy.
  - 5.5.2. If the vacancy is permanent, the replacement will serve out the remainder of the term.

- 5.6. The Program Director shall maintain a list of all committees, their membership, and the dates at which appointments expire in a place and format accessible to all members of the Faculty and applicable administrative staff.
- 5.7. The following standing committees shall be established:
  - 5.7.1. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).
    - 5.7.1.1. The Faculty Affairs Committee operates as an advisory group for the Director on general faculty, curriculum, student, and administrative matters of GLOA.
    - 5.7.1.2. The FAC also completes the annual evaluation of the Director.
    - 5.7.1.3. The FAC is comprised of a minimum of three Faculty members. FAC shall include at least one term faculty member.
    - 5.7.1.4. The Chair of the FAC shall be a tenured Faculty member and may not be a Faculty Affiliate.
  - 5.7.2. MA Advisory Committee (MAC).
    - 5.7.2.1. The MA Advisory Committee is responsible for MA admissions, MA student appeals not otherwise covered by a University or College policy, and advises the Director of Graduate Studies on general matters concerning the MA program.
    - 5.7.2.2. The Chair of the MAC is the Director of Graduate Studies and there shall be at least two other members from the Faculty with experience teaching in the MA.
- 5.8. Ad-hoc Committees.
  - 5.8.1. The Director may appoint ad-hoc committees as they deem appropriate to carry out the work of the program.
  - 5.8.2. Ad-hoc Committees are appointed for up to one academic year.

## Article 6. Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure for Faculty in the Global Affairs Program

- 6.1. GLOA is an interdisciplinary program where the intellectual lives of scholars with various disciplinary backgrounds coexist. The program respects the disciplinary idiosyncrasies of each review, promotion, and tenure case of GLOA Faculty.
- 6.2. Renewal and Promotion of Term Faculty.
  - 6.2.1. Single year contract term-faculty are renewed for an additional year by the Program Director.
  - 6.2.2. Multi-year contracts and promotion cases for term faculty follow the guidelines in this article and must fall in line with guidance and policies from the college and the University, including but not limited to the Provost's annual memo.
  - 6.2.3. A non-promotion renewal case does not require a vote unless specified otherwise by Faculty Handbook. The committee will conduct a detailed review of the materials required for the dossier and produce a letter of evaluation for the Director. The Director will write a separate letter of evaluation and work with the office manager to compile the materials in the dossier and submit it to the College.
  - 6.2.4. In accordance with university policies, term faculty may be considered for promotion normally after five years of service, but may be granted the opportunity to go up early with written consent of the Program Director and in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.
  - 6.2.5. The Director will identify term faculty who are eligible for promotion or multi-year reappointment and will communicate with the candidate as well as the Program RPT committee about the materials required for the dossier, the deadlines for submission, and the overall timetable for the review process.

- 6.2.6. Term multi-year contract renewal and promotion cases do not require external letters and other procedures in this article may be adapted to fit the term faculty case.
  - 6.2.7. The Director appoints a three-member committee for each candidate term faculty renewal or promotion. This committee must include at least one term faculty member and a member of the Global Affairs Faculty.
    - 6.2.7.1. In cases of promotion to Term Associate faculty, at least one Term Associate faculty from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences must serve on the committee.
    - 6.2.7.2. In cases of promotion to Term Full faculty, at least one Term Full faculty from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences must serve on the committee.
  - 6.2.8. The faculty member considered for promotion is not required to give a presentation to the Global Affairs faculty as part of unit procedures.
- 6.3. Renewal and Promotion of Tenure-Line Faculty
- 6.3.1. The Program Director will appoint a Chair of the Global Affairs Renewal, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Committee (RPT Committee) no later than one month after receiving a notification of the identification of the candidate from CHSS. The Chair shall be a tenured full professor of the College of Humanities & Social Sciences.
    - 6.3.1.1. The Program Director, upon the recommendation from the tenured members of the Faculty and the candidate, will appoint to the RPT Committee two additional tenured professors. Including the Chair, the RPT Committee should have at least two tenured members of the Global Affairs Faculty.
    - 6.3.1.2. In case of a promotion to Full professor, the Program Director will appoint two tenured full professors in CHSS regardless of their affiliation with the Program.
    - 6.3.1.3. Members of the RPT Committee must respect disciplinary expectations, conventions, and criteria for tenure considerations.
    - 6.3.1.4. The RPT Committee Chair will correspond with the Director about the timeline of the case, which will follow that set by the Provost and CHSS. The Director will share the timeline and procedure with the candidate. Deadlines to be determined include, but are not limited to, those for: 1) candidate submission of three potential external reviewers; 2) candidate submission of CV and publications for the use in external reviews; 3) candidate submission of materials for the review in the program which will also be part of the dossier to be submitted to CHSS; 4) receipt of external reviews; 5) the tenure case presentation to the Program; and 6) submission of the dossier to CHSS. The timeline shall be strictly consistent with the deadlines set by CHSS.
    - 6.3.1.5. The Committee Chair is also responsible for working with the Director and Case Manager on the logistics of the case, scheduling committee meetings and communicating with the committee members, and helping make sure that all procedures outlined in the Bylaws and by the College and University for RPT are followed.
    - 6.3.1.6. One of the RPT Committee members familiar with the candidate's discipline(s) will be appointed by the Director as a liaison for the candidate.
      - 6.3.1.6.1. The liaison will advise the candidate on submitting the names of no more than three external reviewers who can be approached for letters evaluating the candidate's work. Two reviewers will be chosen from that list.
      - 6.3.1.6.2. The liaison creates the list of at least five possible external reviewers, inclusive of the two recommended by the candidate, in consultation with the RPT Committee. The list is approved by the majority vote of the RPT Committee.

- 6.3.1.6.3. The list is then presented to the Director. The Director will solicit the review letters from the external reviewers in the list. The Director can ask assistance in securing the reviewers from senior faculty members of CHSS.
- 6.3.1.6.4. If the candidate is seeking promotion or tenure/promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching and high competence in scholarship, additional external letters are required to evaluate the scholarship in addition to those in support of the teaching. In that case, the candidate should provide the names of at least two external reviewers for the scholarship in addition to the three for the teaching.
- 6.3.2. The candidate will submit the materials specified by CHSS for the departmental review. The GLOA liaison shall have a chance to read all the materials and offer comments and suggestions to the candidate before the submission to the program.
- 6.3.3. After receiving the letters from the external reviewers, the RPT Committee conducts the review of the tenure case.
- 6.3.4. The materials submitted by the candidate will be stored in a safe physical or digital location under the supervision of the Program Director.
- 6.3.5. The Program Director will hold a special program meeting where the candidate presents the tenure/promotion case. The logistics of the meeting follows that of the GLOA Faculty Meeting. All committee members are expected to participate in this meeting.
  - 6.3.5.1. The tenured members of GLOA Faculty will discuss and vote on the tenure/promotion case after the meeting. Voting on promotion to Full Professor is limited to tenured Full Professors. The logistics of voting follows those of GLOA Faculty Meetings. When a recorded committee vote is conducted, the committee members cannot vote in the Program vote to avoid redundancy. Committee members who are not on the Faculty are ineligible to vote in the Global Affairs Program vote. Faculty are permitted to participate in the meeting virtually and voting will take place electronically in a way that protects the names of the faculty voting.
  - 6.3.5.2. All Faculty will have a chance to read the materials submitted by the candidate at least one week before the Program meeting.
- 6.3.6. The committee will produce a letter of evaluation that contains a summary of the opinions of the Faculty. This letter will become part of the dossier submitted to CHSS and will be submitted it to the Program Director.
  - 6.3.6.1. The Program Director will forward this letter, adding their own recommendation in a separate letter. The Director will work with the office manager to compile the materials in the dossier and submit it to the college.
  - 6.3.6.2. The candidate will receive a copy of these two letters.
- 6.4. Third year renewal of tenure-line faculty
  - 6.4.1. Third-year renewals will mirror the process outlined above for tenure excluding external letters and presentation but including a vote of all eligible faculty.
- 6.5. Defining Excellence in Promotion and Tenure (Assistant to Associate Professor)
  - 6.5.1. Research:
    - 6.5.1.1. The Global Affairs Program is a diverse and productive academic program, where excellence in scholarly work may be defined according to disciplinary norms and this may vary across faculty. The Faculty Handbook (2.4.2) defines scholarly work broadly, including original publications and peer-reviewed contributions that contribute to the advancement of a field or integration of multiple fields. The Faculty Handbook specifies that the format for this may include artistic work, original research, software and media, exhibition, performances, and application of discipline

to the practice of a profession. The Global Affairs Program recognizes the importance of both book and article-based contributions as measures of excellence in scholarly work. It is the responsibility of the Candidate to ensure how contributions relate to these guidelines. Because the Program has diverse faculty that produce article-based and book contributions, it is important to briefly define both criteria.

- 6.5.1.2. All research published by faculty under consideration for promotion and tenure should demonstrate a career trajectory clearly independent from work completed as a graduate student.
- 6.5.1.3. To achieve excellence using a book-based contribution, the candidate should have a single-authored book either published or in press with a well-regarded scholarly publisher during the established timeline to tenure. "In press" means that the manuscript has cleared every stage in the review process and is in process of production (which is understood to include the copy-editing process). An advance contract from a publisher at the time of tenure is by itself insufficient, since such contracts are often granted before the manuscript has cleared the review process and are therefore neither a guarantor of publication nor evidence of the timely development of a scholarly career. A significant number of published research outcomes such as journal articles and book chapters are also expected. Book-length academic or critical translations can also be considered as a singular contribution<sup>0</sup> that defines excellence, but the Program Director's explicit written permission at the time of hire or third-year review is required.
- 6.5.1.4. For article-based contributions, excellence is defined as regular publication in high ranked journals or publication of book chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes. It should be acknowledged that authorship order may be variable, but this does not diminish the contribution of each individual as ordering may reflect work done with students or other colleagues who would more greatly benefit from senior authorship. As a general guideline, candidates primarily co-authoring with other scholars are expected to have a larger number of articles published than those who publish primarily solo-authored articles. A necessary, but not sufficient on its own, condition for excellence in research is an average of one peer-reviewed article per each academic year. Reputation of academic journals may be evaluated using disciplinary norms, ISI ranking, acceptance rates, citations, SSCI, and/or h-indices.
- 6.5.1.5. All faculty under consideration for promotion and tenure should demonstrate ongoing research productivity in different stages of development including conference papers, articles under submission, and book chapters in development.
- 6.5.2. Teaching:
  - 6.5.2.1. The Global Affairs Program requires all faculty to achieve at least 'high competency' in teaching prior to promotion and tenure. High competency in teaching is achieved through a mix of student evaluations, course development, and peer evaluations.
  - 6.5.2.2. Teaching evaluations should be above 4.00 on average for Overall Teaching Effectiveness (Question 15 or comparable question on evaluations from previous institution). In recognizing that some courses present challenges to evaluation scores, an average score and range should be considered in the evaluation. In addition, the Program shall provide three peer-evaluations for the candidate prior to tenure and promotion to provide expert assessment of teaching competency.
  - 6.5.2.3. Faculty should develop courses for the curriculum at George Mason University that speak to their pedagogical strengths. Typical evidence of course development would include clear, effective syllabi combined with the addition of new courses to the curriculum.



6.5.3. Service:

- 6.5.3.1. The candidate under consideration for tenure and promotion should demonstrate a consistent and conscientious role in the everyday operation of the Global Affairs Program.

6.6. Defining Excellence in Promotion to Full Professor

6.6.1. Research:

- 6.6.1.1. To achieve excellence in research, evidence for national recognition for research excellence must be apparent in citation indices, invitations to lecture, plenaries, or other measures of scholarly reputation. Grants, fellowships, and sponsored research programs can be used as supplementary evidence for research excellence. A substantial scholarly growth from the research accomplishment at the time of the tenure review should be apparent.
- 6.6.1.2. To achieve excellence in research using a book-based contribution in promotion to Full Professor, a single-authored book that was not considered in the promotion to Associate Professor must be at least in print at a well-regarded academic publisher prior to the submission of promotional materials. In addition, secondary evidence of peer-reviewed publications including articles and book chapters must be apparent. Editorship of special issues of academic journals, co-authored book, or edited volumes as well as book reviews also are considered supplementary contributions to research excellence.
- 6.6.1.3. To achieve excellence in research using an article-based contribution, continued regular publication in highly ranked journals and book chapters is required. The necessary, though not sufficient on its own, condition is an average of one research article a year in a peer-reviewed academic journal or a peer-reviewed edited volume.

6.6.2. Teaching:

- 6.6.2.1. High competency in teaching in promotion to Full Professor is identical to the excellence in teaching in tenure/promotion to Associate Professor.

6.6.3. Service:

- 6.6.3.1. The candidate under consideration for promotion from Associate to Full Professor should demonstrate a consistent and conscientious role in university and college committees that meet frequently and have a greater charge over decision-making within the broader institution. These may be differentiated from lighter charge committees where fewer meetings and decisions are rendered.
- 6.6.3.2. At the Program level, the candidate should have a track record of continued engagement in heavy service obligations such as search committee or graduate committee as well as various ad-hoc committees.
- 6.6.3.3. Disciplinary service should indicate a trajectory towards greater influence and decision-making capacity, including journal editorship, editorial board membership, or a greater emphasis on leadership roles within professional organizations.

Article 7. Recruitment and Hiring of Faculty

- 7.1. Each year the Director shall engage the Faculty in a discussion of hiring priorities regarding full-time faculty positions in the program. This discussion may take place over email or in a Faculty meeting.

- 7.2. If a tenure-line position is authorized, the Director will form a search committee for the position.

7.2.1. Search committee composition:

- 7.2.1.1. The chair of the search committee is appointed by the Director.
- 7.2.1.2. The chair of the search committee shall be a GLOA Faculty member unless it is a joint-hire with other academic units, in which case the chair may be a faculty member of the applicable unit.
- 7.2.1.3. Other committee members are appointed by the Director and may be drawn from across the university with appropriate regard to the disciplinary, area-specific, and methodological expertise of the hire.
- 7.2.2. Conduct of the search:
  - 7.2.2.1. The search committee drafts the job advertisement and collects feedback on the draft from the Faculty. The draft is voted by the Faculty physically or electronically and passed by a simple majority.
  - 7.2.2.2. Before the candidates for tenure-line positions on the finalist make in-person or virtual campus visits, the Faculty will have a chance to review the application materials of each candidate.
  - 7.2.2.3. After all the campus visits are completed, all Faculty are invited to a meeting where each candidate's candidacy is discussed.
  - 7.2.2.4. The search committee members, GLOA faculty or not, can be present in the meeting to answer possible questions from the Faculty.
    - 7.2.2.4.1. A simple-majority vote will be cast by secret ballot after the meeting.
    - 7.2.2.4.2. All full-time Faculty can vote. The vote is administered by the search coordinator who will report the result to the Director.
    - 7.2.2.4.3. Other logistics of the meeting and voting follow those of GLOA Faculty meeting.
  - 7.2.2.5. The search committee writes a letter for the Program Director offering the evaluation of each of the candidates.
- 7.3. If a full-time non-tenure line faculty position is authorized, the Director determines the process leading to the final candidate(s).
  - 7.3.1. The process should include a meeting where all full-time Faculty are invited and the cases of each candidate is presented either by the Director or the candidates themselves.
    - 7.3.1.1. A simple-majority voting shall be conducted by secret ballot after the meeting.
    - 7.3.1.2. Other logistics of the meeting and voting follow those of GLOA Faculty meeting.
  - 7.3.2. The Director will assume final responsibility for all recommendations regarding initial appointments.
- 7.4. Non-full time faculty are hired by the Director in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee.

## Article 8. Annual Review of Full-time Faculty

- 8.1. The Director shall review all full-time (tenured, tenure-line and term) faculty on an annual basis according to the timeline set by the Office of the Provost and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. The Director's evaluation shall be based on the faculty member's self-evaluation covering the preceding academic year.
- 8.2. The Program Director provides faculty with appropriate evaluation criteria for satisfactory/unsatisfactory performance. This is in the form of guidelines for tenure-line and term faculty to achieve varied ratings set by Global Affairs in the areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service; these guidelines are reviewed by the faculty periodically and when changes are implemented in standards in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences or the

Office of the Provost. These guidelines are shared by the Program Director when the template for the self-report is distributed. Faculty may ask the Program Director for these guidelines at any time.

- 8.3. Upon the Director's written request, each full-time faculty member shall provide the Program Director with their self-evaluation following the annual evaluation applicable to the rank they held for the majority of the reporting year along with all required enclosures.
- 8.4. The Program Director may request additional information from the faculty member if necessary. The Program Director's evaluation shall take into account the disciplinary context of each faculty member and the entire scope of their contributions during the prior year, including but not limited to: research and scholarship, teaching, and service. The Program Director will consider all job components that are part of their assigned workload during the evaluation period.
- 8.5. The Program Director's evaluation shall be given to the faculty member before transmittal to the Dean and the faculty member shall have the opportunity to respond to the evaluation, following the procedure outlined in Section 2.6.1 of the Faculty Handbook. The Program Director will communicate with faculty about their progress towards reappointment, renewal, promotion, or tenure at least once per year, or more often if the faculty chooses.
- 8.6. For tenure-line faculty, Global Affairs uses a rating system of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," and "Unsatisfactory," with ratings based on productivity in research and scholarship, effective teaching, and contributions to service. Tenure-line faculty are assigned one of these ratings in research and scholarship, teaching, and service and as an overall rating. What is needed to achieve each of these ratings is clearly outlined in GLOA guidelines and distributed to faculty with the self-evaluation form (see Appendix).
  - 8.6.1. Unsatisfactory performance indicates a failure to meet basic expectations of competency including but not limited to failures due to misconduct or failure to follow previously agreed upon remediation efforts.
- 8.7. For term faculty, Global Affairs uses a rating system of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," and "Unsatisfactory," with ratings based primarily on effective teaching and contributions to service. What is needed to achieve each of these ratings is clearly outlined in GLOA guidelines and distributed to faculty with the self-evaluation form (see Appendix).
  - 8.7.1. Unsatisfactory performance indicates a failure to meet basic expectations of competency in the duties specified in the term faculty members contract, including but not limited to failures due to misconduct or failure to follow previously agreed upon remediation efforts.
- 8.8. The Director shall meet with any tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty on a multi-year contract who receives an overall unsatisfactory rating in their annual review within two weeks of the evaluation's transmittal to Dean to develop a written Performance Development Plan as outlined in Section 2.6.1 of the Faculty Handbook.
- 8.9. All other aspects of annual evaluation shall follow the principles and procedures put forth in section 2.6 of the Faculty Handbook.

## Article 9. Annual Review of Part-time Faculty

- 9.1. Adjunct Faculty.
  - 9.1.1. The evaluation of adjunct faculty in Global Affairs is managed by the Director in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee.
  - 9.1.2. New adjunct faculty are evaluated during the instructor's second semester of teaching. All adjunct faculty will be reviewed once every three years. If an adjunct faculty is not teaching in the year they are to be evaluated they will be reviewed the next semester they teach.

- 9.1.3. This evaluation will include a classroom observation as one measure, along with student evaluations, syllabi, select teaching materials, any other relevant documentation, and the adjunct faculty's response to any feedback provided to them from the Program.
  - 9.1.3.1. Classroom observers are designated by the Director in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies (for undergraduate courses) or Director of Graduate Studies (for graduate courses).
  - 9.1.3.2. Classroom observers may include Faculty members who are Associate or Full Professor and tenured or term-faculty.
  - 9.1.3.3. Classroom observations will be scheduled ahead of time in cooperation with the adjunct faculty.
  - 9.1.3.4. For new adjunct faculty this observation will occur in their second semester of teaching. If requested by new adjunct faculty, an observation may be performed in their first semester of teaching instead.
  - 9.1.3.5. Classroom observations will follow the format approved by a simple majority of the Faculty and included as an appendix to these by-laws and addressing pre-observation communication, the classroom observation itself, and post-observation meetings.
  - 9.1.4. A write up of the observation as a whole will be provide by the observer to the Director and to the adjunct faculty member. All evaluations (initial as well as subsequent) will include feedback for the instructor and suggestions for improvement if appropriate. The Director will maintain a copy of such evaluations for a minimum of 5 years.
  - 9.1.5. The adjunct faculty member may request a follow-up meeting with the Director to discuss their review following its completion. The adjunct faculty has the opportunity to provide a response to their review in writing, no later than a semester following the observation, to the Director which will be maintained alongside the review.
- 9.2. Graduate Teaching Assistants
- 9.2.1. The evaluation of graduate teaching assistants (GTA) in Global Affairs is managed by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Faculty Affairs Committee in coordination with the Director.
  - 9.2.2. Classroom observers are identified by the Director of Undegraduate Studies in consultation with the FAC and the Director and may include any term or tenure-line Faculty.
  - 9.2.2.1. Classroom observations will be scheduled ahead of time in cooperation with the GTA. For new GTAs, this observation will take place in the second half of their first semester of teaching. This evaluation will include a classroom observation as one measure with the goal of enhancing teaching effectiveness.
  - 9.2.2.2. Classroom observations will follow the format for adjunct faculty approved by a majority of the Faculty and included as an appendix to these Bylaws. These will present guidelines for the three parts of the observation, including pre-observation communication, the classroom observation itself (including observation of asynchronous classes where appropriate), and post-observation meetings.
  - 9.2.3. A write-up of the observation as a whole will be provided by the observer to the Director and to the GTA. All evaluations (initial as well as subsequent) will include feedback for the instructor and suggestions for improvement if appropriate.
  - 9.2.4. The Director will maintain a copy of such evaluations for a minimum of 5 years. A copy of the evaluation will be provided to the Chair or Director of the GTAs home department.
  - 9.2.5. The GTA may request a follow-up meeting with the Director to discuss their review following its completion. The GTA has the opportunity to provide a response to their review

in writing, no later than a semester following the observation, to the Director which will be maintained alongside the review.

#### Article 10. Review of the Director, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of Graduate Studies

##### 10.1. Mid-term Review of the Director

- 10.1.1. The mid-term review at the program level will produce a recommendation letter to the Dean's office based on a Program-wide survey.
- 10.1.2. The Program Director shall notify the Faculty Affairs Committee a timeline specifying the deadline of the review letter with the survey to be completed at least four weeks before the deadline.
- 10.1.3. The Faculty Affairs Committee will electronically circulate an anonymous survey and summarize the result.
- 10.1.4. The summary includes the means of numeric answers and thematic description of the answers to open-ended questions. The raw numeric data and the exact quotes of answers to open-ended questions are not included.

##### 10.2. Annual Review of the Director

- 10.2.1. The annual review at the program level will produce a recommendation letter to the Dean's office based on a Program-wide survey.
- 10.2.2. The Program Director shall notify the Faculty Affairs Committee a timeline specifying the deadline of the review letter with the survey to be completed at least four weeks before the deadline.
- 10.2.3. The Faculty Affairs Committee will electronically circulate an anonymous survey and summarize the result.
- 10.2.4. The summary includes the means of numeric answers and thematic description of the answers to open-ended questions. The raw numeric data and the exact quotes of answers to open-ended questions are not included.

10.3. The Director of Undergraduate Studies shall be evaluated in the same manner as other Faculty of equivalent rank with due consideration to their additional administrative responsibilities.

10.4. The Director of Graduate Studies shall be evaluated in the same manner as other Faculty of equivalent rank with due consideration to their additional administrative responsibilities.

#### Article 11. Ratification

- 11.1. These Bylaws will go into effect when they are approved by an affirmative vote by written or email ballot by two thirds of Faculty.

#### Article 12. Amendment, Appendices, and Subsidiary Policies

##### 12.1. Amendment of the Bylaws:

- 12.1.1. Any member of the Faculty may propose amendments to these Bylaws. Proposed amendments must be distributed with the agenda for the meetings at which they are to be considered.
- 12.1.2. Initial motions to amend the Bylaws may not be introduced from the floor and considered at the same meeting but changes in a proposed amendment may be approved by a majority vote of the Faculty present at a meeting at which the amendment is being considered.

12.1.3. All motions to amend these Bylaws must be read and discussed at two successive faculty meetings. A two-thirds affirmative vote by mail or electronic ballot of the Faculty is required for passage of an amendment. Changes to any Annexes to the Bylaws must be approved by a simple majority of the Faculty by mail or email ballot.

12.2. Appendices and subsidiary policies.

12.2.1. The Faculty may by simple majority at a regular or extraordinary meeting adopt or change such rules, policies, guidelines and procedures necessary to ensure the unit's effective operations and to comply with College and University requirements.

12.2.2. Such policies are to be included as appendices to these Bylaws.

12.3. Non-substantive changes to these Bylaws may be enacted by the Faculty by simple majority vote at a regular or extraordinary meeting.

12.3.1. Non-substantive changes are changes that do not alter the meaning or intent of any Article, subarticle, or phrase and include corrections of spelling, numbering, grammar, punctuation, and case.

Article 13. Severability. In the event that any article of these Bylaws or any portion thereof shall be declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, or becomes inconsistent with University rules and regulations, such article or portion thereof shall be severed from these Bylaws without affecting the validity of the remainder of these Bylaws.

## APPENDIX 1: ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF TENURE-LINE AND TERM FACULTY

### Global Affairs Annual Evaluations Tenure-Line Faculty

#### RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP

In each category faculty can have 2+ of the same item count towards the number required to achieve that rating (e.g., you can have 2 peer-reviewed articles and achieve “Excellent.”) Global Affairs recognizes that all scholarship does not look the same depending upon the discipline, audience, and outlet. If you do not find a ‘product’ below but believe it should be counted towards Research & Scholarship, please include in your self-report and provide a brief justification.

#### EXCELLENT

**Category A:** Need 1.

- Single authored or co-authored book published by university presses or major publishing firms \*

**Category B:** If you do not have Category A, then need equivalent to 2 of the following.

- Editor or co-editor of published or accepted volume (contract or publication during evaluation period)
- Article accepted or published in peer-reviewed professional journals, sole-authored or first or second author (acceptance or publication during evaluation period) \*\*
- Chapter published or accepted in refereed volumes (acceptance or publication during evaluation period, must be peer-reviewed, not editor-reviewed)
- External grant awarded in support of research projects (award occurred during evaluation period)
- External fellowship awarded in support of research or writing (award occurred during evaluation period)
- Editor of special issue of a professional journal that is accepted or published (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)

**Category C:** If you have 1 from Category B, then need equivalent to 2 of the following. If none in Category B, then need equivalent to 3 of the following.

- Organization (or co-organization) of a professional conference (conference occurred within evaluation period)
- Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor (or similar title) of a peer-reviewed journal (held position for all or part of evaluation period)
- Article accepted or published in peer-reviewed professional journals, third author or after (acceptance or publication during evaluation period) \*\*
- Translational professional activities that apply insights of scholarship and expertise in a more public forum or method, e.g., film, photography, art exhibit, workshops, seminars (“final product” available or event occurred during evaluation period)
- Creative work that bridges academia and the public (e.g., digital archive, podcasts)
- Award in recognition of scholarly work (notified of award during evaluation period)

- Consultation activities that utilize research expertise and result in the production of substantial, reviewed reports, e.g., Freedom House, Human Rights Watch. (Element of review most important for Category C)
- Peer-reviewed book review (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)
- Other forms of recognition or scholarship that do not fall into the categories listed here, e.g., interviews or writings for national or international media, keynote or plenary presentations, contributions to research reports and papers by national or international organizations or agencies (published during evaluation period)

**Category D:** If you have 1 from Category B and 1 from Category C, then need equivalent to 2 of the following. If you have none from Category B and 2 from Category C, then need equivalent to 3 of the following. If none from Categories B or C, then equivalent to 5 of the following.

- Organization (or co-organization) of a panel for a professional conference (conference occurred within evaluation period)
- Consultation activities, expert witness of Congressional Hearings, for local NGOs and civil society (“final product” available or event occurred during evaluation period)
- Presentation at professional meetings and conferences (presentation within evaluation period)
- Invited talks (not keynote or plenary) at conferences, events, or meetings (talk must have occurred within evaluation period)
- Submission of peer-reviewed publications and/or external grant proposals (submission in evaluation period)
- Non-peer reviewed or invited articles or publications, not major news media, e.g., produced by professional organizations, volumes, encyclopedia articles (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)
- Internal fellowship to support research or writing (notification during evaluation period)

## **VERY GOOD**

**Category A:** Need 1 of the following.

- Article accepted or published in peer-reviewed professional journals, sole-authored or first or second author (acceptance or publication during evaluation period) \*\*
- Chapter published or accepted in refereed volumes (acceptance or publication during evaluation period, must be peer-reviewed not editor-reviewed)

**Category B:** If you do not have any in Category A, then need equivalent to 3 of the following.

- Single authored or co-authored book published by university presses or major publishing firms \*
- Editor or co-editor of volume (contract or publication during evaluation period, originally counted in previous year only)
- Editor of special issue of a professional journal (originally counted in previous year only)
- Internal fellowship to support research or writing (notification during evaluation period)
- Accepted or published book reviews or similar shorter academic writing appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline, e.g., case notes, research briefs (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)
- Article accepted or published in peer-reviewed professional journals, third author or after (acceptance or publication during evaluation period) \*\*
- Presentation at professional meetings and conferences (presentation within evaluation period)



- Service to the profession, e.g., editorial boards, grant review committees, manuscript reviews (service took place during all or part of the evaluation period)
- Submission of external grant proposal (submission during evaluation period)
- Publication of digital media, e.g., Conversation, series for professional organizations, website or blog with some level of review (made available online during evaluation period)
- Internal funding award (notified of award during evaluation period)

**Category C:** If you have 1-2 from Category B, then need any 2 of the following. If you have none from Category B, then need any 4 of the following.

- Timely progress on journal articles to be submitted for publication at peer-reviewed journals (in preparation)
- Timely progress on a book manuscript that will be submitted
- Chapters submitted to edited volumes (submission occurred during evaluation period, volume should be peer-reviewed not only editor-reviewed)
- Translational professional activities that apply insights of scholarship and expertise in a more public forum or method, e.g., film, photography, art exhibit, workshops, seminars (“final product” available or event occurred during evaluation period)
- Non-peer reviewed or invited articles or publications, not major news media, e.g., produced by professional organizations, volumes, encyclopedia articles (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)
- Submission of proposal for internal funding

## **SATISFACTORY**

Any 2 of the following.

- Attendance at professional conferences or scholarly seminars without presenting
- Accepted or published book reviews or similar shorter academic writing appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline, e.g., case notes, research reports (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)
- Professional growth related to area of research, e.g., attending workshops without presenting
- Submitted presentations for professional conferences (submission during evaluation period)

## **UNSATISFACTORY**

Any 1 of the following.

- Publication or acceptance of a book review or similar shorter academic writing appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline, e.g., case notes, research reports (acceptance or publication during evaluation period)
- Submission of 1 presentation for a professional conference
- Professional growth related to area of research, e.g., attending a workshop without presenting
- Attendance at 1 professional conference or scholarly seminar without presenting

\* Books may be counted up to three consecutive years. In the two years leading up to publication a book can be counted as “Very Good” (so when “under review” or “in revision”). A book can only be counted as “Excellent”

when it is published or when the publication date is announced on the publisher’s website. It can be counted as “Very Good” in the two years after publication.

**\*\*** This distinction is to recognize that in some disciplines co-authorship is not as conventional as single authored articles, but if the faculty member is listed as the third author or at any point thereafter and made significant and substantial contributions to the writing and publishing of the article, then they should explain this in the narrative, and perhaps why their article should be counted as a sole- or co-authored article instead.

Faculty can count submissions (and re-submissions) of articles, chapters, grants, and other publications. If these are then counted in a subsequent year (i.e., article submitted and then published or grant submitted and then awarded in a separate year) then it must be clearly stated in the evaluation that the faculty counted the submission in a previous evaluation and year must be listed. GLOA recognizes the time and labor that it takes to prepare a publication or proposal; however, the Director has some discretion as to whether or not the subsequent listing will be counted.

Faculty cannot list any item more than twice in total (i.e., in two separate years, even if it goes through R&R and is re-submitted) with the exception of books (see \* note). Faculty should clearly state this in the narrative and note the difference in the listings. This is to ensure that faculty are not being held at different standards with some having to produce more to earn higher ratings.

## TEACHING

On the self-report form, please report the median ratings for each of the four categories of the BLUE evaluations for courses taught during the previous academic year. You can choose when to report summer courses if you teach then (e.g., if you taught in Summer 2023 you can report it in Fall 2023 or lump summer into your Fall 2024 report, with the assumption that you would include Summer 2024 in your Fall 2025 report). Locate in the table below where the median for each of the four categories falls. If you find that the medians fall all within one range, then use that range to see what other activities should be performed to achieve a particular rating. If you find that the medians fall across ranges and you have two or more in a higher range, then choose that range to follow. If you have three or more in a lower range, then you should choose that range to follow instead (e.g., Medians for two of the categories are 4.75 but two other categories are 4.40, then choose the 4.50-5.00 range to follow, or, medians for three of the categories are 4.40 but one is 4.80, then you should follow the 4.00-4.49 range). The number in the column to the right of the ranges indicates how many items (or the equivalent of) you should have from the list below in order to achieve that rating for teaching.

This is to serve as a guideline and it is recognized that scores and number of items can be impacted by course reductions due to research, fellowship, or administrative duties. Any course reductions for these reasons should be noted in the narrative part of the evaluation. In addition, if there are items not included in the list below that you feel should count towards teaching and pedagogical activities, list them in the self-report and provide a brief justification.

Median Score	Excellent	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
4.50-5.00	2+	0-1	X	X
4.00-4.49	3+	2	0-1	X
3.50-3.99	X	3+	2	0-1

3.49 or below	X	X	X	Any
---------------	---	---	---	-----

- Professional development with regard to teaching, e.g., presentations at or participation in pedagogically focused conferences or workshops, presentation on teaching practices at professional conference, published work on teaching in peer-reviewed or significant, impactful outlets (presentation, submission, or publication took place during evaluation period)
- New course developed and taught during academic year (entirely new prep and first-time teaching)
- Course revision, e.g., new assignments created, revision of syllabi, new delivery model, etc.
- Teaching award (nominated or received during evaluation period)
- Mentoring of students engaged in original research or creative projects, e.g., Honors, URSP
- External or internal funding focused on curriculum development and/or student mentoring; Curriculum Impact Grant (CIG), Summer Team Impact Grant (SIG), NSF Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU), or similar (submission of proposal or notification of award during evaluation period)
- Advising of GLOA graduate students (indicate # of students and description of advising activities)
- Involvement in educational grants/partnerships/projects or establish partnerships with educational or professional organizations to improve quality of teaching, e.g., ADVANCE
- Participation in curriculum development at the program, college, or university level, e.g., Mason Impact, revision of BA or MA in GLOA, Mason Core, or at the professional level through an organization or working group
- Guiding students through applications (e.g., fellowship or scholarship) and in preparation for a research presentation (e.g., Celebration of Scholarship)
- Bringing international students and scholars to the university for training, mentoring, or collaboration
- Supervising MA or PhD students in other units at Mason
- Participation in semester long or other lengthier trainings (e.g., online course development)
- Development and/or leading of GLOA 710 or GLOA 480 (GLOA 710 is a course and should be listed under teaching)

Ratings for teaching and the course on student evaluations are a baseline and do not solely determine the rating for teaching on the annual evaluation for faculty. Other factors are also considered. If scores for one course fall below your other courses for the academic year significantly, please address this in your self-report. This is so that evaluations do not act as a disincentive to introduce new courses, to revise courses, or to experiment with new teaching techniques. Faculty should document, though, the new course prep as part of their annual evaluations to demonstrate innovation and development in teaching. Positive comments from peer observations and from student evaluations can be used to supplement the above demonstrated activities and productivity in the area of teaching.

## **SERVICE**

It is recognized that tenure-line faculty in Global Affairs have different types of appointments and are at different stages of their tenure clock or tenure. The program acknowledges that some faculty have 100% appointments in Global Affairs while others have primary appointments in GLOA and secondary appointments in other units. Moreover, faculty are at different stages of their tenure clock and tenure and may hold administrative positions in the unit or at the college or university level. Please see the notes below on how to address this in the self-report. Service work is important, but needs to be balanced with all commitments at the university and as a faculty member. The table below was written primarily for faculty who have 100% appointments in Global Affairs and should serve as a general guideline.

EXCELLENT	Two major service activities in GLOA <b>plus</b> 3 major service activities that fall under any of the other categories or one major service activity in any of the categories other than the program and 4 minor activities that span at least two of the four categories or one major service activity in any of the categories other than the program and 2 minor activities that are split between any two of the four categories
VERY GOOD	One major service activity in GLOA <b>plus</b> 2 major service activities that fall under any of the other categories or one major service activity in any of the categories other than the program and 2 minor activities that are split between any two of the four categories or four minor service activities that span at least two of the four categories
SATISFACTORY	Two minor service activities in GLOA <b>plus</b> 1 minor service activity that falls under any of the other categories
UNSATISFACTORY	No major service in GLOA <b>plus</b> no major service in any of the other categories and no more than 1 minor service activity in any of the four categories

	Major	Minor
GLOA	Undergraduate Academic Advising (including Mason Korea, study abroad, and internships) Organization (or co-organization) of event or program for GLOA	Mentor to new faculty member, adjunct faculty, or a GTA or graduate lecturer Participation in BA and/or BAM/MA recruitment (or public event as representing GLOA)
	Chair or active member of a GLOA committee (e.g., Bylaws, Colloquium, APR, Assessment)	Advisor to student organization inside of GLOA or outside of the unit
	Participation in student events like orientation, alumni series, welcome party, Mason Korea, etc.	Invited speaker in a GLOA class or a class in another unit
	Chair or active member of a Promotion & Tenure Committee or Faculty Search Committee	Writing a news item or short piece for website or social media
	Classroom observation of GTAs, adjunct faculty, term faculty, or tenure-line or tenured faculty	Help in the production of recruitment materials
	Recruitment of Honors, Global Politics Fellows, Study Abroad, or other programs linked to GLOA	Provide information for reports or assessment as requested by the Director or Assistant Director
CHSS	Chair or active member of a college-level committee	Participation in workshop or event organized by the college on professional development
	Director of minor or certificate program	Invited speaker for a class in CHSS
	Organization (or co-organization) of collegelevel event for faculty and staff or for students	Writing a news item or short piece for website or social media

	Member of MA or PhD committees in other units (indicate #, role on committee, and student's stage)	Participation in a student event
	Elected role in CHSS Faculty Assembly or for a college committee or group	Participation in recruitment event (or public event as representing CHSS)
University	Member of steering committee or similar for a program or center on campus	Participation in student event or new student orientation at Mason
	Organization (or co-organization) of Masonwide event for faculty and staff or for students (e.g., reading group)	Writing a news item or short piece for website or social media
	Elected role in Faculty Senate or for a university committee or group Chair or active member of university-level committee	Participating in recruitment event (or public event as representing Mason) Advisor to a student organization outside of GLOA
Profession	Organization (or co-organization) of workshop or event aimed at professional development	Participation in workshop or event aimed at professional development (e.g., invited speaker)
	Officer of professional organization during at least part of the evaluation period	Reviewer for competition at the professional level (e.g., book award or best student paper award)
	External reviewer or panel member for granting agencies or foundations	Peer review of journal articles or book proposals or manuscripts
	Member of task force or special committee as part of a professional organization	Conference reviewer

This system is designed to have faculty service performance be well-rounded with participation in service activities at multiple levels each year. Faculty should provide a justification for any service activity that they see the Director as perhaps undervaluing; this can include a high-time commitment, extensive collaboration or coordination, or complicated nature of the tasks involved. This system weights “Major” service activities heavier than the “Minor” ones as a way to encourage faculty of not spreading their time and energies too thin among minor activities before making more impactful contributions to the unit, college, university, or profession, while also maintaining a healthy balance in terms of service. Committee membership, event coordination, and serving as a reviewer or officer, and participation in recruitment or events can count more than once if repeated within the evaluation year as long as they are different (i.e., you reviewed grant proposals for two different foundations or you contributed to two different GLOA committees). It is recognized that some service activities require more time and commitment than others. The faculty can indicate in the narrative that the weights of specific activities may vary from what is listed in this document based upon time and labor. The Director will take this into consideration.

Service expectations as faculty move towards tenure and then post-tenure, but should be balanced so not to hinder promotion to Full Professor. Faculty in their first year of their tenure-clock are not expected to do any Major service but can participate in Major or Minor service if they choose to do so. In their second year, there is an expectation that faculty should participate in a small amount of service in Global Affairs, such as one Major

activity or a few minor ones. In their third year, the expectation is that they are moving towards the expectations listed above and becoming more involved in the program in particular, but may not have as much service at the college or university level. Post-tenure, college and university service become important for promotion to Full.

Faculty with joint appointments have a percentage of their service dedicated to Global Affairs outlined in their MOU with the secondary unit. GLOA will share this percentage with the college, university, and profession since it is the larger portion. It is recognized that faculty with joint appointments, especially those who are post-tenure, may not fulfill all of the above expectations or may do so, but the activities fall across GLOA and their joint appointment. The faculty member should document all of their service in their self-report and provide a few sentences about how it fulfills the percentage in the MOU (again, please see note above about faculty in the early stages of their tenure-clock as this must be flexible).

## OVERALL RATING

The table below includes the combinations of ratings based on [Research & Scholarship][Teaching][Service] that will translate into an overall rating of Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory for that year's annual faculty evaluation.

Excellent	EEE EVE	EEV EEV	EES EVS	VEE VEV	VES			
Very Good	ESE	ESV	ESS	VVE VSE	VVV VSV	VVS VSS		
Satisfactory	EEU EVU ESU	VEU VVU VSU	SEE SVE SSE	SEV SVV SSV	SES SVS SSS	SEU SVU SSU	EUE EUV EUS	VUE VUV VUS
	UEE UVE	UEV UVV	UES UVS	EUU	SUE SUV SUS			
Unsatisfactory	EUU VUU SUU	UEU UVU USU	UUE UUV UUS UUU	USE USV USS				

Global Affairs  
Annual Evaluations Scoring  
Term Faculty

## TEACHING

On the self-report form, please report the median ratings for each of the four categories of the BLUE evaluations for courses taught during the previous academic year. You can choose when to report summer courses if you teach then (e.g., if you taught in Summer 2023 you can report it in Fall 2023 or lump summer into your Fall 2024 report, with the assumption that you would include Summer 2024 in your Fall 2025 report). Locate in the table below where the median for each of the four categories falls. If you find that the medians fall all within one range, then use that range to see what other activities should be performed to achieve a particular rating. If you find that

the medians fall across ranges and you have two or more in a higher range, then choose that range to follow. If you have three or more in a lower range, then you should choose that range to follow instead (e.g., Medians for two of the categories are 4.75 but two other categories are 4.40, then choose the 4.50-5.00 range to follow, or, medians for three of the categories are 4.40 but one is 4.80, then you should follow the 4.00-4.49 range). The number in the column to the right of the ranges indicates how many items (or the equivalent of) you should have from the list below in order to achieve that rating for teaching.

This is to serve as a guideline and it is recognized that scores and number of items can be impacted by course reductions due to research, fellowship, or administrative duties. Any course reductions for these reasons should be noted in self-report in the narrative. In addition, if there are items not included in the list below that you feel should count towards teaching and pedagogical activities, list them in the self-report and provide a short justification.

Average Evaluation Score	Excellent	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
4.50-5.00	3+	2	1	X
4.00-4.49	4+	3	2	0-1
3.50-3.99	X	4+	3	0-2
3.49 and below	X	X	X	Any

- Professional development with regard to teaching, e.g., presentations at or participation in pedagogically focused conferences or workshops, presentation on teaching practices at professional conference, published work on teaching in peer-reviewed or significant, impactful outlets (presentation, submission, or publication took place during evaluation period)
- New course developed and taught during academic year (entirely new prep and first-time teaching)
- Course revision, e.g., new assignments created, revision of syllabus, new delivery model, etc.
- Teaching award (nominated or received during evaluation period)
- Participation in workshops or course development offered through the Stearns Center or other centers on campus, or through professional organizations or other universities
- Mentoring of students engaged in original research or creative projects, e.g., Honors, URSP
- External or internal funding focused on curriculum development and/or student mentoring; Curriculum Impact Grant (CIG), Summer Team Impact Grant (SIG), NSF Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU), or similar (submission of proposal or notification of award during evaluation period)
- Member of MA committees in other units (indicate #, role on committee, and student's stage)
- Involvement in educational grants/partnerships/projects or establishment of partnerships with educational or professional organizations to improve quality of teaching, e.g., ADVANCE, INTO Mason
- Participation in curriculum development at the program, college, or university level, e.g., Mason Impact, revision of BA or MA in GLOA, Mason Core, or at the professional level
- Guiding students through applications (e.g., fellowship or scholarship) and in preparation for a research presentation (e.g., Celebration of Scholarship)
- Developing and/or leading GLOA 710 or GLOA 480 (GLOA 710 should be included in the table above)

Ratings on student evaluations are a baseline and do not solely determine the rating for teaching on the annual evaluation for faculty. Other factors are also considered, as noted in the table and list. If scores for one course fall

below your other courses for the academic year significantly, please address this in your self-report. This is so that evaluations do not act as a disincentive to introduce new courses, to revise courses, or to experiment with new teaching techniques. Faculty should document, though, the new course prep as part of their annual evaluations to demonstrate innovation and development in teaching. Positive comments from peer observations and from student evaluations can be used to supplement the above demonstrated activities and productivity in the area of teaching.

## SERVICE

Term faculty in Global Affairs are expected to serve as the academic advisor for a portion of our undergraduate students. When on leave, their advising load will be reassigned to another faculty or staff member. While service work outside of advising is expected of term faculty, the table below is aimed to keep a balance between advising and other service given that advising can take up several hours per week during peak weeks of the semester. In the self-report, term faculty should document the number of undergraduate students they advised during the academic year. The academic advisor has the exact breakdown of advising loads.

EXCELLENT	3+ service activities in Category A <b>OR</b> 2 service activities in Category A and 2+ service activities that fall Category B
VERY GOOD	2 service activities in Category A <b>OR</b> 1 service activity in Category A and 2+ service activities in Category B
SATISFACTORY	1 service activity in Category A <b>OR</b> 2 (no more, no less) service activities in Category B
UNSATISFACTORY	No service activities in Category A and no more than 1 service activity in Category B <b>OR</b> no service activities in either Category A or B

### Category A: GLOA

- Organization in an event or program for GLOA aimed at students
- Chair or active member of a GLOA committee (e.g., APR and assessment, Bylaws, relating to curriculum)
- Classroom observation of GTAs or faculty
- Mentor to new GLOA faculty member or to a GTA or graduate lecturer
- Chair or active member of faculty or staff search committee
- Chair or active member of term promotion or renewal case (or service on the Mason Korea committee)
- Participation in recruitment or public event as representative of GLOA, CHSS, or Mason
- Advising and mentoring of GLOA MA students (provide number or discussion of what this entailed)
- Participation in recruitment of Honors, Global Politics Fellows, Study Abroad, or other programs linked to GLOA

### Category B: Minor Program Service + College, University, & Profession

- Advisor to a student organization inside or outside of GLOA § Invited speaker for a class inside or outside of GLOA
- Participation in a student event sponsored by CHSS or Mason
- Organization of a college-wide or university-wide event aimed at students or professional development
- Writing a news item or short piece for website or social media (GLOA, CHSS, or Mason)
- Help in the production of recruitment materials or advertising materials for GLOA, CHSS, or Mason



- Participation in OSCAR (or similar) activities
- Director of a minor or a certificate program
- Elected Role in CHSS Faculty Assembly or Faculty Senate
- Organization of a professional workshop or event aimed at teaching and pedagogy
- Chair or member of a college-level or university-wide committee § Officer of a professional organization
- Reviewer or panel member for granting agencies or foundations
- Reviewer for competition at the professional level aimed at students (e.g., best student paper award)
- Mentoring of students at the professional level (e.g., for a professional organization) § Conference organizer
- Provide information for reports (e.g., annual assessment) as requested by the Director of program
- Mentor or advisor to student in GLOA 492 or GLOA 720 (related to their research)

Term faculty in Global Affairs receive a course reductions each academic year to take on additional service and student advising. The evaluation system here encourages term faculty to focus their attention on service inside of Global Affairs, with a healthy mix of service activities at the college, university, and professional levels. Committee membership, event coordination, serving as a reviewer, and participating in events as a representative of the unit, college, or university can count more than once if repeated within the evaluation period as long as they are different in nature (e.g., serve on the GLOA assessment committee and on the colloquium committee or perform two observations of two different GTAs in GLOA 101).

If in an evaluation period a term faculty member does more service activities from Category B than from Category A, they should address this in their narrative; they can provide an explanation for service, particularly that from outside of the program, that the Director may perhaps undervalue. It is recognized that some service activities require more time and commitment than others. The faculty can indicate in the narrative that the weights of specific activities may vary from what is listed in this document based upon time and labor. The Director will take this into consideration.

### **Special Instructions for the Assistant Director**

The Assistant Director includes a high-time and energy commitment to academic advising and to service for the program. The Assistant Director does many of the tasks in Category A on a regular basis, serves as the Undergraduate Director for Global Affairs, and is one of the main academic advisors. For this reason, service for the Assistant Director will be evaluated differently than service for other term faculty members and they should refer to the self-report as to what is required to document. There is little expectation of additional service outside of the Assistant Director position (and outside of GLOA) for the term faculty member in that role unless they choose to pursue other service work.

### **OVERALL RATING**

The table below includes the combinations of ratings based on [Teaching][Service] that will translate into an overall rating of Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory for that year's annual evaluation.

Excellent	EE	EV	VE		
-----------	----	----	----	--	--

Very Good	VV	ES	VS	SE	SV
Satisfactory	SS	EU	VU	SU	
Unsatisfactory	UE	UV	US	UU	

### **Note on Research and Scholarship**

The category of Research and Scholarship is not included in the overall rating for Term faculty at George Mason but this does not mean that term faculty in Global Affairs will not be encouraged to pursue research and publication. Activities in this area can be given weight based upon the faculty narrative indicating activities during the evaluation period. GLOA is committed to supporting Term Faculty who are active researchers and encourages faculty to integrate students into research when possible. GLOA recognizes that teaching and research are not always separate domains of academic pursuit, but that research can enhance the classroom experience for the faculty member and students (and vice versa). The specific weight given to Research and Scholarship will be a decision made by the Director in consultation with the Term faculty member and depending upon the activities undertaken during the evaluation period, research and scholarship may replace some service expectations (for example, when term faculty are on study leave for a semester they may not fulfill all requirements for the service work as noted in the table above). In no way is this to penalize Term Faculty who do not choose to pursue active research agendas or to seek service at professional levels; all faculty are highly valued in Global Affairs for their talents and the program aims to support faculty, within the limits of maintaining a thriving program (e.g., faculty must do service work to make GLOA a vibrant program), regardless of their interests or goals.

## APPENDIX 2: ANNUAL EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY AND GTA

### Global Affairs Adjunct Faculty Observations

Teaching observations encourage both the observed instructor and the observer to reflect on their teaching, helping them to develop and improve their practice. Observations can offer faculty feedback on aspects of their teaching that students may not be as qualified as peers to evaluate, such as the implementation of particular teaching methods. Mason Policy #3012 requires that each school and college must establish an adjunct faculty evaluation policy and procedures that are consistent with the university policy. In the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS), policies and practices for faculty evaluation occur at the unit level. Given this, Global Affairs (GLOA) has established this document that outlines its review of adjunct faculty who teach in the program. GLOA recognizes that teaching observations have many benefits, but also present challenges in that they can require a significant investment of time and there is a general lack of agreement around what is successful teaching. For these reasons, GLOA considers these reviews to be one measure among many to gauge teaching effectiveness.

1. New adjunct faculty in Global Affairs will be observed in their second semester of teaching, even if they do not teach consecutive semesters. Adjunct faculty who have taught in Global Affairs at least one semester prior to January 2021, the time of implementation of this policy and procedure, will be observed in Spring 2021 or Fall 2021.
2. All adjunct faculty will be reviewed once every three years. This is three years from the date of their most recent review even if they do not teach regularly in GLOA during this time. If an adjunct faculty is not teaching during the academic year in which they are to be reviewed, then they will be reviewed the next semester in which they do teach, in accordance with the university policy.
3. Core and program faculty in GLOA who are Associate and Full Professors (tenure-line) or Term Associate and Full Professors will review adjunct faculty. The Global Affairs Director will arrange the review, connecting the core or program faculty member with the adjunct faculty, and is responsible for keeping track of adjunct faculty who need to be reviewed under this policy.
4. The review will consist of three parts: pre-observation communication between the core or program faculty and adjunct faculty, the observation, and a post-observation meeting between the two faculty members. The GLOA Director can participate in pre- or post-observation activities if either faculty member requests them to do so. Once notified by the Director that a review will occur, the adjunct faculty will suggest days and times for the observation. The adjunct faculty should provide the core or program faculty member with the course syllabus at minimum. They should also grant access to Blackboard (if applicable) and/or provide assignments and in-class activities or other materials they think would be useful for the faculty reviewer.
  - **Pre-Observation Communication:** This can be done via email, phone/virtual meeting, or in-person depending on the preference of the adjunct faculty member. In this phase, the adjunct faculty can discuss their teaching philosophy and strategies as well as talk about their needs and how the faculty member's review can help them. There may be discussion about what the faculty would like to learn about their teaching through the review (e.g., areas they want to improve upon). The adjunct faculty member should take the lead as to the observation and review.
  - **Observation:** During the class visit, the observing faculty member will pay careful attention to teaching style, techniques, engagement with students, feedback provided, and any barriers that might hinder learning. Faculty members should be open to alternative viewpoints. It is not likely that both share the same assumptions about teaching and learning or use the same methods. There are multiple effective

approaches and this can be an opportunity to gain a new perspective on teaching. The observer should be as unobtrusive as possible.

- **Post-Observation Meeting:** After the observation is complete, the two faculty members will have a brief meeting (virtual, on the phone, or in-person) to talk about the class. The observer will share the write-up of the observation in advance of this meeting, which should balance constructive criticism with praise that is specific rather than gratuitous and vague. The observer should focus summary remarks and follow-up discussions on a few areas for improvement. The faculty members should pair each area with possible strategies and ideas—brainstormed together during this meeting—to try in the future. This can serve as an “action plan.”

5. The review may be based upon an in-person class meeting or an online asynchronous or synchronous course module or unit:

- **In-Person:** The core or program faculty charged with completing the review will observe a minimum of one in-person class session. The instructor will suggest potential dates for the observation, working with the faculty member to find one of mutual convenience. The review will be based upon observable practices and actions of the instructor during a single visited class session and their engagement with the students, not directly upon the students in the class.
- **Asynchronous:** The core or program faculty member doing the review will observe a minimum of one completed online module or unit—one that students have completed and for which the instructor has provided feedback. Observation of two different completed online units or modules is recommended. The course instructor can offer guidance as to which units or modules, and which types of tools (e.g., discussion board posts, blogs), should be observed.
- **Synchronous:** The core or program faculty member doing the review should observe a minimum of one live class session. The course instructor can suggest which synchronous class meetings may be observed. It is important for the faculty reviewer to keep in mind that even though this is a live meeting between the instructor and the class, it may look different from an in-person class meeting due to the environment.

6. After the post-observation meeting, the review including the “action plan” will be forwarded to the GLOA Director and will be kept on file by the GLOA Office Manager for a minimum of 5 years. The adjunct faculty will receive a copy for their records. As per University Policy #3012, evaluations will also be maintained in the college/school for no less than 5 years, and copies will be provided to the Office of the Provost when requested.

7. The adjunct faculty member can request a follow-up meeting with the GLOA Director to discuss their review after it is completed. The faculty member also has the opportunity to provide a response to their review in writing to the Director. If they choose to meet or write a response to their review, they must do so no later than the end of the semester following the semester in which the review took place.

8. Adjunct faculty may make a request to the Global Affairs Director for an observation in their first semester of teaching, which will follow the procedure listed in this document. The review may or may not be counted for their evaluation under Mason Policy #3012. If the review is determined to count for their evaluation, no review will be necessary in their second semester of teaching. This will be decided based upon a discussion between the adjunct faculty member and the GLOA Director after the review has taken place.

**Global Affairs**  
Adjunct Faculty Observation

Name of Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

Course (Prefix and Number + Title): \_\_\_\_\_

Pre-Observation Communication

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Highlights from Teaching Philosophy and Strategies:

Observation Targets (areas to look for):

Notes:

Class Observation

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Observation Type:      p Face-to-Face                      p Asynchronous                      p Synchronous

*Provide a numerical score based on the following scale and offer feedback on each of the areas below.*

*5 = Excellent      4 = Very Good      3 = Satisfactory      2 = Fair      1 = Poor      N/A = Not Applicable*

**Clarity and Effectiveness of the Presentation of Material**

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor displays a clear understanding of the materials, organizes and expresses thoughts clearly, presents materials in an engaging way, outlines learning goals and objectives so students understand how the material in that unit/module/class connects to the overarching outcomes for the course, and provides communication that promotes stated learning objectives.

**Concepts and Relationships**

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor uses practices that fosters critical thinking and reflection, effectively relates theory and practice, emphasizes the conceptual understanding and connections among topics, ties current content to topics or

knowledge from the literature, and uses examples and illustrations that were selected intentionally and with purpose.

**Engagement of Students**

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor skillfully challenges students with questions or activities, promotes discussion and friendly debate, elicits students' points of view and their experiences, seeks to encourage students to broaden their worldviews, demonstrates awareness of diverse learning needs, creates a comfortable environment where everyone (students and the instructor) can learn from each other, and selects appropriate and varied course tools for learning, activities, and assessments.

**Learning Environment**

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor exhibits respect and understanding towards students, encourages divergent viewpoints as appropriate, skillfully builds an open rapport among the class, uses practices that foster students' intellectual and professional growth, and holds realistic expectations for the learning activities.

**Instructional Content and Methods**

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor uses appropriate teaching methods for the unit/module/class (such as discussion, exercises, group projects, lecture, etc.), leverages tools and resources available to students to facilitate active learning, has clearly defined descriptions and goals for assignments and activities, reviews material from previous meeting or module/unit to show how the course progresses, employs instructional aids effectively (e.g., films, internet resources, media, etc.).

Post-Observation Meeting

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Overall Observation Feedback:

**Action Plan**

Most Important (try these things right now):

Less Important (try these things when you have time):

Additional Comments:

Adapted from the following sources:

USC Center for Teaching Excellence, "CET Classroom Teaching Observation Checklist"

USC Center for Teaching Excellence, "CET Asynchronous Online Classroom Teaching Observation Checklist"

DePaul University Teaching Commons, "Teaching Observations"

Western Michigan University Faculty Development, "Peer Observation"

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, George Mason, "Peer Review of Instructor's Classroom Effectiveness"