

August 1, 2018

**Memorandum**

**To:** Candidates for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor  
**From:** Tracey E. Hucks, Provost and Dean of the Faculty  
**Subject:** Tenure and Promotion to Associate - Procedures for Spring 2019

The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that the Dean of Faculty must confirm the calendar for tenure and promotion to associate professor decisions and must fully inform all about current procedures. (The complete updated handbook is available on line at <http://www.colgate.edu/offices-and-services/deanoffice/currentfaculty/faculty-handbook>.) Accordingly, I am attaching the following documents:

- (1) Calendar for assembling tenure dossiers
- (2) List of responsibilities
- (3) Guidelines/Checklist for the preparation of tenure dossiers
- (4) Model letters

***Of particular note:* These guidelines are revised annually by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean's Advisory Council. Please review these guidelines with care and DO NOT refer to earlier versions.**

Please note that all material for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor is to be in to the division director by February 8, 2019, and to the Dean of the Faculty's Office by February 15, 2019.<sup>1</sup> Department chairs and division directors should meet this Fall with prospective candidates to discuss the preparation of the dossier and to establish an appropriate timetable for soliciting documentation. Chairs must review the checklist with the division director and the candidates well before the February 8 deadline.

The online edition of the *Faculty Handbook* contains a detailed section on "Procedures for Decisions on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure" (Section III.G.), which should also prove helpful.

Thank you for your contribution to our shared educational mission at Colgate, and best wishes in your preparation to undertake this important professional step.

cc: Department Chairs, Program Directors, and other faculty assigned to assembling dossiers  
Division Directors  
Department [Program] Administrative Assistant  
Promotion and Tenure Committee

---

<sup>1</sup> Materials are due on the first workday after the deadline.

## Calendar for Assembling Tenure Dossiers

### By August 1

The Dean's Office sends candidates, their chair(s) and/or program director(s), department/program administrative assistants, division directors, and members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee copies of the guidelines.

The associate dean of the faculty sends candidates, their chairs, and department/program administrative assistants a list of the courses for which SET forms will be included in the tenure dossier.

### By September 7

Each candidate meets with the respective chair(s) and relevant division director(s) to review the checklist.\*<sup>2</sup>

With a view to ensuring the availability of 3 or 4 candidate-recommended reviews in the dossier, **the candidate brings** to this meeting a **preliminary list of 4 potential reviewers with 2-4 alternates**. Reviewers are normally other faculty members, and when they are, they should be tenured. In those cases in which proposed reviewers are not faculty members, there should be reasonable assurance that they will be able to comment on the candidate's work in a manner relevant to the candidacy. In providing their selections, candidates should bear in mind that reviewers with whom they are closely connected may be regarded as less able to provide an objective assessment.

**The candidate also brings a current *curriculum vitae* and copies of all published and accepted work and of any work in earlier stages that the candidate may want sent out to reviewers.**

The *curriculum vitae* must be complete, including all details on published work such as dates, volume numbers, pages, and so forth. For work that has not yet appeared in print, the status of each individual item must be clearly indicated, along with expected date of publication, if known. Please refer to "Instructions for compiling the dossier" (4.I.A.1) for appropriate categories.<sup>3</sup>

The packet of materials sent to each external evaluator includes the published and accepted work of the candidate, their *c.v.*, and the trajectory statement. At the discretion of the candidate, works in progress or submitted works may also be included in the materials to be sent to external evaluators. Plans or prospectuses for future work, including grant proposals, are not sent to reviewers, but may be noted in the trajectory statement.

This meeting is the occasion for the candidate, chair(s)/program directors, and division director(s) to consult with each other about the form and content of the *vita*. The chair will secure the needed number of copies of the materials to send out to the external evaluators.

At any time during the candidacy, the candidate should inform the chair of any additions to the *c.v.*, such as grants and awards received, articles and books accepted or published, *etc.* If the additions occur prior to sending the candidate's materials to referees, the change should be reflected in what is sent out by the chair.

The candidate should also bring a **1-2 page description** of their scholarly or creative trajectory, identifying key points about work completed, work in progress, and projected work. This synopsis will be sent to external evaluators.

This meeting should also include a discussion of whether to include first-time Core SETs. If the candidate wishes first-time Core SETs to be included, they must make that request in writing to the associate dean of the faculty, and a revised list of the courses for which SET forms will be included in the dossier will be sent to the candidate, the chair, the division director, and the department administrative assistant.

This meeting is an opportunity for candidates whose primary affiliation is in an interdisciplinary program to see the up-to-date list of tenured faculty with joint appointments or other formal association with the program for the purposes of promotion and tenure.

This meeting will also include a discussion of which reviewers will be asked to comment on the extra-departmental teaching (Core, team-taught courses) and on the service of the candidate. If any of the candidate's choices for a service letter should decline to write, the candidate should be given the opportunity to request that a different reviewer be asked to submit a service letter.

This meeting is also an opportunity for the chair and division director to make suggestions and offer guidance to the candidate concerning all of the matters above.

---

<sup>2</sup> In the case of joint appointments, two chairs/program directors and the relevant division director(s) are involved in this meeting. Henceforth in these guidelines the term chair will be used to refer to the head of the department or program of the candidate's primary affiliation, and program director will refer to the head of the other sphere of the candidate's appointment (a second department or program). The chair, in this special sense, is the one responsible for the preparation of the case and should share materials with the other chair/program director and the director(s) of the divisions of the candidate's affiliations in all instances where these guidelines specify communication with the division director. In all parts of the dossier [i.e., SET responses, number of advisees and independent studies], information should include the joint department/program data. The role of the secondary program or department in selecting external evaluators of scholarship is described in the instructions for preparing Section V of the dossier.

<sup>3</sup> The candidate is responsible for providing careful indications in the materials sent to external evaluators regarding the status and content of any unpublished manuscripts sent out.

By September 14

After the chair and division director have received the candidate's list of external evaluators, the chair begins a confidential process of compiling the department's list. The chair should provide the tenured members of the department with the candidate's list. While the department may also list reviewers who are on the candidate's list, the department should avoid naming reviewers with close ties to the candidate. All phases of this process should involve consultation with all tenured department members. Neither the chair nor any other tenured department member is permitted to consult with the candidate over recommendations for the departmental external evaluators. To insure impartiality at this stage of the process, the chair is required to communicate the following statement before the department begins discussion of its list of external evaluators:

To ensure complete impartiality, under no circumstances should any departmental member consult with the candidate with a view to gaining their recommendation over the choice of external evaluators to be chosen by the department.

By September 28

The chair gives the division director a copy of each of the two lists of reviewers; those selected by the candidate and those selected by the department. The candidate's list must clearly indicate the order in which alternates to the top four potential reviewers should be contacted in the event that any decline. The department list must indicate the first 4 reviewers to be contacted.

The division director begins the process of securing 7 or 8 external evaluators for each case including 4 department choices and at least 3 candidate choices by sending Model Letter A with the candidate's *c.v.* and trajectory statement by email to the first four of the candidate's choices and the first four of the department's choices. Throughout the process, the candidate's list has priority. That is, any reviewer whose name appears twice in the initial group of eight (because they are the choice of both the candidate and the department) must be counted as the candidate's choice and replaced by another name on the department's list. As the process proceeds, once a reviewer has been approached following the priority of the candidate's list, that reviewer must be considered the candidate's choice and cannot be counted as the department's choice, even if that reviewer's name is also on the department's list. Additional requests are sent out as necessitated by declines. If fewer than three of the candidate's choices agree to review the case, the candidate will need to be asked for more names.

Once a reviewer has agreed, a letter from the division director to the reviewer (Model Letter B) is forwarded to the chair to be sent along with copies of the materials to be reviewed and the candidate's brief statement about their research. The letter to the reviewer will request a response by January 4 or at least two weeks before the letter for the dossier is needed.

The normal target date for assembling the dossier is January 23. In anticipation of that deadline, chairs should contact reviewers to inquire concerning their letters on or around January 4.

Before February 8, the candidate should be informed of those who have agreed to serve as external evaluators for the case. If the candidate has any serious and specific concerns about any persons on the department's list, they may discuss their concerns with the division director, as may be done with respect to any aspect of the dossier. Substantive concerns may be documented in writing and presented to the division director for inclusion in the dossier after the case has been assembled by the department and gone to the Dean of Faculty's Office.

At this time, the chair should request any internal letters of evaluation.

By November 2

The chair should send materials to external evaluators, accompanied by Model Letter B from the division director.

By December 7

The Dean's office reissues copies of the guidelines to candidates, their chair(s) and/or program director(s), department/program administrative assistants, division directors, and members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

By January 4

Candidate should have received copies of typed comments of all SETs in the case by this date. The chair should make typed SET forms and all materials sent to external evaluators, including the scholarly trajectory, available to departmental colleagues reviewing the case.

By January 4

Letters from external evaluators have arrived, or chair makes inquiries.

By January 11

Candidate provides chair with the following materials for inclusion in the dossier:

- An updated *c.v.* (This *c.v.* should be in a format consistent with information provided in Section I.A. of the guidelines.)
- A statement on teaching, scholarship, and service (Candidates are encouraged to seek guidance and advice from colleagues both within and outside of the department in the preparation of their personal statement.)
- Copies of any letter(s) of acceptance pertaining to work that has been accepted for publication but is not in print
- List of materials for colleagues and Promotion and Tenure Committee to read, including materials sent to external evaluators and any other items that the candidate wishes to be made available at their option, to colleagues and the Promotion and Tenure Committee, *e.g.*, grant proposals, better-reproduced illustrations, reader's or referee reports. (This list should not, of course, include any items specifically precluded from being part of the dossier; see 3 below under Checklist. The candidate should make sure that all of the items on this list are forwarded to the Dean's Office when the dossier has been approved and is sent on.)

Chair collects for the case the following (reviewed with the candidate for accuracy):

- List of dates of hire, third-year review, leaves, study groups, promotion (if relevant)
- List of all courses taught at Colgate, indicating semester and year (This list includes all courses taught at Colgate prior to appointment to the tenure-stream position, *e.g.*, while in a visiting, term, or pre/post-doctoral position.) The department administrative assistant requests the raw data from the Registrar and then compiles the list.

By January 25

The division director requests from the chair a progress report on all elements of the case, including the external review letters, which should be in by this date. In advance of the department meeting(s) that will need to occur, it is necessary for the tenured members of the department to have for review:

- the candidate's *c.v.*, prepared according to the dossier guidelines
- completed candidate's statement (Note: There should be no substantive subsequent changes to this statement.)
- letters from external evaluators (**four from the department's choices and three or four from candidate choices**). If some letters are late in arriving then the chair should consult with the division director
- letters from colleagues writing on the candidate's teaching in and contribution to other programs
- letters from colleagues writing about the candidate's service
- the relevant SET forms
- any study group evaluations
- any information concerning publications, grants, and awards more recent than the candidate's *vita*.

By January 31

All meetings of the tenured members of the department have been held for discussion and deliberation concerning the candidacy, and the chair's brief statement describing the meeting[s] has been distributed to tenured department members.

**The content and result of the department's deliberations are confidential and are not to be reported or indicated to the candidate (except by means of the Chair's summary letter), nor to other members of the faculty, nor to anyone else, with the exception of the relevant university officials. This requirement of confidentiality continues to apply after decisions are announced. (If a candidate wishes for others to be able to report the result of their candidacy after it is made known to the candidate, they may give permission to relate that information.)**

By February 6

Each tenured member of the department, including the chair, submits a letter for the dossier.

Between February 8 and February 15

The chair assembles the dossier in accord with the guidelines. The chair may choose to comment on the completed dossier if the chair believes that there are specific elements of the dossier where further explanation might be helpful to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. It is then given to the division director to be reviewed. The division director may request an additional review of a corrected dossier.

The candidate meets with the division director<sup>4</sup> in order to address any concerns the candidate may have about fair treatment in regard to the preparation of the file. Names of those who have written external evaluation letters for the case will be shared before this meeting. In addition, names of all of the extra-departmental (or program) letter writers, including teaching and service letters will be communicated. At this meeting the division director will share the chair's summary letter with the candidate, who will have 5 working days to submit a response to the division director if desired. This one meeting with the division director is prescribed and should take place prior to February 10. However, candidates may consult with the division director at any point in the process.

By February 15

The original copy, paginated, along with seven (or eight for joint appointments) double-sided copies of each dossier, is brought by the chair to the Dean of the Faculty's Office, along with a complete *c.v.* for each of the external evaluators.

The candidate brings to the Dean's office one copy of each item of the candidate's works sent to external evaluators. Other items, such as grant proposals, may be made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the discretion of the candidate.

Between February 15 and April 15

The Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the dossier in the presence of the relevant division director(s) and with the Dean of Faculty and they make recommendations which are then sent to the president.

By April 15

Candidates and tenured members involved in the review are informed in writing of the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean's recommendation, and the President's decision. The target date for announcing the decisions is mid-April, but if there is a need to extend the process, candidates will be so notified on or before this date. The letter will be mailed to the candidate's home address, unless the candidate informs the Dean of Faculty office that a different address should be used.

---

<sup>4</sup> The dossier does not need to be fully assembled for this meeting to occur.

## **List of Responsibilities by Candidate, Chair, Division Director, and Dean of Faculty**

### **Candidate Responsibilities**

Provide:

1. 1-2 page scholarly trajectory
2. *Curriculum vitae*, prepared according to the dossier guidelines
3. One copy of works to be submitted to reviewers
4. Personal statement
5. List and copies of materials for the Promotion and Tenure Committee to have available to consult, including materials sent to external evaluators and additional allowed materials. (The candidate or their representative should be sure that these materials arrive at the Dean's Office when the case leaves the department for consideration by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.)
6. Any response to the chair's summary of the case, submitted to the relevant division director(s). (optional)

### **Chair Responsibilities (with assistance from the department administrative assistant)**

1. Mail the division director's cover letter and materials to outside reviewers who have agreed to be involved in the case and contact to provide reminders to submit timely letters.
2. Send thanks to external reviewers upon receipt of letters.
3. Solicit letters for extra-departmental evaluation of teaching and service.
4. Solicit letters from extra-departmental tenured faculty with direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching.
5. Assemble typed SET forms and make them available to departmental colleagues reviewing the case.
6. Provide list of all courses taught at Colgate.
7. Provide numbers of independents, honors, and summer research projects by semester for all semesters.
8. Provide numbers of major, minor, and undeclared (including FSEM) advisees for previous six semesters of teaching.
9. Provide assessment of journals and presses in which candidate's work appears.
10. Compile list of materials sent to external evaluators.
11. Provide copy of departmental policy on peer evaluation of teaching.
12. Provide explanation of how the peer review policy was applied in this case.
13. Write and share a brief description of department meeting(s) to discuss tenure recommendation.
14. Solicit letters from tenured members of the department.
15. Consult with the division director and show to all tenured members of the department, the departmental summary of candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. Give this summary to the division director to share with the candidate.
16. Prepare table of contents and assemble dossier (paginated).
17. Assemble any appendices.
18. Send *vitae* of external evaluators to Dean of Faculty Office.

### **Division Director Responsibilities**

1. Email letter to potential external evaluators after conferring with chair.
2. Inform chair when assents are received from reviewers.
3. Forward Model Letter B to department to be sent to external evaluators along with the materials to be reviewed.
4. Meet with candidate to share the names of external evaluators and names of all of the extra-departmental (or program) letter writers, including teaching and service letters once their letters have become part of the dossier.
5. Consult with the chair over the preparation of the chair's summary letter and present that letter to the candidate.

### **Dean of Faculty Office Responsibilities**

1. Provide dates of hire, leaves, promotion, sabbatical, study group, third-year review.
2. Provide student evaluations of off-campus study groups and extended-study groups
3. Write letter providing list of courses for which SET forms are to be included.

## Guidelines for the Preparation of Tenure Dossiers

### 1. Checklist of items to be included

Dossiers should include all of the parts specified on this model table of contents. Each part is described in the comments in item 4 below. In preparing the dossier, chairs must reproduce all entries in this sample table, adding page numbers only after the division director has confirmed that the dossier is complete. If there is no material to be included in a given part, “n/a” (not applicable) should be filled in place of a page number in the table of contents. Chairs may insert into the table, as they see fit, titles and page numbers for any of the subheadings in the following descriptions that they think will make it easier for members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to navigate the dossier. Late additions can be paginated by letters following a page number, *e.g.*, 19a, 19b.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Information about the candidate	
A. Candidate’s <i>curriculum vitae</i> complete and with all information presented according to the dossier guidelines	
B. Dates of hire, third-year review, leaves, study groups, etc.	
C. Candidate’s statement	
II. Teaching	
A. List of all courses taught, including independent studies, honors, and summer research projects	
B. Extra-departmental letters on evaluation of teaching	
C. Extra-departmental letters from tenured faculty with direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching	
D. SET responses (NB: If a first-time-taught Core course is included in the list, the list should be followed by a copy of the candidate’s request to have it included.)	
E. Off-campus-study teaching evaluations	
III. Scholarship	
A. Assessment of venues in which the candidate’s work appears	
B. External evaluations of scholarship	
C. List of material available in the Dean’s Office for inspection by the Promotion and Tenure Committee	
IV. Service	
A. Number of major, minor, and undeclared (including FSEM) advisees for each of the last six semesters of teaching	
B. Letters from extra-departmental colleagues evaluating service	
V. Extra-Departmental Evaluations (only for candidates holding joint appointments)	
A. Program policy for peer evaluation of teaching	
B. Program director’s explanation of how the peer evaluation was applied in this case.	
C. Summary of the program meeting at which the case was discussed.	
D. List of program faculty participating in the review and individual letters	
E. Letter summarizing the views of the program’s tenured members on the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service	
VI. Departmental evaluation and recommendation	
A. Department peer evaluation policy	
B. Chair’s explanation of how the peer evaluation was applied in this case.	
C. Chair’s statement about department meeting and recommendation	
D. List of tenured department members and individual letters	
E. Chair’s summary of teaching, scholarship, and service	
F. Optional Chair’s Letter	
G. Candidate response to the chair’s summary (where applicable)	
VII. Appendix	

### 2. Items not in the dossier but that should be forwarded to the Dean’s Office to be available for the Promotion and Tenure Committee to consult while they deliberate

- CVs of external evaluators (department chair’s responsibility)
- Copies of all materials sent to external evaluators
- Grant proposals (optional)
- Any additional illustrations for the candidate’s statement (optional)

### 3. Items that may not be included in a dossier nor its appendix

- Letters solicited in ways other than terms described in the checklist
- Solicited or unsolicited letters from students
- Letters of annual consultation
- SET forms other than those specified in the guidelines

- (\*) Responsibility of the chair to write or solicit information  
 (\*\*) Provided by the Candidate  
 (\*\*\*) Provided by the Dean of Faculty's Office or division director

#### 4. Instructions for compiling the dossier, section by section

##### I. Information about the candidate

- A. The *curriculum vitae* of the candidate, including education, employment, position status at Colgate (full- or part-time), professional activities, professional recognition, and service. Information should be up-to-date, complete, and presented in the categories listed below. Changes to the *c.v.* can be made up to February 8. Any additional substantive changes after that time are explained by the chair in a note that is appended to the *c.v.* (\*\*)
1. The candidate's full bibliography, broken out by category and chronological within category, using the following headings: (\*\*)
    - a. Published works (grouped by subcategories, which normally include monographs, edited books, articles, abstracts, reviews, review articles). This and other lists should correspond to the lists in the candidate's *c.v.*. Citations must be full citations (including page numbers where appropriate) with indications of whether the venue of publication is refereed or non-refereed. For multi-authored pieces, this list must reproduce the authors' names in the order in which they appear on the publication.
    - b. Scholarly work accepted but not in print (forthcoming or in press). Articles are considered "accepted" when the journal editor verifies in writing that the author(s) have fully completed any changes requested and provided all of the information required for publication. Chapters, edited volumes, and authored books are considered "accepted" when the publisher verifies in writing that the entire book has been fully completed and delivered to the publisher and that all of the changes required have been made. The anticipated date of publication should be added to items in this list. Letters of acceptance for scholarly work in this category should be included in the appendix.
    - c. Scholarly work completed and submitted for publication (grouped by subcategories, which normally include monographs, edited books, articles, abstracts, reviews, review articles).
    - d. Scholarly work in progress. If the candidate has a contract for this work, a copy of that contract should be included in the appendix.
  2. List of papers, presentations, colloquia, *etc.* Each item should be described with the place, date, venue, and nature of the presentation (*viz.*, panel, lecture); the precise contribution of the candidate to multi-authored presentations should also be noted. (\*\*)
  3. Professional Recognition (\*\*)
    - a. Grants and fellowships received in support of scholarly activity (Separate grants into two categories: external [non-Colgate] and internal.)
    - b. Offices held in professional organizations
    - c. Committee membership in professional organizations
    - d. Editorial or related activity
    - e. Consultant services
    - f. Other: honors, awards, prizes, references to the candidate's work in other scholars' publications, *etc.*
  4. A list of committees (noting any positions held) and other services rendered to the department and the university (including study group leadership and participation in all university programs) and the profession, with dates. (\*\*)
- B. Dates of hire, third-year review, leaves, study groups, promotion (if applicable). (\*\*\*) but checked with the candidate)
- C. Candidate's statement on their teaching, scholarship, and service. (\*\*)

The length of this statement should be roughly 20 to 25 pages, double-spaced in a 12-point font, exclusive of illustrations. (N.B. Dossiers will be photocopied, so illustrations will be of poor quality in the versions of the dossier that are read. For this reason, it is advisable for candidates to include one set of good illustrations for the Promotion and Tenure Committee to inspect along with the materials forwarded to the Dean's Office.) Candidates are encouraged to seek guidance and advice from colleagues both within and outside the department in the preparation of their personal statement.

The discussion in the statement should include the candidate's philosophy of teaching, their goals and methods, and an account of their development as a teacher, including plans for future teaching. It might also review such things as new courses developed, participation in departmental and/or programmatic curricular revision, involvement in the Core and other interdisciplinary programs and, if the candidate wishes, perspectives and identities that influence pedagogy. The candidate should provide their reflections on the noteworthy aspects of the SETs, excluding any comment on the quantitative data; these data are not part of the dossier.

The discussion of scholarship should review the candidate's scholarly activities: past development, current projects, and future plans. It should describe the candidate's principal achievements and identify their place in a broader intellectual context, keeping in mind that not all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be familiar with the candidate's discipline. The candidate may also describe the quality of the journals in which their work appears. Discussion of work-in-progress should indicate how near to completion such work is, its prospective outlet, and any preliminary evaluation of it from outside sources. The candidate should also review their activity at professional meetings and any services as a consultant.

The discussion of service should review the candidate's role on university, divisional, and departmental business, study group leadership, and any involvement in their professional field beyond the university (state, regional, national organizations).

## II. Teaching

- A. List of all courses taught at Colgate by semester: course number, title, enrollment, and course type. This list should indicate any fractional credit courses, including labs. The list should also indicate any courses that were team-taught. In courses with labs, the list should indicate whether the candidate taught all or only some parts of the combination of lecture and labs. Where appropriate, the chair should provide a brief description of the candidate's duties in courses where classes or labs taught by the candidate constitute some form of shared or team teaching (*e.g.*, number of weeks and sequence of teaching in a team-taught course, whether a lab instructor teaches some labs, extent of responsibility for designing labs and exams, whether a research seminar involved other faculty participants). For each semester, also include independent students, honors projects, and summer research projects sponsored. (\* but checked with the candidate)
- B. Letters evaluating teaching from teaching faculty outside the department. If the candidate has Core SETs in the dossier, a letter from the UP(s) who supervised that teaching<sup>5</sup> must be included. Core mentors should not be used as evaluators of teaching. In cases where the UP was the mentor an appropriate substitute should be found. If the candidate has taught a course that seems central to an interdisciplinary program's major or minor and SETs for the course are included in the dossier, then a letter from the program director who supervised that teaching<sup>3</sup> should be included here. In the event that the candidate has participated in Core or a program, but a Core or a program letter is not a required element of the dossier, the question of whether such a teaching letter should be solicited is a topic to be discussed at the September meeting of the candidate, chair(s) and relevant division director(s) and is ultimately the candidate's choice. (See model letter D.) Candidates who have taught in the FSEM program have the option of asking for a letter under service, Section IV.B. (\*)
- C. Letters from extra-departmental faculty who have direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching. These letters should be from tenured faculty who have direct, sustained knowledge of the candidate's teaching through team-teaching, linked courses, or some other extensive collaborative work with students. Core mentors should not be used as evaluators of teaching. When someone with this direct experience of the candidate's teaching at Colgate has since left this institution, that colleague may still be asked to contribute a letter. Colgate colleagues who are not faculty may not be asked to comment on a candidate's teaching. (See model letter E.) (\*)
- D. SET form responses from the four on-campus teaching semesters immediately preceding candidacy. SET form responses for a minimum of eight courses are normally required; previous semesters immediately preceding candidacy will be included as necessary. The SET responses should include all courses, except for first-time taught Core courses the candidate has not explicitly asked be included. The section on SET responses must include:
  1. The memo provided by the associate dean's office to the candidate listing SETs to be included in the case. (\*\*\*) If the candidate has requested that a first-time Core course be included in the dossier, that letter must follow this list. (\*\*)
  2. A list of all courses for which SET data are included, with the following information for each course: course number, title, days and times of class meeting, course type, number enrolled (post withdrawal date)/number of student responses. The chair should explain in some detail how SETs were administered and how the SETs apply to candidates where there is some form of shared or fractional credit teaching. (\*)
  3. Typed copies of all student responses on the included SET forms, presented chronologically. There should be a header on each page identifying the course by name and number with the term taught and days and hours of meeting, and number enrolled (post withdrawal date)/number of student responses. SET responses are to be typed as written except that the name of any staff member, student, or faculty member is to be removed (or blacked/redacted out in the case of electronic SETs) and the ellipsis indicated [...]. When a word or words are illegible, the word "illegible" should be inserted in brackets. SET responses within each course should be numbered—1, 2, *etc.* (\*)
- E. Student evaluations of off-campus study groups and extended-study experiences conducted by the candidate. (\*\*\*) The candidate may supply comments on these evaluations (at this point or in their statement) and/or submit their final report. (\*\*)

---

<sup>5</sup> If possible; and if not, the current university professor/program director should provide the letter.

### III. Scholarship

- A. The chair's summary assessment of the journals and presses in which the candidate's work appears. This information should include, when possible, assessment of the significance and selectivity of the venues, and such things as circulation, acceptance rate, and time lag for publication. When possible and relevant, there should be an explanation, based on the rules or guidelines in the discipline or the candidate's area of professional activity, for the order of authorship for collaborative work. An assessment of exhibitions, galleries, performance commitments, and venues that parallels the assessment of work in print must be provided for a candidate whose professional activity is not presented in written form. (\*)
- B. External evaluations of scholarship. This section should contain the following items in order:
1. List of external evaluators including name, title and affiliation, and whether the choice was by the department or by the candidate (\*). The final dossier should include 3 or 4 letters from evaluators chosen by the candidate and 4 from evaluators chosen by the department chair in consultation with the tenured members of the department. (In the case of joint appointments, the department and program share in the selection of four external reviews; see V below.) Reviewers are normally other faculty members, and when they are they should be tenured. In those cases in which proposed reviewers are not faculty members, there should be reasonable assurance that they will be able to comment on the candidate's work in a manner relevant to the candidacy. The package sent to each external evaluator includes the published and accepted work of the candidate, their *c.v.* and the trajectory statement. Unpublished manuscripts with indications of status as outlined in 4.I.A.1 may also be sent, at the request of the candidate. Plans or prospectuses for future work, including grant proposals, should not be included in the packet, but may be noted in the trajectory statement.
  2. Letters from each evaluator, signed, dated, and on letterhead. Hard copy is preferred, but PDF is acceptable. The *vitae* of reviewers should be included among the materials provided to the Promotion and Tenure Committee outside of the dossier. (\*\*\*) (The letter of request - see Model Letter B - specifies that the external evaluator's report should be in the form of a signed letter on institutional letterhead and gives the date by which the letter is needed, building in a margin of safety before the department convenes on the case. Chairs are reminded that it is standard professional courtesy to acknowledge external letters when they are received. Email is fine for this — see Model Letter F).
  3. List of items sent to external referees (\*)
  4. 1-2 page scholarship/creative work trajectory prepared by the candidate (\*\*)
- C. List of materials available in the Dean's Office for inspection by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The list should include all material sent to external evaluators. The chair should share this list with the candidate, who may add other items that are to be made available. The candidate is responsible for taking these items to the Dean's Office. (\*) (\*\*)

### IV. Service

- A. Number of students advised by the candidate during each of the last six teaching semesters at Colgate, with the numbers of major, minor, and undeclared (including FSEM) advisees listed separately for each semester. (\* but checked with the candidate)
- B. At least one and not more than three letters from persons outside of the department in a position to judge and comment on the quality of service of the candidate. The letter from a University Professor about the candidate's teaching in the Core Program is not included here but in section II.B, earlier in the dossier. (\*) (See Model Letter C.)

## V. Extra-departmental Evaluations of Candidates Holding Joint Appointments

In addition to the procedures described elsewhere in these guidelines, the following will apply for candidates who formally hold joint appointments in both a department and an interdisciplinary program, or in two departments. (In the latter case, the chair of the second department will take on the duties that this section assigns to the program director.) When the program director is a member of the home department, they may opt not to take charge of assembling the program dossier. In such case, the division director for the program will designate an appropriate person to act as program director in preparing the file. Subsequent reference to the “program director” refers to this person.

The dossier should include letters evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service from the appropriate program director<sup>6</sup> and from up to four other tenured professors (but not exceeding the number of tenured professors in the candidate’s home department). These additional faculty members, beyond the program director, will be associated with the appropriate program but be from outside the candidate’s home department, and they will be selected with the mutual agreement of the candidate, the program director, and the appropriate division director. Extra-departmental evaluators should be chosen no later than one year prior to the review.

The chair of the home department and the program director should discuss possible choices of external evaluators of scholarship. The external evaluators will be chosen by the department and the candidate under the procedures outlined above with the difference that among the four reviewers not named by the candidate—two are chosen by the program director in consultation with the other extra-departmental faculty who are evaluating the candidate and the other two are the department’s choices.

Prior to the program meeting on the case, the tenured program faculty should have access to the same materials that will be available to tenured faculty in the department, including the candidate’s *curriculum vitae* and personal statement, all student evaluations of teaching in the dossier, the packet of materials sent to the external evaluators, letters from external evaluators of scholarship, and internal letters describing Core teaching and service.

The program director and the program faculty chosen as evaluators should meet to discuss the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service.

***The following statement on confidentiality will be read out loud by the program director at the beginning of each program meeting to discuss the candidate’s case:***

Discussions of cases for tenure, promotion, or third-year review are among the most important discussions a program ever undertakes. To ensure that these discussions can be candid and open, it is vitally important that they proceed with a clear understanding that what is said will be held in the strictest confidence by all those who take part. Under no circumstances, and at no time before or after the hearing of the case, should the views expressed, positions taken, or votes cast be communicated to the candidate or to anyone else not authorized to receive this information.

The chair of the candidate’s home department will attend this meeting in order to hear the program’s views of the candidate. No formal vote will be taken by the program faculty. Following the meeting, the faculty members from the program will write individual letters evaluating all three criteria: the candidate’s teaching, scholarship and service.

The program director will attend the meeting(s) at which the candidate’s home department discusses the dossier. The program director will have a full voice in the meeting and will present the program’s views of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service. However, unless the program director is a member of the department, the program director will not be present for the home department’s summary discussion and vote.

Following the meeting of the home department, the program director should write a letter summarizing the views of the extra-departmental evaluators.

From this process there arise five sets of documents that the program director provides to the department chair for inclusion in the dossier:

- A. The program’s policy for peer evaluation. (\*)
- B. The program director’s explanation of how the peer review policy was applied in this case. (\*)
- C. A brief statement prepared by the chair, of the program meeting(s), indicating:
  - Time and place of the meeting or meetings
  - Identification of the tenured members as present or absent. The absence of qualified members must be explained.
  - Confirmation that the university’s standards for tenure (as set out in the *Faculty Handbook*) were reviewed.
  - Statement attesting that the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service were reviewed.
  - Confirmation that the department’s discussion of teaching was conducted in light of its peer evaluation policy. The chair’s minutes should summarize this part of the review.

This statement should be available for review by the members present, including the chair of the home department, who attends this meeting. (\*)

---

<sup>6</sup> For candidates holding a joint appointment, there is no need for a teaching letter from the program director in Section II.B.

*Items A through C are made available to tenured faculty in the department prior to the departmental meeting(s) on the case.*

- D. List of program faculty participating in the review, followed by the individual letters (on letterhead, dated and signed—hard copy preferred but PDF acceptable) from the tenured professors in the program, including the program director. Rather than being a review of program discussions, individual letters should convey the author’s own evaluation, based on criteria contained in the *Faculty Handbook*, of teaching, scholarship, and service. (\*)
- E. A letter written by the program director summarizing the views of tenured professors in the program reviewing the case. This letter may also address issues raised in the department meeting and is added to the dossier when the rest of the dossier is complete. (\*)

#### VI. Departmental evaluation and recommendations.

At least one meeting must be held for tenured members of the department to consider and evaluate the candidate’s case for tenure. This meeting is normally held after all material for the dossier is in hand. If some items are late in arriving then the chair should consult with the division director and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee concerning the timing of the department meeting. Department members should have available to them:

- the most current *Faculty Handbook* language,
- all of the material sent to external evaluators,
- the candidate’s *c.v.*,
- the candidate’s statement,
- letters from external evaluators,
- all extra-departmental evaluations of teaching and service,
- the SET form responses included in the case,
- any study group evaluations,
- any materials specified by the department policy on peer evaluation, and
- any late-arriving additions to the candidate’s *c.v.*

Tenured members whose attendance in person or by telephone is impossible because of illness, study group leadership, or leave of absence taken away from Hamilton are expected to contribute letters to the dossier and register a vote, which will be announced at the time that the formal vote is taken in the department meeting. After the department has concluded its deliberations and the chair has submitted the completed case to the division director, the chair will inform the division director directly of late-arriving evidence.

***The following statement on confidentiality will be read out loud by the department chair at the beginning of each department meeting to discuss the candidate’s case:***

Discussions of cases for tenure, promotion, or third-year review are among the most important discussions a department ever undertakes. To ensure that these discussions can be candid and open, it is vitally important that they proceed with a clear understanding that what is said will be held in the strictest confidence by all those who take part. Under no circumstances, and at no time before or after the hearing of the case, should the views expressed, positions taken, or votes cast be communicated to the candidate or to anyone else not authorized to receive this information.

The presentation in the dossier of the results of the department’s deliberations must include the following elements:

- A. The department’s peer evaluation policy. (\*)
- B. The chair’s explanation of how the peer review policy was applied in this case. (\*)
- C. Brief statement, prepared by the chair, of the department meeting(s), indicating:
  - Time and place of the meeting or meetings
  - Identification of the tenured members as present or absent. The absence of qualified members must be explained.
  - Confirmation that the university’s standards for tenure (as set out in the *Faculty Handbook*) were reviewed
  - Statement attesting that the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service were reviewed.
  - Confirmation that the department’s discussion of teaching was conducted in light of its peer evaluation policy.
  - A record of the vote taken at the conclusion of the meeting(s) registering separately each tenured member’s vote as yes or no. (Abstention is not forbidden, but it is very strongly discouraged.)

This statement must be made available for review by those who attended the meeting(s), with summary discussion and vote redacted for the program director. (\*)

- D. List of tenured members of the department, followed by the individual letters (on letterhead, dated and signed—hard copy preferred but PDF acceptable) from all tenured members of the department, including the chair, prepared independently. Rather than being a review of departmental discussions, individual letters should convey the author’s own evaluation, based on criteria contained in the *Faculty Handbook*, of teaching, scholarship, and service, and register the author’s vote on the case. (\*)
- E. The chair’s summary of the departmental evaluation, including salient parts of the department meeting(s) and letters, prepared after

all other parts of the dossier are complete. This letter is prepared after consultation with the division director and reviewed by all tenured members of the department. (\*)

- The chair's summary letter presents the department's views on strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service, and will include a summary of external evaluations of scholarship. This letter does not include any statement about departmental vote. In the case of joint appointments, the chair's summary should also provide a sense of the program (or department) meeting. (\*)

Confidentiality should be maintained; therefore, no names or identifying information are to be included. Also, no excerpts from external letters should be included at this time (these may be shared anonymously with the candidate when the full process is complete). The expectation is that these letters will be substantive, so 2-3 pages is the suggested length.

This letter will be shared with the division director to present to the candidate. The candidate may decide, after discussion with the division director, to provide a written response to the summary for inclusion in the dossier. The candidate will have 5 working days to submit a response to the division director, if desired, and it will be added to the dossier after the case has been assembled by the department and delivered to the Dean of Faculty's Office.

#### *Description of Optional Chair's Letter*

- F. Optional Chair's Letter: The chair may choose to comment on the completed dossier if the chair believes that there are specific elements of the dossier where further explanation might be helpful to P&T. This letter should not summarize or reargue the case. This letter is not shared with the department members or the candidate. Examples of issues that might be addressed in this letter:
- Outliers: contextualization of comments that are made in a single letter and not addressed in other parts of the dossier,
  - Contextualization: background information that might provide P&T with insight on points of contention in the dossier,
  - Inaccuracies: flagging statements in letters that the chair knows to be factually inaccurate,
  - Potential unfairness: the flagging of statements that the chair believes may be biased, prejudicial, or otherwise unfair.
- G. Candidate response to the chair's summary (where applicable)

#### VII. Appendix

The Appendix should contain appropriate supporting materials (labeled VII. A., B., etc.) that clearly reference their connection to materials within the dossier. (\*\*)

## MODEL LETTER A

*Email letter sent, from the office division director, to potential external evaluators*

**Preferred Subject Line: Request for Tenure and Promotion Evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_**

DATE

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

This email is sent to ask if you would be willing to perform an important service to \_\_\_\_\_ and to Colgate University.

During the Spring 2019, \_\_\_\_\_ will be considered for appointment with continuous tenure and promotion to associate professor. To help us make an informed decision, we are asking for your considered judgment of \_\_\_\_\_'s scholarly/creative work. Attached please find \_\_\_\_\_'s *curriculum vitae* and a short statement of their research trajectory. If you agree to participate in the review, the chair of the \_\_\_\_\_ department [and the director of \_\_\_\_\_ program] will send copies of \_\_\_\_\_'s scholarly/creative work. It may be helpful for you to know that the candidate will be provided with a list of the external evaluators of their work. Unless you direct us otherwise, we may share anonymous excerpts from your comments for constructive feedback to the candidate. The review will be needed by January 2, 2019.

Please let me know next week whether you would be willing to perform this important service. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Division Director of \_\_\_\_\_  
[Designated Division Director of \_\_\_\_\_]

Attachment: candidate's *curriculum vitae*  
Candidate's trajectory

cc: department administrative assistant  
[program administrative assistant]

**MODEL LETTER B**

*Letter from the division director, which is forwarded to the department chair to be sent out with materials to external scholars who have agreed to evaluate scholarship.*

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

Thank you for agreeing to provide your considered judgment of the scholarship/creative work of \_\_\_\_\_, who stands for appointment with continuous tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ [and program] at Colgate University in Spring 2019. A copy of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed together with a personal statement describing their scholarly/creative trajectory and the publications and materials we are asking you to evaluate.

We seek your opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's professional work, your assessment of the quality, originality and significance of these accomplishments, and your estimate of the candidate's potential for continued scholarly/creative work. It may be helpful for you to know that some members of the committee evaluating the candidate's case may not have specialized knowledge of the candidate's field of expertise. In your response please indicate whether you know the candidate personally and, if so, in what capacity. The candidate will be informed that you are one of the external evaluators of their work. Unless you direct us otherwise, we may share anonymous excerpts from your comments for constructive feedback to the candidate.

It would be most helpful if you could forward your evaluation by January 2, 2019, to \_\_\_\_\_, chair of the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ (contact information below). Please record your assessment on letterhead and include your signature on a hard copy posted to the department chair (preferred) or send them a PDF image of the signed letter on letterhead.

We would appreciate your enclosing a recent version of your *vita* with your review.

Thank you for rendering this very important service. If you have questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to write or call me.

Sincerely,

Division Director of \_\_\_\_\_  
[Designated Division Director of \_\_\_\_\_]

Chair of \_\_\_\_\_  
[Designated review committee chair]

Enclosure: candidate's *curriculum vitae*  
Candidate statement of scholarly/creative trajectory  
Professional materials to be reviewed (see list)

cc: Department Chair  
[Program Chair]  
Administrative Assistant  
[Program Administrative Assistant]

## MODEL LETTER C

*Letter of solicitation to Colgate colleagues to evaluate candidate's service - do not depart from the wording of the sample letter. SET forms are not provided to those evaluating a candidate's service.*

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

\_\_\_\_\_ will be considered in the Spring semester for an appointment with continuous tenure and promotion to associate professor.

I ask you to review the section in the *Faculty Handbook* on "Service" (Chapter III, Section F, Part 3) and to offer your considered judgment of \_\_\_\_\_'s work in the capacity in which you have known them.

If this service was on a committee, please indicate its purpose and accomplishments, the amount of time the candidate devoted to the committee and the quality of their contributions to it.

Could you please forward your evaluation to me by \_\_\_\_\_?

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair  
[Program Director]

**MODEL LETTER D***Letter of solicitation to Core component chair and other program directors to evaluate teaching*

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

\_\_\_\_\_ will be considered in the Spring semester for an appointment with continuous tenure and promotion to associate professor.

I ask you to review the sections in the *Faculty Handbook* on teaching (Chapter III, Section F, Part 1) and service (Chapter III, Section F, Part 3) and to offer your considered judgment of \_\_\_\_\_'s work in your program. SETs for the following courses from [Core component name or interdisciplinary program name] will be included in the dossier and typed copies will be provided to you.

[Listing of SETs: course and term]

Please comment on the candidate's contributions to their students, to the staff of your program, and to the course or the program as a whole. It would be most helpful if you would review the appropriate SETs and discuss them within the context of the program as a whole. Please keep in mind that SETs not included within the dossier are not part of this evaluation and should not be used as a basis for your letter. Moreover, references to other faculty who teach in your program may not be included in your letter. In the event that you find it necessary to consult with someone else who directed your Core component or interdisciplinary program, please state in your letter that such consultation has taken place and ask that person to initial any of their comments that you include in your letter.

Could you please forward your evaluation to me by \_\_\_\_\_?

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair  
[Program Director]

**MODEL LETTER E**

*Letter of solicitation to tenured extra-departmental Colgate faculty colleagues with direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching.*

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

\_\_\_\_\_ will be considered in the Spring semester for an appointment with continuous tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Under the promotion and tenure guidelines regarding the evaluation of teaching, the Promotion and Tenure Committee seeks the input from tenured members of faculty who have direct knowledge of a candidate's teaching. I ask you to review the sections in the *Faculty Handbook* on teaching (Chapter III, Section F, Part 1) and provide your assessment of the quality of \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching.

Your letter will be most helpful if it considers both the strengths and weaknesses of \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching. We are primarily interested in your direct observations of the candidate's teaching. If, however, your knowledge of the candidate's teaching is from a team-taught course, it is permissible to review and comment on SETs that were previously made available to you for that course.

Could you please forward your evaluation to me by \_\_\_\_\_?

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair  
[Program Director]

**MODEL LETTER F***Email or letter of thanks to external evaluators*

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

We have received your review of the scholarly materials for \_\_\_\_\_ as part of the review for continuous tenure and promotion to associate professor. Your contribution will be very important in the deliberations on the case. Unless you directed otherwise, we may share anonymous excerpts from your comments for constructive feedback to the candidate once the review is complete.

We greatly appreciate your time and effort on behalf of Colgate University and the department/program as we undertake the process of faculty review.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Department Chair  
[Program Director]