

August 1, 2018

Corrections: 8/1/18 (p. 11)

Corrections 9/25/18

Memorandum

To: Candidates for Third-Year Comprehensive Review
From: Tracey E. Hucks, Provost and Dean of the Faculty
Subject: Third-year Review Procedures for Spring 2019

The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that the Dean of Faculty must confirm the calendar for third-year review (TYR) decisions and must fully inform all about current procedures. (The complete updated handbook is available online at <http://www.colgate.edu/offices-and-services/deanoffacultyoffice/currentfaculty/faculty-handbook>) Accordingly, I am attaching the following documents:

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

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

Please note that all material for TYR is to be to the division director by February 8, 2019, and in the Dean of the Faculty's Office by February 15, 2019.¹ Please be reminded of the January 1, 2019 deadline for completion of the Ph.D. or terminal degree. In the term prior to review, department chairs and division directors should meet 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

Calendar for Assembling Spring Third-Year Review Dossiers

¹ Materials are due on the first workday after the deadline.

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 Dean's Office also supplies the dates of hire, leaves, and study group directorship.

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 TYR dossier.

By September 7

Each candidate meets with their chair(s) and relevant division director(s) to review the checklist.²

The candidate brings:

1. a current curriculum vita. 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.
2. copies of work that will be sent out to reviewers. Published work is sent to reviewers. 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. Proposals for future work, including grant proposals, should not be sent to reviewers.
3. a one-page statement describing the candidate's plans regarding present and future scholarly/creative work, including plans for the junior faculty leave. This statement will be included with the materials sent to external evaluators.

This meeting is the occasion for the candidate, chair, and division director to consult with each other about the form and content of the vita. Items listed in the vita can also be listed and counted at the time of Tenure Review. The chair will secure the needed number of copies of the materials to be sent to the external evaluators.

At any time during the process of the review, the candidate should inform the chair of any additions to the cv, 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. The chair should inform the division director of the additions and any changes in what is sent out.

The meeting includes a discussion of the selection of external evaluators. Procedures for selecting evaluators depend on when the candidate received the Ph.D. or terminal degree. A detailed description of the selection process is contained in the instructions for preparing Section III.A. of the dossier.

This meeting should also include a discussion of which faculty, if any, will be asked to comment on the extra-departmental teaching (Core, team-taught courses).

The meeting is also an opportunity, if the candidate so wishes, to discuss whether to request that first-time Core SETs be included in the dossier. A candidate who wishes first-time Core SETs to be included 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 TYR dossier will be sent to the candidate, the chair, and the department administrative assistant.

² 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. The chair of the home department should share materials with the program director and the other division director in all instances when the guidelines specify communication with the division director. In all parts of the dossier [viz., SET responses 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 IV of the dossier.

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

By September 14

The chair sends letters of invitation to external evaluators. 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 chair.

By December 7

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 2

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

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 available to departmental colleagues reviewing the case.

By January 11

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

- An updated *c.v.*
- A statement on teaching, scholarship, and service (Candidates are encouraged to seek guidance and advice from colleagues both within and outside 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 his or her option, to colleagues and the Promotion and Tenure Committee, e.g., grant proposals, reader's or referee reports, better-reproduced illustrations. (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, leaves, study groups, promotion (if relevant), from the Dean of the Faculty's Office
- 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 department 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 updated cv
- candidate's completed statement (there should be no substantive subsequent changes to this statement)
- letters from external evaluators
- letters from colleagues writing on the candidate's teaching in and contribution to other programs
- the relevant SET forms
- any study group evaluations
- any information concerning publications, grants, and awards more recent than the candidate's vita
- a copy of the department's peer evaluation policy and copies of any items that the policy specifies as part of peer review (such as syllabi).

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, 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 department chair completes the Institutional Need section and assembles the dossier in accord with the guidelines. 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 director³ in order to address any concerns the candidate may have about fair treatment in regard to the preparation of the file. Those candidates who have received the Ph.D. or terminal degree more than five years prior to the review year are informed of those who have agreed to serve as external evaluators for the case before this meeting. In addition, names of all of the extra-departmental (or program) letter writers will be communicated. This one meeting 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 department to the Dean of the Faculty's Office.

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 are informed in writing of the Dean's recommendation to the President. 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 Office of the Dean of the Faculty that a different address should be used.

³ The dossier does not need to be fully assembled for this meeting to occur.

List of Responsibilities by Candidate, Chair, and Dean of Faculty

Candidate Responsibilities

Provide:

1. *Curriculum vitae*
2. One copy of works to be submitted to reviewers
3. Personal statement
4. 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.)
5. A one-page statement describing the candidate's plans regarding present and future scholarly/creative work, including plans for the junior faculty leave. This statement will be included with the materials sent to external evaluators.

Chair Responsibilities (with assistance from the department administrative assistant)

1. Email letters to potential external evaluators.
2. Send materials to external evaluators and contact to provide reminders to submit timely letters.
3. Send thanks to external reviewers upon receipt of letters.
4. Make materials sent to external evaluators available to departmental colleagues reviewing the case.
5. Solicit letters for extra-departmental evaluation of teaching.
6. Solicit letters from extra-departmental tenured faculty with direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching.
7. Assemble typed SET forms and make them available to departmental colleagues reviewing the case.
8. Provide list of all courses taught at Colgate.
9. Provide numbers of independent studies and honors projects directed by semester for all semesters.
10. List of student summer research projects directed for each semester.
11. Compile list of materials sent to external evaluators.
12. Provide copy of departmental policy on peer evaluation of teaching.
13. Write and share a summary of the department meeting(s) to discuss third-year review recommendation.
14. Solicit letters from tenured members of the department.
15. Prepare table of contents and assemble dossier (paginated).
16. Assemble any appendices.
17. Prepare and share statement on institutional need.

Dean of Faculty Office Responsibilities

1. Write letter providing list of courses for which SET forms are to be included.
2. Provide dates of hire, leaves, study groups, date for tenure consideration.
3. Provide student evaluations of off-campus study groups and extended-study groups

Guidelines for the Preparation of Third-year Review 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 that follow the table. In preparing the dossier, chairs must reproduce all entries in this sample table, adding page numbers only after the final review of the dossier by the division director. 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.

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
I. Information about the candidate	
A. Candidate's <i>curriculum vitae</i>	
B. Dates of hire, 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 group/extended study evaluations	
III. Scholarship	
A. External evaluations of scholarship	
B. List of material available in the Dean's Office for inspection by the Promotion and Tenure Committee	
IV. 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 policy was applied	
C. Program director's summary statement	
D. List of program faculty participating in the review and individual letters	
V. Departmental evaluation and recommendation	
A. Department peer evaluation policy	
B. Chair's explanation of how the peer evaluation policy was applied	
C. Chair's summary statement	
D. List of tenured members of the department and individual letters	
VI. Institutional Need ⁴	
A. Department statement on institutional need	
B. Program statement on institutional need (only for candidates holding joint appointments)	
VII. Appendix (All items separated and identified as A., B., C., as needed)	

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

- 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 or 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

⁴ This section does not apply to Category I candidates.

(*) Responsibility of the Chair to write or solicit the information

(**) Provided by the Candidate

(***) Provided by the Dean of Faculty's Office

I. Information about the candidate

- A. The most current *curriculum vitae* of the candidate, covering education, employment, position status at Colgate (full- or part-time), professional activities, and experience. 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.* (**)
- B. Dates of hire, leaves, study groups, date for tenure consideration, etc. For Category I candidates the date for review of Institutional Need should be noted as well. (***) 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. As student evaluations are included in the dossier it is not necessary to quote from them.

The discussion of scholarship should review the candidate's scholarly activities: past development, current projects, and future plans. This section should specify the planned activities and expected accomplishments of the one-semester junior-faculty leave for which the successful candidate will be eligible.⁵ It should describe the candidate's scholarship and its 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. Discussion of work-in-progress might 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.

II. Teaching

- A. List of all courses taught at Colgate by semester, including the current 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 or whether in courses with labs 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 studies**, 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 university professor who supervised that teaching⁶ 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 is (1) listed

⁵ Successful passage of third-year review will entitle a candidate to a two-course junior-faculty leave. This leave may be taken in a single semester, or it may be taken as a one-course load reduction in each of two semesters. It must be completed before the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed for tenure, and will be taken at a time mutually acceptable to the candidate and their department.

⁶ If possible; and if not, the current UP/program director should provide the letter.

as part of an interdisciplinary program's concentration program (2) seems central to that program and (3) for which SETs for the course are included in the dossier, then letter(s) from the program director who supervised that teaching 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 directors and is ultimately the candidate's choice. (See model letter C.) (*)

- 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 D.) (*)
- D. SETs for all courses in the three semesters preceding the semester of third-year review. SET form responses for a minimum of six courses are normally required; previous semesters immediately preceding candidacy will be included as necessary. The SET responses should include all courses, except 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. Where there is some form of shared or fractional credit teaching, the chair should explain in some detail how SETs were administered and how the SETs apply to the candidate. (*)
 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 out/redacted 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 his/her statement) and/or submit their final report. (**) This will include overall evaluations of the quality of the program and qualitative SET responses for director-taught programs.

III. Scholarship

A. External evaluations of scholarship.

For review of those faculty who have received the Ph.D. or terminal degree within the five years prior to the review, the external evaluators are chosen by the candidate in consultation with the chair. Normal practice is for the candidate's dissertation advisor and others who are already familiar with the candidate's work (such as other members of the dissertation committee or post-doc supervisors) to be asked to write these letters. The candidate should provide a list with at least 4 names.

For review of those faculty who have received the Ph.D. or terminal degree more than five years prior to the review year, the candidate may select external evaluators (normally two), with one or two additional reviewers selected by the department. Department selections in this case are assembled by the Chair in consultation with other tenured members of the department and without input from or consultation with the candidate.

Before February 10, those candidates who have received the Ph.D. or terminal degree more than five years prior to the review year 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 should be documented in writing, and the candidate's statement of concern will be included in the dossier.

The chair begins the process by sending letters of request to 3-4 potential evaluators (see Model Letter A). Additional requests should be sent if needed. A dossier should normally contain 3-4 external letters, but a case may proceed with 2 letters so long as the department has sent at least 4

letters of request. For candidates who received the Ph.D. or terminal degree more than five years earlier at least one reviewer must be a department choice.

The package sent to each external evaluator includes the published and accepted work of the candidate and their *c.v.* Unpublished manuscripts may be sent, at the request of the candidate. Plans or prospectuses for future work, including grant proposals, should not be sent to reviewers. All reviewers should receive the same materials.

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 E.

This part of the case must include:

1. A preliminary sheet listing the name, title, and academic affiliation of each evaluator and noting whether they are the candidate’s or department’s choice. (*)
 2. Letters from each evaluator, signed, dated, and on letterhead. Hard copy is preferred, but PDF is acceptable. (*)
- B. List of materials available in the Dean’s Office for inspection by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This list should include all material sent to external evaluators (starred). The chair should share this list with the candidate, and additional items that the candidate may want to make available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee should be listed separately. The candidate is responsible for taking these items to the Dean’s Office. (*) (**)

IV. 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.⁷ The dossier should include letters evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service from the appropriate program director⁸ and from up to four (but not exceeding the number of tenured professors in the candidate’s home department) other tenured professors. 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 third-year review.

The chair of the home department and the program director should discuss with the candidate possible choices of external evaluators of scholarship. The external evaluators will be chosen by the department and the candidate under the procedures outlined in III.A, except that for candidates more than five years past the Ph.D. or terminal degree one external evaluator will be chosen by the program director in consultation with the other extra-departmental faculty who are evaluating the candidate, and this letter will be in place of one of the two possible letters that would normally count as a department selection.

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.

⁷ This section of the guidelines also applies to candidates who hold appointments in two academic departments. For candidates with appointments in two departments, the chair of the second department will take on the duties that this section assigns to the program director. For candidates holding a joint appointment, there is no need for a teaching letter from the program director in Section II.B.

⁸ When the program director is a member of the candidate’s home department, they may opt not to take charge of assembling the program dossier. In that 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 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 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.

From this process there arise four 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 letter, prepared by the program director, which presents the brief minutes of the meeting of the program faculty. This summary must include:
 - The 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 third-year review (as set out in the *Faculty Handbook*) were reviewed.
 - A statement attesting that the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service were reviewed.
 - Confirmation that the program's discussion of teaching was conducted in light of its peer evaluation policy. The program director's minutes should summarize this part of the review.

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

Items A-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. When appropriate, advice for the candidate may be suggested. (*)

V. 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 third-year review. 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 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 cv and statement, letters from external evaluators, all extra-departmental evaluations of teaching, 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 cv.

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. Absent colleagues must register votes on teaching, scholarship, service, and the case as a whole, which will be announced at the time that the formal votes are taken in the department. After the department has concluded its deliberations and the chair has submitted the completed case to the division director, chairs 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 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 comments on how the peer review policy was applied in this case. (*)
- C. The chair's summary of the department meeting(s). This summary must include:
 - The 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 third-year review (as set out in the Faculty Handbook) were reviewed.
 - A statement attesting that the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service were reviewed.
 - For the teaching review it is expected that the department's discussion is conducted in light of its peer evaluation policy and that the chair's minutes summarize this part of the review.
 - The departmental vote. For purposes of later communication with the candidate, 4 votes should be taken at this meeting. For teaching, scholarship, and service, the minutes should record separately the vote of each tenured faculty member using the following categories:

Satisfactory or better: continued performance at the level established in the TYR dossier seems an appropriate trajectory for a potentially successful tenure review.

Acceptable for TYR but in need of improvement prior to tenure review: the candidate has shown the promise required for passing TYR but is below the trajectory expected for tenure.

Unacceptable: the candidate has failed to fulfill the area's requirement for successfully passing TYR. A vote of "unacceptable" in one or more areas will be considered a "no" vote on the overall case.

The minutes should also record each tenured member's vote (yes or no) on the question of whether the candidate has passed TYR. Anyone voting "no" must indicate on what ground(s) the "no" vote was cast, according to the Faculty Handbook (Chapter III, Section E, Part 6, pp. 49-50). These minutes, with the record of the votes, must be made available for review by those who attended the meeting(s).(*)

- 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 votes on the case. (*)

VI. Institutional need (*)

- A. The chair should provide a statement with the necessary documentation addressing institutional need as discussed in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter III, Section G, Parts 5 and 6). Prior to writing this statement, the division director will review the position with the chair and suggest questions that should be addressed. The chair's statement on institutional need should also include:
 1. the need for the position based upon the specialization it represents within the department's curriculum and potential for contribution to all-university programs;
 2. justification of the position in relation to departmental faculty rank structure, both at present and as projected in the next five years, taking into account anticipated retirements;
 3. explanation of how the candidate has met the pedagogical, curricular and professional expectations established at the time of hire;

4. discussion of the impact of recent enrollment trends on the need for the number of positions in the department. Where appropriate, the chair may include, or the committee may request, information such as the following items:
 - a) enrollments in all courses the candidate has taught at Colgate (including all courses prior to tenure-track appointment), including the current semester;
 - b) recent enrollments in all department courses (six semesters, including the current semester, would be typical). Raw data will be supplied by the registrar on request. Any such list should be presented in “portrait” rather than “landscape” format;
 - c) numbers of graduating concentrators and minors, shown as separate numbers, for each semester since the candidate was hired;
5. a copy of the job announcement that resulted in the candidate's hire, or letter of appointment (with financial information deleted) if it was a targeted opportunity hire.

This statement should be made available for review by all tenured members of the department before the dossier is submitted to the division director.

- B. For candidates formally holding a joint appointment, the program director should provide a statement with the necessary documentation addressing institutional need as discussed in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter III, Section G, Parts 5 and 6). This should include:
 1. the need for the position based upon the specialization it represents within the program's curriculum;
 2. explanation of how the candidate has met the pedagogical, curricular, and professional expectations established at the time of hire. [A copy of the job announcement that resulted in the candidate's hire is included in A.5.]
 3. the need for positions in the program based upon recent enrollment trends, including the following:
 - a. enrollments in all of the program courses the candidate has taught at Colgate (including all courses prior to tenure-track appointment). For cross-listed courses, indicate how many students enrolled under each heading (dept/program), plus total enrollment, including the current semester;
 - b. six semesters of enrollment in all the program's courses and also enrollments in the current semester. This listing should not include courses originating outside the program (e.g. cross-listed courses where the primary listing is departmental). The dossier should contain the raw data supplied by the registrar (listings of all courses taught by the program for each term with final enrollments for each course). This list should be presented in “portrait” rather than “landscape” format;
 - c. numbers of graduating concentrators, showing majors and minors separately, for each semester since the candidate was hired;

This statement should be made available for review by all of the extra-departmental evaluators before the dossier is submitted to the division director.

VII. Appendix

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

PROCEDURES AND REVIEW

All third-year review candidates shall be informed of the results of the Promotion and Tenure Committee discussion of both merit and institutional need. Depending on the nature of the results of the Promotion and Tenure Committee deliberations, the Dean may determine that a re-review of a particular area or an annual update on institutional need may be necessary during the fourth and fifth years for some faculty members.

- A. After assessing a department's response to VI.A. (and, for faculty holding joint appointments, the program's response to VI.B.), the Promotion and Tenure Committee will come to one of three possible conclusions:
 1. position should be continued;
 2. the need for the position is uncertain and should undergo annual review; or
 3. the position is no longer needed and will be discontinued on_____.

- B. The decision to terminate a faculty member in a tenure-stream position will be made on the basis of one or more of the following considerations: (See Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, Section G, Parts 5-6.)
 1. inadequate teaching with insufficient evidence of potential for improvement.
 2. non-completion of the Ph.D. or terminal degree or insufficient evidence of significant scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D. or terminal degree (Successful candidates must have completed the Ph.D. or terminal degree by January 1 of the third year as documented by a letter from the Ph.D. granting institution.)
 3. failure to satisfy or to show promise of satisfying reasonable expectations for service as expressed in Chapter III, Section F, Part 3 of the Faculty Handbook concerning service to the university community.
 4. evidence that the candidate has not met the pedagogical or curricular or professional expectations established at the time of hire.
 5. institutional needs and priorities that would mandate a termination or redefinition of the position.

MODEL LETTER A—Non-Category I Faculty

Email letter sent, from the chair to potential external evaluators

Preferred Subject Line: Request for Third-year Review 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 undergo a third-year review. This review, which is made by the individual's department and submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, is based on the quality of the individual's teaching, scholarly promise in addition to the Ph.D. dissertation, and service to Colgate. On the basis of this review, successful candidates continue toward tenure, a decision made in their sixth year.

To help us make an informed decision, we are asking for your considered judgment of _____'s scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D. or terminal degree. If you agree to participate in the review, we 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,

Department Chair
[Program Director]

Attachments

Candidate's *curriculum vitae*

Candidate's statement of scholarly/creative plans

cc: [department administrative assistant]
[program administrative assistant]

MODEL LETTER A—Category I Faculty

Email letter sent from the chair to potential external evaluators

Preferred Subject Line: Request for Comprehensive Review 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 undergo a comprehensive review. This review, which is made by the individual's department and submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, is based on the quality of the individual's teaching, scholarly promise in addition to the Ph.D. dissertation, and service to Colgate.

To help us make an informed decision, we are asking for your considered judgment of _____'s scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D. or terminal degree. If you agree to participate in the review, we 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,

Department Chair
[Program Director]

Attachments:

Candidate's *curriculum vitae*

Candidate's statement of scholarly/creative plans

cc: [department administrative assistant]
[program administrative assistant]

MODEL LETTER B—Non-Category I Faculty

Letter to be used in solicitation of external scholars to evaluate scholarship – do not depart from the wording of this of any other sample letter unless permitted by the division director.

Dear _____,

Thank you for agreeing to provide your considered judgment of the scholarship/creative work of _____, who stands for third-year review in the Department of _____ [and program name] at Colgate University in Spring 2019. A copy of Professor _____'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed together with copies of the publications and materials we are asking you to evaluate.

We request that you give us your evaluation of _____'s scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D. or terminal degree based on an evaluation of the items listed in the *curriculum vitae*.

We want to learn what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's current and proposed scholarship, your opinion of its quality, originality and significance. We also wish to receive your estimate of the candidate's potential for continued scholarly work.

In your response, please indicate whether you know the candidate personally, and if so, in what capacity. Please record your assessment on letterhead and include your signature on a hard copy posted to me (preferred) or a PDF image of the signed letter on letterhead. It would be most helpful if you could forward your evaluation to me by January 2, 2019.

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.

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

Sincerely,

Signed by Department Chair
[Program Director]

enclosures: candidate's *curriculum vitae*
[list of materials sent to external evaluators]

cc: [department administrative assistant]
[program administrative assistant]

MODEL LETTER B—Category I Faculty

Letter to be used in solicitation of external scholars to evaluate scholarship – do not depart from the wording of this of any other sample letter unless permitted by the division director.

Dear _____,

Thank you for agreeing to provide your considered judgment of the scholarship/creative work of _____, who stands for comprehensive review in the Department of _____ [and program name] at Colgate University in Spring 2019. A copy of Professor _____'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed together with copies of the publications and materials we are asking you to evaluate.

We request that you give us your evaluation of _____'s scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D. or terminal degree based on an evaluation of the items listed in the *curriculum vitae*.

We want to learn what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's current and proposed scholarship, your opinion of its quality, originality and significance. We also wish to receive your estimate of the candidate's potential for continued scholarly work.

In your response, please indicate whether you know the candidate personally, and if so, in what capacity. Please record your assessment on letterhead and include your signature on a hard copy posted to me (preferred) or a PDF image of the signed letter on letterhead. It would be most helpful if you could forward your evaluation to me by January 2, 2019.

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 with the candidate as constructive feedback.

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

Sincerely,

Signed by Department Chair [Program
Director]

enclosures: candidate's *curriculum vitae*
[list of materials sent to outside evaluators]

cc: [department administrative assistant]
[program administrative assistant]

MODEL LETTER C

Letter of solicitation to Core component chair and other interdisciplinary program directors to evaluate teaching

Dear _____:

_____ will undergo third-year review in the Spring semester.

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 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 D

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

Dear _____:

_____ will undergo third-year review in the Spring semester.

Under the guidelines outlined in the Faculty Handbook regarding the evaluation of teaching, the Promotion and Tenure Committee seeks the input from tenured members of team-taught courses. We would greatly appreciate 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 E

Email or Letter of thanks to external evaluators

Dear_____:

We have received your review of the scholarly materials for_____as part of the third-year review. Your contribution will be very important in the deliberations on the case. Unless you direct us otherwise, we may share anonymous excerpts from your comments with the candidate as constructive feedback. We greatly appreciate your time and effort on behalf of Colgate University and the department as we undertake the process of faculty review.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Department Chair
[Program Director]