

Committee for the Review of Undergraduate Tenure and Promotion, 2011-2012

Report and Recommendations, June 2012

Larry Boetsch, Professor of Spanish and Director of International Education
Scott Boylan, Haight Term Professor of Accounting
Marcia France, John T. Herwick, M.D. Professor of Chemistry
Lesley Wheeler, Henry S. Fox Professor of English (chair)

Introduction

Provost Bob Strong convened this working group in September 2011 with the following charge:

This committee will look carefully at undergraduate tenure and promotion at Washington and Lee. The committee will proceed in the following fashion:

- *Listen.* Your initial task is to listen to colleagues across campus, in all ranks, in many disciplines and in both undergraduate schools. Determine if there are common themes, conclusions or perceptions about our tenure and promotion process. In your discussions, you will, of course, respect the confidentiality that necessarily surrounds individual cases.
- *Compare.* Examine what other colleges and universities are doing in connection with tenure and promotion, without assuming that they are better than we are in these matters. Look for best practices, useful ideas, and/or errors we might wish to avoid.
- *Report.* Prepare a report to the Provost during the 2011-12 academic year that will be distributed to the full undergraduate faculty. Your report should summarize what you have learned from listening to colleagues and examining other institutions.
- *Recommend.* After the undergraduate faculty has received your report, you may prepare recommendations, if you deem them advisable, for consideration by the undergraduate faculty or by appropriate administrative officers. Any substantive recommendations for changes to tenure and promotion guidelines, standards or procedures will not be entertained unless they are accompanied by provisions that provide for their gradual introduction. No changes will be introduced that would add burdens or new sources of uncertainty to candidates for tenure and promotion in the near term. Adequate notice will be necessary before any changes can be implemented. Submit recommendations for consideration, should there be any, at the end of the 2011-12 academic year or early in the fall term, 2012.

We held a series of meetings between September and February with a range of constituencies: current and former members of the Advisory Committee; the Provost and undergraduate Deans; pre-tenure faculty members; associate professors; members of the Faculty Review Committee; Department Heads; and a few faculty members who requested individual meetings. We also conducted two general meetings, received correspondence, and listened to a December Faculty Academy Q&A run by the Provost on tenure and promotion. Finally, we analyzed the practices of peer schools using materials compiled by the Provost's Office.

Our conversations revealed that many faculty members do not trust the fairness of our tenure and promotion system. The chief problems seem to be **unclear standards** interwoven with **inconsistent procedures**: many view the Faculty Handbook as confusing and insufficient; other documents and protocols, sometimes referred to in composite as “the shadow handbook,” have an ambiguous status and are not readily available; and there were many anecdotes of violations in the procedures as written. These problems are aggravated by **uneven access to information**. Administrators and other current and recent members of the Advisory Committee are not completely sanguine about our tenure and promotion processes, but they have significantly more faith in the system’s justice than others, to whom the operations of the Advisory Committee can seem disturbingly opaque. This culture of mistrust can be mitigated for individuals by good mentoring, but in the absence of a strong department leadership or other knowledgeable advice, it is toxic to faculty morale.

What follows is a more detailed summary of our findings. The first two sections of the report, **Standards** and **Procedures**, reflect our extensive discussions with professors and administrators, highlighting areas of widest and most urgent concern. While we occasionally quote recurring phrases, all these points are composite, synthesizing multiple arguments. The third section, **Appendix of Practices at Peer Schools**, puts our discoveries into a larger context.

Our **chief recommendation** is:

- **the prompt establishment of a committee to revise the portions of the Handbook describing Faculty Careers.** The standards for tenure and promotion are determined by the faculty, so this group should be representative of many constituencies and contain **elected members**. Its recommendations should be subject to faculty vote.

We must agree as a group about what qualities tenured associate and full professors at Washington and Lee University should possess—**what the goals of tenure and promotion should be**—before we can refine our procedures. Because we received many procedural recommendations worth considering, however, we include those at the end of Section II.

In the meantime, we suggest a **vigorous administrative effort to improve communication about tenure and promotion** at Washington and Lee. This might include but is not limited to:

- Annual Q&A discussions during Faculty Academy such as the December 2011 meeting
- Regular informational meetings for probationary candidates
- Periodic discussion during Undergraduate Faculty Meetings of how the Advisory Committee and other key groups operate
- FAQs on the Provost’s page
- Regularizing communication between the Advisory Committee and Department Heads
- Establishment of mentoring circles, in which cohorts of assistant and associate professors at similar career stages meet with knowledgeable professors, ideally former Advisory Committee members; these groups could support professional development in teaching, scholarship, creative endeavor, and academic citizenship in ways not limited to file production

Consistency in message is crucial, as is making effective use of faculty time, a limited and precious resource. However, multiple support mechanisms mean that occasional mentoring lapses are less likely to damage careers. They also reduce pressure on Department Heads, for whom the roles of evaluator and mentor sometimes seem in conflict.

According to the current Faculty Handbook, “The evaluation process should be administered in ways that enhance the spirit of trust, community, and common purpose that enrich this University” (page 13). That is, good evaluation procedures promote development as well as ensuring equity in reappointments and the allocation of resources. Ideally, tenure and promotion processes are the logical culmination of good hiring, careful mentoring, and well-directed effort by talented candidates; they provide opportunities to celebrate and reward accomplishment.

Even under the best circumstances, however, these procedures are inherently stressful. The stakes are high, especially for tenure and promotion candidates but to some extent for everyone involved. Most professors will work with multiple Department Heads and Deans throughout their probationary periods; the membership of the Advisory Committee is in constant flux; changes in the profession and many other factors introduce ambiguity into the evaluation process; the need for confidentiality about particular cases compromises transparency. Widespread perceptions of unfairness, whether grounded or not, jeopardize our ability to work together effectively. To be an excellent teacher-scholar-artist-citizen is a challenge at any career stage; in order to focus on the core missions of this institution, we must be confident that evaluation practices and our common conditions of employment are reasonable and consistently administered. The doubts expressed below represent a harmful distraction from these core missions.

I. Standards

Below we identify deficiencies in Washington and Lee’s standards for tenure and promotion, and, where appropriate, convey our impressions of their underlying causes. Faculty members asked questions about measuring teaching effectiveness and expressed uncertainty about the appropriate level of academic citizenship at various career stages. However, the vast majority of the faculty’s concerns regarding standards pertain to scholarship. There is a pervasive sense that criteria for “intellectual activity and achievement” are more stringent than in the past, although this section of the Handbook has not been updated.

General Concerns

A commonly held belief among faculty members, and one that permeates the rest of the discussion on tenure and promotion, is that our tenure and promotion standards, as expressed in the Faculty Handbook (page 7), are insufficiently clear, leading to inconsistencies in how tenure and promotion cases are presented and evaluated.

Faculty Handbook Language

One source of concern is that the handbook language itself is outdated and in need of a “clean-sheet” revision. Many faculty members suggest we develop and articulate a generally agreed-upon narrative of **what qualities and characteristics we expect tenured faculty to possess**. We cannot satisfactorily address other questions surrounding tenure and promotion until we address this issue.

Despite the need to better articulate tenure and promotion standards, there was **little appetite amongst faculty members for quantitative standards in any category**. A certain amount of “strategic vagueness” allows us to make good judgments despite disciplinary differences and

varied professional trajectories, especially where scholarship is concerned. At the same time, we need to have a sense of how to pace and focus our research and creative endeavors, and how the merit of our work will be determined.

Informal Standards and Procedures

A second source of concern is that a set of informal tenure and promotion standards and procedures (the “**shadow handbook**”) have evolved over the course of time. These include, for example, templates for soliciting letters from external evaluators and instructions for peer teaching observations. Faculty express uncertainty about where to find those standards and protocols; the degree to which the standards are recommendations versus requirements; and if such documents are recommendations, how decisions about whether or not to follow them are interpreted by those with decision-making authority.

In addition, some faculty members argue that any set of tenure standards and procedures should be approved by the faculty as a whole – and included in the faculty handbook. Accordingly, any informal standards and procedures not approved by the faculty should not be binding, particularly if they are inconsistent with language in the faculty handbook.

Portfolio Considerations

The Faculty Handbook clearly indicates that “teaching effectiveness” is the primary criterion upon which faculty members are evaluated, and that “intellectual activity and achievement” and “academic citizenship” are important also. However, faculty members are unclear about the degree to which one must demonstrate achievement in each area (“it is not possible to be equally strong in all of the relevant considerations,” page 7). A common question was, “is it ever okay to have a zero in one of the baskets?”

Role of Advisory Committee

There is significant apprehension among faculty members about the role the Advisory Committee plays in tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty members are often unaware of how the Advisory Committee evaluates cases. It is unclear whether there is a set of principles or conceptual framework, beyond the materials available in the Faculty Handbook, guiding deliberations and decisions. It also is unclear the degree to which Advisory Committee members use personal opinions as a basis for discussion and decision-making. For instance, is it appropriate for an Advisory Committee member to use a “nationally recognized scholar” model to evaluate a tenure file if he/she believes that that is what the standard should be at W&L? Has this ever happened? Could it happen in the future?

Specific questions and concerns that have arisen repeatedly include the following: Under what conditions would the Advisory Committee overturn a positive decision rendered at the department-level? How aggressive is the committee willing to be in making such decisions?

The general consensus is that there ought to be more open communication between the Advisory Committee and the faculty at large. In addition, there is a sense that if we are careful in re-writing our tenure standards, those standards can be the conceptual framework upon which the Advisory Committee should evaluate tenure files.

Specific Areas of Concern

In addition to these general issues, faculty raised several specific issues regarding tenure and promotion standards. Virtually all relate to how we measure achievement. Moreover, these concerns generally can be linked back to the need to revise the Handbook and the existence of informal standards, as noted above. The most frequently raised and most noteworthy involve:

Outside Letters

The Faculty Handbook makes it clear that outside letters are optional for tenure cases. However, many faculty report receiving mixed signals about this issue. Moreover, faculty members are concerned that failure to include “optional” letters may negatively affect one’s tenure case.

In addition, there was considerable variation in faculty perceptions about what the letters ought to accomplish and why they are useful. For tenure files containing unpublished work, and in cases in which a tenure committee is unable to evaluate the rigor of the peer review process, outside letters seem desirable. In contrast, when tenure cases rest principally on published peer-reviewed work, and committee members are qualified to evaluate its merit and the publication outlets, outside letters in their current form seem redundant.

In addition, there was considerable uncertainty about the role of those letters in tenure deliberations. Some Advisory Committee and tenure committee members indicated that they used letters to evaluate whether a candidate’s research, when viewed as a whole, made a substantive impact on a particular field (i.e., testing whether the candidate constituted “a nationally recognized scholar”). Others insisted that such a model is inconsistent with the research standard at Washington and Lee, and that the letters serve as an additional piece of evidence about individual projects.

The general consensus on outside letters is that there should be a faculty-wide discussion about them. And, regardless of whether we decide to require them or keep them as an option, we must agree on their objectives, how we will use the information they provide, and how they will be solicited. Finally, whatever we decide ought to be consistent with any revised narrative that we produce regarding tenure standards.

Scholarship Completed Prior to Appointment at W&L

There is variation in both beliefs and practice regarding whether research or other forms of scholarship completed prior to one’s appointment to the W&L faculty should be included in one’s tenure file. Some argued none of this work should be included in one’s file. Others differentiated between work generated in graduate school versus at other faculty positions. Finally, some held the opinion that prior work should not be discounted or ignored simply because it was generated elsewhere, particularly when there is a shortened tenure clock.

There does not appear to be a consensus as to how to treat prior work except that we need a clear, consistent policy.

Kinds of Research

Faculty members are uncertain about how pedagogical research/publication is valued. There appears to be variation across departments regarding this issue; although the Advisory Committee members we spoke to asserted that it counts as scholarship, its relative weight remains unclear to most.

We also heard questions about the relative weight of artistic production and traditional scholarship. Peer review in the arts presents complicated problems: for example, it is difficult to arrange peer review for ephemeral small-town productions. Probationary candidates hear mixed messages about what kind of work they must produce and how its merit will be judged. Similar questions pertain to the status of literary translation.

Teaching Effectiveness

“Effectiveness,” many think, is not an inspiring criterion for a teaching-focused institution. Many people asserted that while “potential” in scholarship is a reasonable criterion at tenure, there should be demonstrated excellence in teaching at the same juncture. Measuring/documenting this remains a problem. Here, as elsewhere, it is difficult to discuss standards without referring to process: how can effective teaching be measured? While a wide array of documents seems desirable—candidate statements, course evaluations, peer observations, letters from former students—we heard no consensus on contentious issues such as the value of quantitative course evaluations.

Academic Citizenship

Numerous tenured associate professors expressed concern that the service standard for promotion to full professor is unclear (note that “academic citizenship” is the Handbook term, but in other contexts the word “service” appears more frequently). In particular, there is uncertainty about how important it is to hold positions on *elected* committees at W&L, and whether one must chair a committee as a pre-condition for promotion—or, conversely, whether administrative work could be a liability if it distracts from teaching and research productivity. Faculty members appear to be receiving mixed information about these issues, depending on their department.

Some raised the concern that service may count towards tenure and promotion less than formerly. If so, this needs to be explicit. The in-between role of academic advising—it has aspects of teaching and aspects of service—also remains unclear.

II. Procedures

Our discussions with faculty at all levels revealed consistent concerns about how our procedures for tenure and promotion are communicated, facilitated, and implemented. Associate professors, however, asserted that the procedures for promotion to full professor seemed reasonably clear, although the criteria are not.

General Concerns

Most of the following indicate problems in communications rather than in procedures.

Varying Sources and Messages

Many voices provide information about process and the information is not always consistent; faculty struggle to determine the relative authority of those messages. Much of the difficulty emanates not from the actual description of procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook but in the implementation of those procedures during the probationary period. During that time, candidates hear from Department Heads, Deans, assigned mentors, peers in various departments, and other members of the faculty, but often hear conflicting messages about what the expectations for tenure are and who has responsibility for marking the candidate's progress. Most of the complaints involved differing instructions received from Department Heads and Deans, and the discrepancies are exacerbated when the people serving in these roles change during the probationary period; candidates do not know how to resolve conflicting messages from those powerful parties.

Associate professors can feel completely out of the loop. Communication with Department Heads can be sporadic; sometimes the only serious conversation is the annual salary review, which may be used to discuss progress toward promotion but has no official role in that progress. Annual salary review procedures, moreover, differ substantially between the College and the Williams School and among individual departments.

Differences between the Williams School and the College

Lines of communication between candidates and administrators differ in the College and the Williams School, in part due to the size of these entities and in part due to divergent school cultures and traditions. College faculty rely heavily on communication from Department Heads while Williams School faculty have more direct dealings with the Dean as well as with the Department Head. This creates asymmetries in procedures and perceptions.

Differences among Disciplines/ Departments

Faculty believe that there is no institutional standard for "scholarly achievement" so that definitions can and do vary widely from one discipline to the next and from one department to the next. Are the expectations in this area the same for social scientists, humanists, physical scientists and mathematicians or do they vary according to undefined standards for each? The procedural implication: some departments articulate local expectations ("at least three articles for tenure," for example). Some do not.

There is a general perception that **large departments have certain advantages over smaller departments** in terms of being able to form a tenure committee and provide experienced, ongoing guidance to candidates. The tenure committee in a large department is, for the most

part, already constituted as the candidate undergoes the probationary period. In small departments, the full committee composition is not known until the actual tenure/promotion evaluation year. In addition, some smaller departments may not have any professors who have been through the process in recent years to provide advice to the candidate.

The Role of the Advisory Committee

As described above, the operations of the Advisory Committee seem remote and mysterious to faculty. There is no evident bridge between the Advisory Committee and the Department Heads, who typically oversee file production.

As a consequence, many faculty express uncertainties about the Advisory Committee's role in tenure and promotion processes. What instructions do its members receive? Does the Advisory Committee consider differences among departments and/or disciplines? What sort of communication exists between Department Heads and the Advisory Committee to ensure that there is a common understanding of expectations for tenure? Is the representation on the Advisory Committee sufficiently broad at all times to accommodate these differences? Does the Advisory Committee simply assume that proper procedure has occurred—does it ratify decisions or probe process?

An additional concern relates to the appeal procedures for a negative decision and the fact that Advisory Committee decisions on materials, some of which cannot be seen by the candidate, may only be appealed on the grounds of procedural misconduct. Yet since the Advisory Committee deliberations are so isolated, it may be difficult for a candidate to determine if a procedural violation contributes to a negative decision.

The Role of the Deans

Other inconsistencies have to do with the role of the Deans in the overall process. The Handbook defines the role of the Dean as the person who appoints the candidates' tenure committee and takes the file to the Advisory Committee. Confusion exists over additional activities of the Deans. What is the authority of the various templates, checklists, and suggestions regarding a candidate's file and its construction that are issued by the Dean through the Department Heads (the so-called "shadow handbook")?

On the Advisory Committee, Deans present the files but also vote on the files. No one identified this as a major crisis but many saw it as a potential conflict of interest. Some note that the two undergraduate Deans also present the files differently.

Specific questions

Who assembles the file?

While Department Heads and candidates prepare the file "in cooperation," distinct assignments for collecting various parts of the file are not always clear (page 14 of the Handbook). Nor is it obvious what a candidate should do if procedural irregularities occur, such as in assembling letters from former students or arranging peer teaching observations; when to address any irregularities; or what the consequences of irregularities will/ should be.

Who assembles the committee and when?

Uncertainty about the composition of the tenure committee presents a significant burden to candidates in small departments. When the committee isn't established until the fall of the tenure year, opportunities for advice and improvement are short-circuited; while a candidate in a high-functioning large department receives ongoing mentoring (a process of evaluation-advice-improvement-reevaluation), a candidate in a small department may only receive a brief evaluation, with no opportunity to remedy problems. A reasonable schedule of peer teaching observations becomes difficult or impossible to arrange.

The size of the tenure committee has also, in practice, been smaller than the Handbook mandates (at least five, according to page 15).

Faculty Review Committee and Procedures

Despite general agreement that the FRC should continue to consider appeals based solely on procedural issues, some questions regarding the operation of the committee were raised. For example, it is not clear if cases submitted to the FRC for review are considered open or closed. Does the FRC have the authority to reopen a case or does it simply issue a recommendation? What is the President's role within FRC procedures?

Specific Suggestions, with Merits and Drawbacks

Procedures depend on goals; conversations about standards should, in most cases, precede revisions to process. However, several recurring suggestions from this year's conversations seem worth bearing in mind.

- **Process advocates:** While the Deans check each file for completeness—that the necessary documents are present in the regular order—no party seems to be in charge of checking that procedures have been followed properly before the files reach the Advisory Committee. Should someone external to each case be checking process, and if so, who, and when? **Pros:** Consistency, fairness. **Cons:** This activity would be expensive in expert time and effort and might introduce a new layer of legal liability.
- **Department-specific standards, in writing:** Several suggested that individual departments should put their own interpretations of the Handbook in writing: “What the Handbook Scholarship Standards Mean for English,” etc. **Pros:** Clarity for candidate; opportunity for conversation among department members and Advisory. **Cons:** Less flexibility; another task for Department Heads, some of the most burdened members of the university community.
- **Identify tenure committees by the end of, or possibly before, the second pre-tenure review.** **Pros:** Clarity for the candidate; better mentoring opportunities. **Cons:** These arrangements may not be stable, especially when committee members are external to Washington and Lee or when committee members go on sabbatical or leave the university.
- **Condense the two pre-tenure reviews into one and consider AC involvement at that stage.** Currently Heads provide feedback to tenure candidates as often as two or three times per year: at the end of each school year; at salary time; at the first and second pre-

tenure reviews. This is clearly expensive in labor. Is it crucial to good mentoring, or might it dilute the significance of each interaction? **Pros:** Candidates and Heads receive feedback while there is still time to make necessary improvements (currently there are only 18 months between the second pre-tenure review and the tenure review); less expensive in Department Head and candidate effort. **Cons:** Fewer intervention opportunities; if the Advisory Committee provides feedback, this is more expensive in terms of their effort.

- **Allow greater communication between the AC and committees.** The Handbook currently directs the Advisory Committee to return to the department if procedures are not correct; some suggest that returning to departments with more substantive questions could also be productive (pages 15-16).
- **Reexamine the constitution of the Advisory Committee.** It seems problematic to many that in any given year, major constituencies have no representation—that the committee contains no artists, no natural scientists, no professors from the Williams School, etc. Others suggested that there is **too much incumbency**—gaps between terms ought to be greater so that the knowledge acquired by AC members can percolate through more departments.
- **Use Sharepoint to distribute electronic files.** Some people expressed horror at the amount of paper involved.

APPENDIX: SUMMARY OF PRACTICES AT PEER INSTITUTIONS

Listed below is the information the committee members searched for in each institution's faculty handbook. Sometimes a whole category was missing; many schools say little about the criteria for promotion to full professor, for example.

1. Each institutional summary below begins with a note on the name and composition (when available) of the **T&P committee**.
2. **Hiring:** Term of initial appointment and length of tenure process; how the decision is made to hire someone with tenure, if addressed.
3. **Reappointment:** What is in the file; what the standards are; who makes recommendations and in what order; who communicates with the candidate about requirements and processes.
4. **Tenure procedures:** Composition of committee; what is in the file; how evaluation of the file works; whether external reviews are required and if so, how many.
5. **Tenure criteria:** How standards are articulated.
6. **Promotion procedures:** What is in the file; how evaluation of the file works; external reviews.
7. **Promotion criteria:** How standards are articulated.
8. **Grievance procedures** and grounds.

A brief summary of observations in each of the categories follows:

Hiring: This is generally done by the department. In a few cases, members of T&P committee (or another committee), the Dean, or the President is involved in hiring. Means of establishing credit for service at another institution vary as do procedures for hiring faculty with tenure.

Reappointment: There is a variety of different models for reappointment. The majority of schools (19) have one pre-tenure reappointment, most often in the third year. Five institutions have two pre-tenure reappointments, generally in years two and four. Regardless of the number and timing of formal reappointments, most institutions have some type of regular review process, often annual. Reappointments are generally handled by the department and Dean, but at least nine institutions also involve the T&P committee in some way. Most schools require the candidate to submit a file similar to the tenure file, and a few include external letters at this point.

Tenure procedures: Many of the faculty handbooks do not discuss the composition of the tenure committee. When they do, the tenure committees generally consist of all tenured members of the department. In cases where the department does not have the minimum number of people or when the appointment is interdisciplinary, the committee is generally determined at the time of appointment, during first year, or by the time of the formal reappointment. Several handbooks discuss procedures for adding additional people to the tenure committee if there are fewer than two or three eligible faculty. This is often done by the Dean in consultation with other parties. The contents of the files (evidence of good teaching, documentation of scholarship and service) are similar. At least 17 of the 26 peer institutions studied require outside letters for tenure, with two additional schools indicating such letters are optional. The remaining seven do not discuss outside letters in their faculty

handbook, so it is not clear what their practice is. The procedure for soliciting letters varies, involving different combinations of the candidate, department head, department, dean, or T&P committee. The general tenure process is similar at most institutions: the candidate creates a file, the department adds confidential materials and makes a recommendation that goes to the Dean and the tenure committee; they make a recommendation that goes to the President; the President delivers a recommendation to the trustees; the trustees make the decision. At least nine institutions clearly state that the T&P committee can go back to the candidate and/or department for additional information or clarification if necessary after the file has been reviewed.

Tenure criteria: The general tenure criteria are often vague. While standards are articulated in various ways, expectations seem similar. Usually teaching and scholarship are weighted about equally. Service is often a lower priority. Some faculty handbooks state that individual departments have their own (presumably more explicit) criteria. Advising, when mentioned, is sometimes counted as teaching and sometimes as service. A few schools consider departmental and/or institutional needs in addition to the merits of the individual candidate.

Promotion procedures: Less information is available than for tenure, though procedures seem similar. Promotion committees, when they are described in the handbooks, consist of all full professors. Many universities have formalized intermediate reviews, evaluations, or meetings for associate professors in order to help them stay on track for promotion. The tendency to require outside letters appears to be the same as for tenure.

Promotion criteria: Less information is available than for tenure. When covered, criteria are comparable to that for tenure, with an emphasis on continued development in each of the three areas since tenure.

Grievance procedures: Every institution that discusses grievance procedures in its faculty handbook states that appeal can only be made on procedural, discrimination, or academic freedom issues, not substantive issues.

A table summarizing some of the responses is included at the end of this section.

The provost asked us to look for **best practices, useful ideas, and/or errors** we might wish to avoid. The chief **error** seems to us to be an unclear handbook: Washington and Lee is not the only highly-ranked liberal arts college with this problem. **Best practices and useful ideas** intersect neatly with the recommendations at the end of Section II: Procedures:

- The T&P committee can go back to the candidate and/or department for additional information or clarification if necessary after the file has been reviewed.
- In cases where the department does not have the minimum number of people or when the appointment is interdisciplinary, the committee is generally determined at the time of appointment, during the first year, or by the time of the formal reappointment.
- Some faculty handbooks state that individual departments have their own criteria for tenure and promotion.
- Most institutions have some form of intermediate review for associate professors.

AMHERST

T&P Committee

- Committee of Six (COS).
- Ex officio Dean and President.

Hiring

- Initial tenure-track appointments usually 3 years; tenure process normally 7 years.
- If the candidate has held a similar position elsewhere, the total duration of both is normally not more than 8 years; computations made explicit in writing at the time of appointment.
- In order to be hired with tenure, an ad hoc committee appointed by President reviews materials; COS and the Dean also make recommendations.

Reappointment

- Department head (DH) “will make clear” considerations governing reappointment; conducts annual conversations on teaching and research based on evidence including course evaluations, peer observation, other materials submitted by candidate.
- File includes evidence of “teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative growth, and other contributions to the life of the College” including course evaluations; confidential letters from students; peer testimony; published work, publicly presented work, and work in progress.
- Candidates also submit letter describing experiences and plans to their department as the basis of reappointment conversations; this does not enter the dossier.
- Department sends recommendation to the Dean; Dean presents file to COS; Dean conveys their questions and comments to the DH.
- The President makes a recommendation to the Board; after formal reappointment, the dean meets with each candidate to discuss the COS’s reading of the case.
- After reappointment, DH also discusses with candidate considerations that may enter into tenure decision.

Tenure procedures

- If fewer than 2 tenured faculty in Department, Dean and COS appoint an ad hoc committee.
- Dossier contains elements of reappointment file plus no fewer than 6 letters from external reviewers, “leading scholars and practitioners,” chosen equally from lists supplied by candidate and the department. File should also include department solicitation letter plus a description of the process.
- Recommendation originates in department, proceeds to COS.
- COS may request further clarification from department; if its straw vote differs from the department’s recommendation, it meets with the tenure committee.
- The Dean of Faculty is Secretary to the COS, maintains record of sum and substance, and may communicate this to the candidate once the process is complete.
- President sits with COS during review. If both Department and Committee’s decisions are negative, President’s must be. If they both make positive recommendations, he must convey these to the Board along with his own.

Tenure criteria

- “The College values faculty whose commitment to the life of the mind is demonstrated through teaching, scholarship and the creation of works of art, and a concern for the general life of the College.”

- “Effective teaching” is prime factor.
- “Great weight to continued scholarly growth”: research and publication are important indications of such growth; teaching and service can’t compensate for its absence.

Promotion procedures

- May originate with department or candidate, usually 6-8 years after tenure.
- Committee consists of all full professors in department and may include 2 others in consultation with the Dean; the Dean selects the committee chair.
- Committee chair produces letter discussing achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service.
- COS reviews all candidates, makes recommendation to President.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- Candidate may ask for review of negative decision based on procedural flaws or violation of academic freedom.

BATES

T&P Committee

- Committee on Personnel.
- 7 elected faculty members, plus ex officio President and Dean.
- Subset of 4 “examiners” reads files; 1 is delegated to check file for completeness, notify department if there are gaps or ask for removal of “improper” documents.

Hiring

- Initial appointments are 4 years; credit for previous experience may be negotiated.
- Tenure at hiring can only be granted upon recommendation of Committee on Personnel.

Reappointment

- During 2nd year of 1st appointment;
- Faculty from interdisciplinary programs may participate in committee
- “Standard is performance and promise.” “Tangible evidence of effectiveness in teaching and of professional commitment is a condition of service beyond the fourth year.”
- Evidence includes student ratings and letters, peer evaluations of teaching, and possible outside letters.
- Report addresses strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and service; Dean is notified that this process has occurred

Tenure procedures

- Committee: chair and senior colleagues; if fewer than 3, senior members of other departments are chosen by “chair of division in consultation with the candidate and department chair.”
- If candidate appointed only in interdisciplinary department, the committee is chosen at time of appointment.
- Evidence includes letters from at least 20 current or former students (may involve 60 requests); candidate’s teaching and research statements; course evaluations; peer observation letters; annual reports of professional activities; grant proposals; publications; list of service; other materials submitted by candidate.

- 4 outside letters required (candidate chooses one and suggests 3 others; chair suggests 3 others; committee chooses).

Tenure criteria

- Teaching should be “excellent”: knowledge, enthusiasm; organization; ability to present abstract ideas clearly; encouragement of critical thinking; reliability; accessibility; fairness. Advising counts here.
- “Significant professional achievement”: varies according to field, “may take the form of research, writing, publication, or creative work and exhibition.” Committee looks for recognition of candidate’s work; significance, quality, and originality; breadth and depth; will and capacity to continue work.
- Outstanding achievement in teaching or research “may offset lower level of achievement in other category.”
- “Professional Service to the Public” is separated out from “Service to the College.”

Promotion procedures

- Evidence includes letters from at least 20 current or former students (may involve 60 requests); candidate’s teaching and research statements; course evaluations; peer observation letters; annual reports of professional activities; grant proposals; publications; list of service; other materials submitted by candidate.

Promotion criteria

- “Continuing excellence in teaching and continuing significant professional achievement are the two chief criteria...service also expected.”

Grievance Procedures

- Only grounds are violation of process.
- Initiated by candidate letter to Dean; judged by Trustee Review Committee.

BOWDOIN

T&P Committee

- Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CAPT).

Hiring

- Initial appointment 4 years.

Reappointment

- Fall semester of 1st year: candidate, dean, and chair meet together to confirm understanding of procedures.
- At end of 1st year, candidate, chair, and at least 1 other tenured department member meet to discuss progress and goals; letter describing conversation enters file; “encouraged” to have these meetings every year until tenure.
- At least 2 tenured faculty and ideally 3 on committee; if fewer than 2, Dean and T&P chair choose additional members.
- All 3 areas are significant, but teaching and research are “paramount”; “strength as teachers and promise as scholars or artists.”
- File includes candidate’s statement, CV, syllabi, evidence of scholarly engagement; numeric summaries of evaluations; possibly other evaluations and additional material.
- DH solicits student letters.
- Committee evaluates file, checks process with dean’s office, then releases letter to candidate.

Tenure Procedures

- At least 2 and ideally 3 tenured members on committee; if fewer than 2, Dean and T&P chair choose additional members.
- File: candidate submits statement, CV, syllabi, evidence of scholarly engagement; numeric summaries of evaluations; possibly other evaluations and additional material.
- CAPT solicits letters from students.
- Dean solicits 6 external reviewers suggested by candidate and department.
- Dean and CAPT review file, may ask for information or meeting with department.
- Dean, CAPT, and President meet; CAPT makes recommendation that goes to Dean, then President, then Board.

Tenure criteria

- Excellent teaching.
- Scholarly achievement recognized beyond College.
- Contributions to community, including advising.

Promotion procedures

- Normally at least 6 years in rank before bid, but can come early.
- If department doesn't have at least 2 full professors, Dean appoints committee.
- Similar process as for 1st promotion.

Promotion criteria

- Continuing excellence in teaching and scholarship.

Grievance procedures

- Grounds are alleged discrimination, violation of academic freedom, or "inadequate consideration." Procedure, not standards.
- Appeals committee consists of 6 elected faculty members.

CARLETON

T&P Committee

- Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC).
- 5 elected faculty members plus ex officio dean and president, although the latter 2 vote in the final recommendation.

Hiring

- Usual initial appointment 3 years.
- Maximum pre-tenure period is 7 years.

Reappointment

- Conducted by dean and department during 3rd year.
- When fewer than 3 tenured members in department, special committee is formed, usually when the hire occurs; its chair conducts annual reviews.
- Evidence: repeated classroom observations; student evaluations; career prospectus; other materials agreed to by candidate; research and creative work, published and unpublished; letters solicited from students by dean.
- Department makes recommendation to dean, president, 2 members of FRC; dean and president make decision.

Tenure Procedures

- Committee and file same as those in 3rd year review, with several additions to file.
- 4 external reviewers; option for review of teaching materials as well as scholarship.

- Department recommendation proceeds to FPC; discussions include dean and president; may return to consult with department.

Tenure criteria

- “Demonstrated excellence in teaching” is the most important concern but this “depend[s] on a commitment to and capacity for scholarship and continuing intellectual growth.”

Promotion procedures

- 2nd year following tenure, candidate writes a plan and meets with dean and full professors to discuss it; also occurs at 4th year.
- 6th year, candidate submits 3rd biennial report and CV; full professors read this, consult with other department members at all ranks and make recommendation.
- Dean and President review recommendation, may call meeting with candidate and department.

Promotion criteria

- Engagement and achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service.
- “College-wide recognition of post-tenure accomplishments.”

Grievance procedures

- Grounds are violation of academic freedom, discrimination, or improper procedure.
- Heard by Faculty Affairs Committee.

CENTRE

T&P Committee

- Committee on Tenure and Appointment (CTA).

Hiring

- Mid-probationary review will be in 3rd year.
- At least 6 years in rank before tenure.
- For prior full-time teaching, up to 3 years credit may be given.

Reappointment

- Untenured faculty evaluated annually.
- Untenured faculty have at least 3 classroom observations per year with written evaluation.
- File includes annual faculty activity statements, a CV, a statement of professional goals, annual letters, candidate statements, and observation letters.
- Dean solicits student letters
- Mid-probationary review conducted by CTA, gives recommendation to Dean and President.

Tenure Procedures

- File: updated documents from mid-probationary review; Dean solicits new rounds of student letters.
- No mention of external letters.
- Division chair evaluates materials, makes recommendation to CTA; CTA deliberates alone; makes recommendation to Dean, who makes recommendation to President.

Tenure criteria

- “Performance that meets the standards of the college; the needs of the college”; effective teaching, scholarly and professional activity and achievement, and service to the College and the community.”

Promotion procedures

- Tenured faculty evaluated every other year.

- At least 8 years in rank before promotion to full.
- Reviewed by Special Subcommittee for Promotions, which may seek letters from outside scholars.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- Grounds are inadequate or inappropriate consideration.
- Heard by Review Board (3 members).

CLAREMONT MCKENNA

T&P Committee

- Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, with the subgroup Executive Committee (APT/EC).

Hiring

- For both entry-level hires and hires with tenure, after department decides it wants to hire a particular person, APT/EC has to give a recommendation to president.

Reappointment

- Junior faculty mentoring includes annual department review and meeting with the Dean; annual general advice sessions; assigned mentor; conveyance of departmental standards to APT.
- Promise as well as performance comes into play; strong promise in teaching and scholarship merits 3 year reappointment.
- Dossier includes candidate statement, department report and recommendation
- Goes to Dean then APT/EC.

Tenure Procedures

- Department's report based on study of syllabi, course evaluations, interviews with students; candidate also gives at least one public research presentation; must include substantive and "jargon free" assessment of scholarship; report on service.
- At least 5 external reviews (referred to as "arm's-length reviews").
- Candidate may request earlier or later date of consideration.
- When dean receives candidate's preliminary statement, takes it to APT/EC, which may ask the department to consider particular issues in its review. The Dean then requests report from department.
- Then a *separate* committee, a Field Investigation subcommittee, also prepares report than includes review of publications, interviews with students and colleagues, etc.
- APT/EC gives recommendation based on latter report.

Tenure criteria

- Teaching and scholarship are both necessary for the advancement of the individual and the college; service "integral but lesser."
- Merited only by "meeting high standards of teaching and scholarship": skill at imparting knowledge and encouraging intellectual growth; mastery of an area of knowledge; contributions of "obvious professional value" to discipline. Most commonly this means publishing in professional journals and books, but the crucial element is "value."

Promotion procedures

- Normally 7 years after tenure; if not they undergo a post-tenure review at the 9 year mark.

- Post-tenure review includes CV, personal statement; reports from previous reviews; teaching evaluations; sabbatical requests and reports.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- Can request a review of negative decision on grounds of violation of process, academic freedom, or law.
- Appeal Panel is appointed by the Dean
- After a negative tenure decision, a candidate may appeal to EC for second consideration after a year or two has passed.

COLGATE

T&P Committee

- Committee on Promotion & Tenure (CPT), also called the “Watchdog Committee”.
- Dean’s Advisory Council also plays role.

Hiring

- Initial appointments may be as little as 1 year; previous experience credited minus 1 year.
- Total probationary period of 7 years; extensions granted for family, medical, and disability leaves.

Reappointment

- Third year review.
- Checklist of items available from Dean.
- Annual “candid and constructive” consultations with department chair.
- Assistant professor should “embody maturity and achievement in scholarship, of which doctor’s degree is the normal testimonial”; promising in teaching and scholarship.
- Department review should include an analysis of institutional needs.

Tenure Procedures

- Committee is all tenured department members.
- Tenured colleagues should assess candidate’s classroom effectiveness, field mastery, capacity to contribute important courses, willingness to teach and advise.
- Teaching evidence: course evaluations, course materials, candidate’s participation in creating new courses and updating old ones; comments on essays, candidate’s statement.
- Scholarship evidence: candidate’s statement; list of publications and presentations; grants and awards; institutional research; reviews and citations.
- External reviews required.
- Recommendation begins with department, goes to division director, then to Dean’s Advisory Council, then CPT, then Dean, then President.

Tenure criteria

- Should have proved their worth as teachers and have substantial records as scholars.
- “Seeks a faculty of teacher-scholars of high quality. Excellence in teaching is the most important consideration” and yet it’s not sufficient alone; it cannot compensate for lack of high-quality scholarship. Service third, less important.
- Effective teaching involves commitment, knowledge, ability to inspire, fairness; “enables the student to use ideas and think for him- or herself in a liberal, open-minded manner.” “A quiet and deliberative manner may serve as well as a more dramatic approach.”

- Scholarship denotes original research or creative expression; advances field or provides new insights. Scholars seek to make results available to professional audiences. May include publications, presentations; also pedagogical scholarship and textbooks; presentations to general audiences; success can also be indicated by reviews, grants, and awards.
- Service includes advising as well as administration, participation in governance; participation in the life of the college (attending lectures etc.); “colleagueship.”
- Goal of 55-56% of faculty in tenured ranks; if trending below that, personnel policies need review.

Promotion procedures

- Following 1st post-tenure sabbatical, faculty member meets with division chair and again every fourth year to discuss criteria and possible timing.
- Typically after 6 to 10 years in rank.
- May be initiated by full professors in department, but candidate and division director also can initiate.
- Dossier similar to tenure file.
- Recommendations go to CPT, then Dean.

Promotion criteria

- Criteria similar to tenure, with further advancement expected.
- Service may be weighted more heavily than at tenure.
- Must have reputation among peers in field.
- Length and quality of service count; should be reasonable certainty of continued usefulness.

Grievance procedures

- If based on Dean’s review, taken to President; President consults with CPT; then President may either take action or appoint an investigative officer or group

FURMAN

T&P Committee

- Faculty Status Committee.
- Makes recommendations to VPPA and President.

Hiring

- Initial 3-year appointment.
- Tenure process in 7th year.
- Total probationary period not to exceed 7 years.

Reappointment

- Annual departmental review through Chair interview.
- Pre-tenure review in 3rd year for all faculty with less than 3 years credit.
- Candidate presents file summarizing activities.
- File to tenured members of department and VPAA. Letter of recommendation from each tenured faculty; letter from DH.

Tenure procedures

- Committee includes all tenured members of department.
- Early fall of review year prepare dossier. Committee meets at end of fall to discuss dossier and make recommendation to Faculty Status Committee.
- FS Committee recommends to President, President to Board.

Tenure criteria

- Academic preparation and terminal degrees.
- Experience.
- Teaching effectiveness, professional activity, institutional service, devotion to duty, professional ethics, community service.

Promotion procedures

- Not provided.

Promotion criteria

- Same as tenure.

Grievance procedures

- Not specified.

GRINNELL

T&P Committee

- Faculty Personnel Committee.

Hiring

- Initial appointment is 2 years.
- Second appointment is 2 years
- Third appointment is 3 years.
- Tenure review in year 6.

Reappointment

- Complete evaluation in years 3 or 4, 6 or 7 at latest.
- Interim evaluations by DH annually.
- File includes CV, scholarly work (published, conferences, in progress); letters from others “who have some knowledge of the candidate’s performance” - Can be on or off-campus colleagues-; written evaluation from the Student Educational Policy Committee who interview students.
- DH consults with members of the department regarding effectiveness, interest in research, desire of candidate to return.
- Recommendation submitted to Dean and Faculty Personnel Committee. Recommendation to President.

Tenure procedures

- Recommendation from DH in form of a report that includes analysis of teaching and indication of source of information; analysis of scholarship based on information from colleagues inside and outside the college; service record; statement from colleagues inside and outside indicating candidate’s will to continue, desire to promote and general appraisal; CV with complete bibliography; evaluation of teaching from Student Educational Policy Committee.
- Recommendation goes first to Divisional Personnel Committee, then to Faculty Personnel Committee. Divisional Committee representative makes separate appraisal of the recommendation and adds to report.
- Recommendation to President, then Board.

Tenure criteria

- Excellence in teaching is of primary importance. Includes both beginning and advanced levels. Consider strengths and weaknesses as both teacher and advisor.
- Expect indication of scholarly production.

- Service is given less weight.

Promotion procedures

- After 6 years at rank of Associate, Faculty Budget Committee identifies candidates based on demonstrated continuing excellence in teaching, continued professional productivity based on reviewed scholarship of high quality.
- File contains evidence of above as well as statement from departmental colleagues, CV, evaluation from Student Educational Policy Committee.
- Recommendation goes to Divisional Personnel Committee, then Faculty Personnel Committee, then President.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- For “inadequate consideration” according to AAUP guidelines.
- May ask Dean to reconvene committee for purpose of reconsideration within one month of decision. Letter must detail factors that warrant reconsideration.
- If committee does not reconsider, can go to Personal Appeals Board for consideration of inadequate consideration based on process: 6 elected tenured faculty of which 3 consider the case.
- Committee report to petitioner, Dean, DH, President within 2 months.

HAMILTON

T&P Committee

- Committee on Appointments (COA).

Hiring

- Not clear – contract seem to be annual.
- Notice for non-renewal can come in 1st year.

Reappointment

- File to include course evaluations, samples of scholarly achievement, evaluation of tenured members.
- May include course syllabi and materials, articles on pedagogy, new courses developed, evidence of cross-disciplinary work, outside evaluation of teaching, colleagues’ evaluation of teaching.
- Report on service from department.

Tenure procedures

- Candidate provides six copies of materials s/he believes helpful to adequate consideration including: personal statement on teaching, research and service; current CV; any documents relevant to teaching or scholarship.
- Candidate provides list of up to 10 former or present students to VPAA.
- May include confidential evaluation of scholarly work from outside sources.
- Department recommendation to VPAA is detailed statement on performance on all 3 areas, summary of departmental views on candidate and departmental vote. Includes individual letters from all members of department including non-voting. Chair to discuss evaluation with candidate before submitting.
- VPAA forwards file to COA with own recommendation.
- Goes to President who has final authority on decision.

Tenure criteria

- Accomplishments in teaching as evidenced by mastery of subject, depth and breadth, effectiveness working with students.
- Evidence of scholarship that supports teaching, original research and publication.
- Contributions to the life of the College.

Promotion procedures

- File to include updated CV, paragraph describing expertise, letters from 5-6 outside professionals to evaluate teaching and scholarship, letters from present and former colleagues, letters from 10-15 former students.

Promotion criteria

- Accomplishments in all three areas of evaluation.
- Distinguished teaching.
- Sound and developing scholarship.

Grievance procedures

- Not specified.

HENDRIX

T&P Committee

- Committee on Academic and Professional Concerns.
- Includes promotion and tenure, teaching loads, academic freedom issues, salaries, discrimination.

Hiring

- Initial 1 year appointment
- No more than 3 years prior service granted.
- Normal probationary period is 6 years.

No information in Handbook on reappointment procedures, tenure procedures, tenure criteria, promotion procedures, promotion criteria, or grievance process.

KENYON

T&P Committee

- Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P).

Hiring

- Not specific but pre-tenure review in year 3.
- Tenure review in year 6
- Post-tenure review within 2 years of sabbatical cycle.

Reappointment

- Each tenure-track candidate has faculty mentoring group made up of DH, a tenured member of the department, and one other faculty member, to evaluate progress annually.
- File includes: CV; letter from department; letters of evaluation from 3 members of the department; 2 colleagues outside the department, one for teaching, one for scholarship; letters from 10 students; annual reports (FAR); other evidence the candidate thinks relevant. May include syllabi, publications, outside letters.
- File goes to Tenure and Promotion Committee for recommendation to the President and Board.

Tenure procedures

- File includes: CV; department letter summarizing meeting of tenured and non-tenured faculty; 3 letters from department; 2 letters from colleagues outside the department; letters from 10 students; 3 letters from outside the College; other materials candidate deems relevant.
- File to T&P Committee for recommendation to President and Board.

Tenure criteria

- Teaching excellence is the “sine qua non” for advancement. Candidate to demonstrate: thorough and imaginative course planning; effective lecture, discussion and tutorial guidance; timely, painstaking, fair evaluation of student work, availability and guidance to students.
- With regard to scholarship, each department offers guidelines to indicate how College standards relate to discipline. Candidate to demonstrate active participation in field through publication; participation in scholarly discussions; active work with students on research; exchange of information with peers; acquisition of new skills.
- Citizenship through committees; leadership in governance; attendance at faculty meetings; assistance in recruiting; engagement in life of the College.

Promotion procedures

- File includes CV; letter of recommendation from Provost; 3 letters from colleagues, 1 outside letter; letters from 10 students; copies of annual reports; student evaluations; other materials deemed relevant.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- Not specified.

MIDDLEBURY

T&P Committee

- Council on Reviews.
- Made up of two committees, the Committee on Reappointments and the Committee on Promotions.

Hiring

- For first appointment, 3rd year review.
- Tenure review in the 7th year, but probationary period can vary according to previous service.

Reappointment

- Review conducted by Reappointments Committee. Must have completed terminal degree by time of review.
- File to include: CV; syllabi; other material requested and that candidate thinks appropriate, e.g. examples of scholarly publication or other evidence of scholarship; self-evaluation that focuses on teaching performance and scholarly activity; letter from DH; letters from tenured members of department; course evaluations.
- Reappointment committee members arrange for classroom visits: one committee member will interview the candidate: committee may request information from other members of the College, alumni, or persons off-campus as necessary.

- Upon successful recommendation committee will meet with the candidate within four weeks to provide an assessment of candidate's performance and produce a written summary of the meeting.
- Recommendation goes to Provost, then President who has final authority.

Tenure procedures

- Same file materials as reappointment plus: self-evaluation of scholarship; outside letters; recommendation from DH.
- Overseen by Promotions Committee
- President interviews all candidates, reviews file, hears report from Promotions Committee and recommends to Board.

Tenure criteria

- Evidence of exceptional quality in teaching, scholarship or creative activity; service a distant third.

Promotion procedures

- 5-8 years after tenure.
- File to include self-evaluation of career since tenure; CV; list of courses taught; may include letters from inside and outside.
- Member of Promotions Committee interviews candidate.
- Promotion Committee members undertake class visits.
- Recommendation to President.

Promotion Criteria

- Must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, scholarship and service to the College.

Grievance procedures

- Not specified.

Mount Holyoke

T&P Committee

- Advisory Committee.

Hiring

- Initial appointment 3 years.
- Second appointment 2 years
- Third appointment 2 years.
- Tenure in 7th year.

Reappointment

- Probationary period includes annual review with summaries to Provost and President.
- File to include summary of student evaluations; submission of "such information or evidence that may be helpful to adequate consideration."
- Recommendation from tenured members of department (3 minimum) to President. If not 3 then can form "Special Committee" with 2 from the College, 2 from the field.

Tenure procedures

- Same committee formation as for reappointment.
- DH asks for "evidence helpful to adequate consideration". Department committee determines what is pertinent including "judgment of competent scholars in the same field".

- File to President and Advisory Committee. Both examine full record and may ask for additional information. Advisory Committee can pass on to President or return to department to reconsider recommendation.

Tenure criteria

- Not clearly stated.

Promotion procedures

- Eligibility after 4 years in rank.
- Similar evidence requested as for tenure.
- Review by Advisory Committee and President.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- If reappointment denied, candidate can appeal to the Advisory Committee within 2 weeks. Further appeal to Appeals Committee.
- Not specified for tenure or promotion.

OBERLIN

T&P Committee

- Not discussed.

Hiring

- Initial term 4 years.
- Second term less than or equal to 3 years.
- Incomplete dissertation leads to 2 year appointment with 2 year renewal upon completion.

Reappointment

- As above, reappointment normally occurs after 4th year.
- Criteria/procedures available from Deans. Not included in handbook.
- Positive evaluation required for reappointment.
- Evaluation procedures/criteria for reappointment are specific to divisional faculties.

Tenure procedures

- Divisional faculty councils evaluate in the 5th or 6th spring. (3rd or 4th possible if faculty member has previous teaching experience).
- Outside letters are not mentioned in document.

Tenure criteria

- Consistent with 1940 AAUP *Statement of principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
- Specific evidence of teaching excellence is necessary.
- Demonstrated achievement in teaching and research (rather than promise or progress) is the standard.
- Tenure is possible (but rare) for excellent teachers not engaged in regular scholarly publication/artistic performance.

Promotion procedures

- Not discussed.

Promotion criteria

- Comparable to tenure.
- Greater emphasis on external recognition of research/creative work.

- No explicit mention of external letters.

Grievance procedures

- No discussion of scope of review (procedural, merit, etc.).
- General Faculty Mediation Committee reviews decisions upon receipt of petitions.

POMONA

T&P Committee

- Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC).

Hiring

- Initial term less than or equal to 5 years (normally a 3 year appointment).
- Second term less than or equal to 3 years.
- Incomplete dissertation leads to 2 year appointment with 2 year renewal upon completion.
- Six years to tenure.

Reappointment

- Note: It appears that there are two separate reviews, however the document is unclear.
- 2nd year assessment conducted by department.
- Candidate assembles a file. Which includes course evaluations.
- No student letters or outside letters on scholarship.
- Appears to be another review in the 3rd year – as a condition for reappointment.
- Reappointment file contents as discussed below for tenure.
- Three outside letters from recognized experts for reappointment.
- Contribution to the field, comparison to other work in the area.

Tenure procedures

- Spring prior to tenure review, candidate, DH and dean meet to discuss procedures.
- DH sets committee, acquires outside letters/student letters (random + chosen by candidate).
- Candidate submits file to DH.
- File includes statements of teaching/scholarly or artistic activity/service, CV, publications, syllabi etc. – if desired, names of potential outside reviewers, names of 10-20 students for student letters, department letters.
- Outside letters – six for tenure.
- DH submits letter to FPC, signed by all members.
- Sequence: department, FPC, President, Cabinet, Trustees.

Tenure criteria

- Good teaching evidenced by competence in three areas (and excellence in at least one of the areas): lecturing, leading seminars/discussions, and guiding laboratories/studios/tutorials/student research.
- Professional achievement evidenced by excellent work in one's field, recognized outside Pomona College.
- Effective service.

Promotion procedures

- By DH or cabinet nomination, or 8th year in rank.

Promotion criteria

- Same as for tenure.

Grievance procedures

- Scope not discussed.
- Appeals go to Faculty Grievance Committee

RHODES

T&P Committee

- Faculty Committee on Tenure and Promotion (FCTP).

Hiring

- Maximum 6 years to tenure.

Reappointment

- Based on regular annual reviews and a “special” 3rd year review.
- Reappointments must demonstrate trajectory toward meeting tenure requirements.
- File required – materials comparable to W&L 4th year reviews.
- Five letters: DH and two other senior members from within department and 2 more from outside the department.

Tenure procedures

- Three files required.
- For FCTP – materials comparable to W&L tenure file.
- For department – similar, but without outside or student letters.
- For Classroom Visitation Committee (CVC, consisting of four Rhodes faculty) –teaching statement plus materials.
- Two outside letters –selected from larger pool.
- Each senior department member writes a letter to FCTP and DH.
- Each CVC member visits at least 3 classes and writes a letter to FCTP and DH.
- FCTP makes recommendation to provost.

Tenure criteria

- “Active, engaged, energetic, effective teacher scholar” and engaged in service to College.
- Teaching is most important. Several “standard” criteria mentioned.
- Scholarship is a “close second,” involving regular appearance of professional work.
- Departments establish specific criteria for “ongoing engagement” in scholarship.
- Past accomplishments prior to appointment are valued in light of potential for continued productivity/growth, etc.
- Service is third in order of importance.
- Levels of assessment for teaching, scholarship and service are: exceptional, excellent, good, marginal, and inadequate. Each is defined. The top two levels appear necessary for tenure.

Promotion procedures

- Triennial review. Review file similar to 3rd year file. No outside/student letters. Includes a “3-year plan.”
- Promotion review is comparable to tenure. Includes two outside letters.

Promotion criteria

- “Long-established patterns of excellence...” in each area.
- Expectation of continuation.

Grievance procedures

- Scope is “capriciousness or violation of procedure.”
- Provost meets with candidate to discuss reason(s) for denial.
- Written appeal to Provost, President, and Faculty Appeals Committee.

RICHMOND

T&P Committee

- Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P).
- 7 tenured faculty – elected.
- 2 per each division in College, plus 1 at-large.
- Dean is an ex-officio member.

Hiring

- No discussion.

Reappointment

- Mid-course review in 3rd year.
- Determine if candidate is on track.
- Tenured department members plus Dean.
- Minimum of four members, excluding Dean.
- DH drafts letter, signed by tenured department members.
- Dean makes reappointment decision based on review.

Tenure procedures

- Tenured department members plus Dean and T&P Committee.
- Minimum of four members, excluding Dean.
- Departments establish “career profiles.”
- Departmental letter includes objective summary, strengths and weaknesses, strength of consensus.
- Outside letters – 4 total (2 from candidate’s list, 2 from department’s list).
- Student letters – chosen by candidate and at random.
- Provost reviews and makes recommendation to President, who makes recommendation to Trustees.

Tenure criteria

- Teaching is most important, demonstrates that candidate is “committed to excellence.”
- Scholarship is “virtually as important.” Quality is more important than quantity. Research must be ongoing, with a demonstrated ability to complete. Open to scrutiny by peers.
- Effectively serve department and school.

Promotion procedures

- Initiated by candidate or DH 6-10 years after tenure.

Promotion criteria

- “Sustained achievement,” and “continued promise.”

Grievance procedures

- “Bias or violation of procedure.”
- University Grievance Committee.

ROLLINS

T&P Committee

- Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC).
- 5 tenured full-professors.
- Appointed – ratified by faculty.
- 1 course release.

- No authority to challenge substantive criteria for T&P established by departments/College.

Hiring

- Dean appoints – candidate must receive approval of majority of department.
- Two- or three-year reappointments.
- Maximum 7 years to tenure.

Reappointment

- Mid-course evaluation in 3rd year.
- Conducted by department and FEC.
- Candidate Evaluation Committee selected by DH.
- DH plus at least two tenured department members.
- “Promise” is key element.

Tenure procedures

- Minimum of 6 years (4 years at Rollins).
- “Candidate Evaluation Committee” same as for reappointment plus 1 FEC member (ex-officio).
- File includes candidate’s statement regarding activities since last review.
- Outside letters – “at the candidate’s request....two peer evaluators will be selected....from a list submitted by the candidate.” [Looks like it is optional.]
- “Candidate Evaluation Committee” evaluates file and votes on recommendation.
- Dean conducts independent review and writes recommendation to Provost.
- FEC reviews file and reports from FEC and Dean.
- Reports to Provost.
- Provost reports to president who reports to trustees

Tenure criteria

- Articulated at department level.
- Teaching is first priority. Demonstrate excellence. Typical measures are used.
- Scholarship “concomitant to good teaching.” Evidence of an “active scholarly life,” including manuscripts, publications, presentations, creation of art/performance, moderator/discussant/referee, etc. Show a pattern that is likely to continue.
- Service to college.

Promotion procedures

- Minimum of 5 years as associate (3 years at Rollins).
- Mid-course review at candidate’s option.

Promotion criteria

- Same as for tenure, with expectation of advancement.

Grievance procedures

- Grounds are only for discrimination, violations of academic freedom, or procedural improprieties. Review of merits/substance not permitted.
- Appeals Committee

SEWANEE

T&P Committee

- Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Hiring

- Six years to tenure (up to 3 years credit for service elsewhere) plus possible 1-year extension for exceptional circumstances.

Reappointment

- 2nd + 4th year reviews.
- At least 3 tenured members – write evaluation letters.
- DH and 1 committee member do in-class visitation in 2 courses.
- Student evaluations.
- DH writes evaluation letter – submits to dean, who discusses w/ candidate.
- Dean makes reappointment decisions.

Tenure procedures

- All tenured department members evaluate file and write letters.
- Minimum of three members.
- File comparable to reappointment.
- Outside letters required. Dean obtains. No discussion of process/etc.
- No mention of student letters.
- T&P committee reviews and makes recommendation to dean, who makes recommendation to Provost. Then goes to Vice-Chancellor and then to Regents.

Tenure criteria

- Demonstrated professional excellence in the three areas.
- Potential for future contribution is key.
- Teaching effectiveness, measured by standard metrics.
- Scholarship: Candidate has completed and made available work of such quality to gain favorable peer recognition. Past accomplishment and future promise are key.
- Service is evaluated by typical metrics/language.

Promotion procedures

- Six years as associate.
- Same procedures as for tenure.

Promotion criteria

- Similar to tenure.

Grievance procedure

- Procedural review only.
- Candidate may appeal to provost, who may ask Dean to reconsider. If dean makes unfavorable recommendation, candidate may appeal to Hearings Committee.

SMITH

T&P committee

- Committee on Tenure and Promotion (CTP).

Hiring

- Non-tenured faculty are considered “temporary instructional staff”. Appointments and reappointments are for one, two, or three years.
- Appointment made with tenure in special circumstances at request of department, recommendation to CTP, must have support of majority of voting members of department.
- Tenure recommendation is completed during academic year in which candidate’s 12th semester of service is completed. Sabbatical and leave of absence can be counted upon request.

Reappointment

- Annual review of scholarship and service of every non-tenured faculty jointly by candidate and chair.
- Others who are eligible to vote on reappointment, promotion, tenure are “responsible for their role in periodic evaluation.”
- Every member of permanent instructional staff below rank of full professor is entitled to review by department at least every 3 years.

Tenure procedures

- Committee consists of all permanent and temporary members whose rank is higher than candidate.
- If less than 3, committee “shall be modeled as closely as possible upon regular procedures.”
- Each department establishes procedures it considers effective in evaluating teaching of its members. Candidate and chair set up mutually agreeable plan that may include classroom visits.
- Student opinions are considered as reflected in evaluations.
- Outside evaluations required. Candidate and department each submit 4 names, CTP solicits 2 from each list. Referees are given CV, other material as determined by department and candidate.
- Departmental vote submitted in writing to CTP.
- If unanimous, letter contains statement of reasons, summary of evidence. Copy to candidate.
- If split, each committee member writes confidential letter explaining his judgment. Chair also provides summary letter. Candidate may communicate in writing to CTP. CTP meets with available voting department members.
- If evidence differs substantially from original, CTP chair sends letter to Department chair and all members of department summarizing new evidence. Candidate may respond.
- If CTP approves departmental recommendation, president submits to Board of Trustees. If not in agreement, written statement of reasons is given to department chair.
- If majority of CTP feels it does not have adequate information, it can consult candidate and department to collect necessary information.

Tenure criteria

- Accomplishments as teacher and scholar are primary. Service is also considered.
- Teaching “adheres to high standards of scholarship and presents students with subject matter in such a way as to stimulate interest, develop critical habits of thought, and encourage independent, creative scholarly or artistic work.”
- Scholarship: Published work is best guide to scholarly capabilities, enables peers outside College to judge quality; may also be judged by unpublished manuscripts, meeting presentations, lectures, and creative works inside or outside College.
- Teaching cannot be considered apart from scholarly work, but there may be exceptional teachers who do not engage in original research. In such cases, continuing interest or work in new areas, new approaches, participation in professional activities may be considered.
- Service is part of normal, expected duties. Faculty should carry “appropriate share.” Not substitute for achievements in teaching, but adds to person’s “usefulness to the College.” Includes advising.

- Institutional considerations as tenure composition of department, faculty member's field of interest, curricular needs of department are also weighed in reappointment and tenure recommendations.

Promotion procedures

- CTP annually reviews status of each associate professor for 8 years or more. If 15 years or more, departments are encouraged to consider promotion.
- Outside evaluations required (see procedure for tenure).
- See tenure procedures.

Promotion criteria

- Not specified.

Grievance procedures

- Not specified.

TRINITY

T&P committee

- Appointments and Promotions Committee (A&P).
- Share responsibility with Dean and President.

Hiring

- Initial appointment 3 years
- Followed by two 2-year renewals.
- Tenure review no later than spring of 6th year.

Reappointment

- 1st reappointment in spring semester of second year.
- 2nd reappointment in spring semester of 4th year.
- File contains guidelines to document evolution of teaching, scholarship, service expectations at each stage: reappointment, as well as tenure and promotion.

Tenure procedures

- Departmental Review Committee: Tenured members of department, normally chaired by Department Chair (designated as "Filekeeper").
- File contains CV; candidate's statement; internal and external letters addressing teaching, research, service; departmental recommendation; collection of candidate's scholarly work for review.
- Review proceeds through department, A&P, President, Academic Affairs Committee of Board, Board of Trustees or its executive committee.
- Review committee evaluates file, meets to vote. Filekeeper prepares letter to A&P, signed by candidate and each committee member. Similar for teaching effectiveness letter. Each committee member also writes letter on recommendation/vote and a second on teaching effectiveness.
- If file deficient or flawed, A&P chair may return it to filekeeper for rectification.
- A&P meets in closed session, but if additional information is required, may interview candidate, review committee, or others prior to taking action.
- Negative decision: dean of faculty sends letter to chair of candidate's review committee and candidate citing reasons. Dean and A&P each write letters with their recommendations, send to president. President sends his/her recommendation in letter to A&P.

- If positive decision from Dean, A&P, and President – goes to trustee Academic Affairs Committee.
- If at least one of 3 is negative, president and committee meet, A&P may request additional information, more interviews, etc. Revised recommendations may be made.
- If still divided, all letters are forwarded to trustee Academic Affairs Committee to make its own recommendation.

Tenure criteria

- None of 3 areas can be ignored.
- Teaching: “Continuing development of teaching effectiveness in the classroom as well as related areas of advising, supervision of student projects, and curriculum and program development.” “Full teaching effectiveness” “over range of courses.”
- Scholarship: “Scholarly intentions and a program of research as well as evidence of engagement in productive scholarship, of steady progression in the quality...., and of its recognition by a wider professional community.” “Progressed beyond stage of promise and achieved its promise of fruition.” “Significant public demonstration and corresponding professional recognition.”
- Service: “Continuing growth in the scope and significance of service contributions.” “Demonstrable contributions to College” and beginning contributions to profession or larger community, where possible.

Promotion procedures

- At each stage in reappointments, tenure, promotion – department, A&P and Dean, and president (as required) review candidate’s record.
- See tenure.

Promotion criteria

- “Already a fully effective teacher,” should now be demonstrating “leadership in curriculum and program development.”
- “A record of mature scholarship.”
- “Sustained and significant contributions to college proper, and, where possible contributions to his/her profession an larger community.”

Grievance procedures

- Appeal through Appointments and Promotions Appeals Board.

VASSAR

T&P committee

- Faculty Appointments and Salary Committee (FASC).

Hiring

- Initial 3 year appointment, with review in 2nd year
- Contract extension of 2 years, with review in 4th year
- Annual reviews in years when no reappointment.
- Initial term for associate and full professor without previous experience at the College is for indeterminate term or for limited term, normally of 3 years or fewer. Indeterminate tenure is awarded either upon appointment or following review and renewal of contracts.

Reappointment

- Reappointment contract of 3 years, with review in 7th year followed by promotion to associate professor with tenure indeterminate.

- File contains CV; teaching portfolio; personal statement on career and professional development as reflected in teaching, scholarly activity, service; scholarly work produced since appointment; student course evaluations; departmental performance evaluations; recommendations from other departments/programs candidate participated in.
- “Substantial evidence of high quality teaching” is of primary importance.
- Evidence of degree of scholarly or artistic development “sufficient to warrant expectation of significant accomplishment by time of tenure review.” May include published and works in progress, papers at meetings, etc.
- “Contributions to departmental activities” “will also be important factors.”

Tenure procedures

- Committee: Voting members of faculty in rank superior to candidate. Tenured professors may vote in cases involving others of same rank.
- If fewer than 2, ad hoc committee of 3 is appointed by Dean, in consultation with FASC after soliciting separate lists of names of 3 potential members from candidate and from a senior member of department. Effort will be made to choose at least one member from each list.
- File contents as outlined under Reappointment above.
- Outside letters: Candidates provide list of 6 names, four are chosen by Dean in consultation of FASC. Letters are not made available to department until after they’ve discussed file but before vote is taken.
- Outside evaluators receive CV, scholarly materials and statement that places scholarship in context for scholars in field.
- “Any materials that are not specifically called for in the.... *Faculty Handbook* shall be deemed extraneous and shall not be considered in the review process.”
- Fairly detailed instructions for file, including format of CV, what should be in personal statement, etc.
- After departmental vote, chair writes letter documenting discussion, which is signed by all department members, submitted to dean and candidate.
- Dean and FASC review file and outside evaluations independently. FASC meets with dean after FASC has made preliminary review.
- FASC then meets with both Dean and President
- If needed, consultation with department.
- Committee makes final recommendation to Dean, who gives a recommendation to President, who submits it to BOT.

Tenure criteria

- “Distinction in teaching together with scholarly or artistic achievement of high quality as judged by peers both inside and outside college” or “Distinction in scholarly or artistic achievement together with teaching of high quality.”
- Teaching: “Command of and continuing engagement in subject, contributions to intellectual vitality of department, expository ability, understanding and empathy for students, ability to excite intellectual curiosity, willingness to participate in guidance and advising of students.”
- Scholarship: “Quality of work should demonstrate incisiveness of mind, felicity of expression, and control of materials” as well as “continuing engagement in scholarly or artistic projects resulting in timely publication or presentation.” “Emphasis on published or performed work begun or completed since appointment.” May include unpublished, work in progress, papers from meetings, etc.

- Evidence of “intellectual growth and academic leadership,” including service within and outside college.

Promotion procedures

- No requirement for years in rank. Normally associate professor is considered for promotion in 6th year after tenure.
- Committee includes voting members of faculty in rank superior to candidate.
- File contents: See tenure.
- Evaluation on basis of achievements since awarding of tenure..

Promotion criteria

- “Marked distinction” in scholarship, teaching, or both.
- “Continued demonstration of significant scholarship” and “teaching of high quality.”
- Consider all professional activity, placing emphasis on work since granting of tenure.
- Academic leadership is “an important additional consideration.”

Grievance procedures

- Candidate may initiate informal and confidential discussions with individual member or whole Appeal Committee (AC).
- Formal appeal in writing by Sept 15 of following academic year.
- AC reviews file, written communications subsequent to departmental recommendation, meeting summaries, etc. Appellant may appear in person to discuss grievances.
- No new material may be introduced after this point.
- In case of successful appeal, any document related to procedures found to be flawed is removed from file.
- If appeal denied, AC informs appellant with copy to president. In other cases, AC informs President, with copies to appellant, Dean, FASC, department.
- If resolution proposed by President differs from AC recommendation, passes to trustee Committee of Academic Affairs for final decision.

WELLESLEY

T&P committee

- Committee on Faculty Appointments (CFA).
- Dean is chair.

Hiring

- Initial appointment 3 or 4 years, depending on departmental recommendation (3 if already faculty member elsewhere).
- Can be appointed as associate or full if “considerable experience at another institution” and have demonstrated “unusually strong evidence of teaching ability and intellectual distinction.” Initial appointment is 3 years, with tenure notification in April of 2nd year.
- 7 year of contracts pre-tenure, with tenure decision in December of 6th year.

Reappointment

- Varies depending on whether person had been assistant professor elsewhere and for how long (7 years of contracts pre-tenure).

Tenure procedures

- In Department: Reappointments and Promotions Committee (RPC).
- Established in first year of service for interdepartmental appointments.
- RPC meets annually with untenured faculty, memorandum prepared.

- Materials include professional achievements and plans for future.
- Two required first year class visits (for development, not evaluation).
- External professional evaluation of published work required, optional inclusion of unpublished work. Evaluators are chosen jointly by Dean, RPC, and candidate.
- RPC makes recommendation to CFA.
- If CFA upholds negative RPC or reverses positive RPC recommendation: Candidate has right to discuss denial with Dean of College or whole CFA. May request written summary.
- CFA recommendation goes to President to be made to Board of Trustees.

Tenure criteria

- “Quality of teaching” is of “major importance.” Evaluation includes faculty classroom visits, conferences, supervision of independent work and theses, student evaluations, student letters, candidate’s letter on teaching. Candidate must be “able teacher and possesses intellectual enthusiasm and power.”
- “Evidence of Scholarly Strength and Growth, including research activity and potential, evidence of remaining abreast of one’s field”. Includes research in progress, publications, unpublished work.
- Service within the College and external Professional activities.
- Reappointments, tenure, and promotion may consider departmental structure, distribution of faculty, projected retirement patterns, etc.

Promotion procedures

- At least 3 full professors on RPC meet with associate professors during 4th year at rank to discuss progress towards full, with memorandum.
- Usually promotion review is in 7th year in rank as associate professor.
- See tenure procedures.

Promotion criteria

- Same as tenure.

Grievance procedures

- Filed with CFA or Board of Appeals, by candidate or RPC.
- Appeal to Board of Appeals: Must appeal within 60 days after candidate has been notified of decision; must conclude its action by end of first week of following semester.
- Appeal to CFA: Must appeal within 1 year.

WESLEYAN

T&P committee

- Advisory Committee (AC).
- 9 tenured faculty, 3 from each division.
- At least 1 full, one associate from each division.
- No more than 2 from same department.

Hiring

- Job candidates meet with at least 1 member of AC.
- Initial appointment is 4 years.
- Reappointment is 4 year term.
- Period of time pre-tenure (Wesleyan and elsewhere) shall not exceed 8 years. Decisions concerning tenure made by end of 7th year.

- Appointments are made by president or department through the president. President is not bound by evaluations of candidates made by faculty. If nomination of appointment originates with president, (s)he consults with Academic Council members in department before presenting nomination to AC.
- Appointments with tenure are made by president, subject to approval by BOT.

Reappointment

- Chair, in consultation with senior colleagues, keeps track of progress, meets with tenure-track faculty by April 1 of 2nd and 5th years to discuss progress.
- Reappointment decision made by end of 3rd year of 4-year appointment.
- Review by senior members of department.
- File contains student evaluations, collected by registrar; department may also solicit evaluations from current or former students; faculty peer evaluation; candidate's teaching statement and teaching materials; published and unpublished scholarly work, evaluated by senior members of department. Department may seek outside referees.
- Collegueship – testimony of department chair
- Candidate may request tenured member of department to assist them in presenting case, review file, etc.
- Chair consults all members of department (including non-tenured, except those in first or last year).
- Decision goes to AC in spring term.
- AC may request additional information.
- Candidate has right to state own case before AC.

Tenure procedures

- File includes – Same materials as for reappointment, plus outside letters on scholarship.
- Chair solicits 3-5 outside letters. Candidate may name up to additional 3.
- May include inside letters of evaluation from authorities within Wesleyan – supplementary, not substitutes for outside letters.
- Fairly detailed descriptions of what to include, how to solicit outside letters, etc.
- Department should include information on quality of journals and presses.
- Chair consults all members of department, including non-tenured (except those in 1st and last years).
- Candidate may state own case before AC. Candidate may request tenured member of department to assist in presenting case (counselor).
- Department (all tenured members) orally presents case to AC.
- AC may request additional information, including additional outside opinions.
- If both AC and department decisions are positive, AC seeks concurrence of the Review and Appeals Board (RAB).
- RAB may overturn AC if procedural error or if AC recommendation is based on any of “3 inappropriate criteria.” If overturned, case is remanded to AC to address procedural matters or RAB may review case itself.
- If both AC and department decisions are negative, RAB and president are informed.
- If department decision is negative, AC reviews file and summary of reasons. May seek additional information and/or meet with candidate and/or members of department.
- AC may not substitute its judgment about merits. Sole role is to determine whether or not there is procedural error or any of 3 inappropriate criteria have been used. If yes, AC may

remand to department or rectify error. If department decision remains negative, AC may sustain department recommendation or forward to RAB.

- President seeks advice from AC before making report to BOT.

Tenure criteria

- Consider both performance and promise in teaching, as well as scholarship, and collegueship. “Clear and sufficient evidence that the normal expectations of excellence evidenced in scholarship, teaching, and collegueship have been met.”
- Teaching: Classroom performance and promise as evaluated by students and colleagues. Influence and contribution to teaching of colleagues is also considered.
- Scholarship is evaluated on intellectual power, depth, breadth of knowledge, originality and skill in research, creativity, and significance. Past contributions and future promise are considered. Published work is clearest measure. Published or accepted for publication works are considered. Manuscripts, drafts, public talks, etc. are only included if evaluated by qualified external judges.
- Some departments require book or specific number of publications. Candidate must be informed upon arrival at Wesleyan.
- If department does not have specific number of publications required, it should “arrive at separate and clear understandings with the Office of Academic Affairs and the AC as to what constitutes the usual evidence of performance and promise in that field.” This should be in the form of a written statement.
- Collegueship includes contributions to collegial life of faculty as a community of scholars. Candidate must demonstrate effectiveness in stimulating thinking of colleagues and encouragement and constructive criticism of their work, participate in intellectual life beyond the classroom, and share in establishing conditions for sustaining a stimulating intellectual atmosphere.
- Tenure is not an award for administrative or committee work, but that will strengthen the case.

Promotion procedures

- May request at any time. If not promoted by end of 5th year at rank, consideration is given at end of 6th year unless candidate declines to be considered.
- File similar to tenure file.
- Chair solicits 2-4 outside letters. Candidate may name 1-2 additional.
- Presentation to AC by all full professors in department.
- See tenure procedures.

Promotion criteria

- “Teaching done after receiving tenure should be at least as good as teaching done before that time.”
- “Significant additional scholarly and/or artistic accomplishments.”
- “Candidate should have continued to make collegial contributions.”

Grievance procedures

- See also tenure decision process.
- Department whose positive recommendation is not approved by AC may directly appeal to RAB within 30 days.

- RAB determines whether AC made procedural error or used 3 inappropriate criteria. Has access to all materials. If determines was procedural error or inappropriate criteria, remand to AC or may choose to review case itself.
- President may decline to accept positive recommendation from RAB but must report to BOT.
- If Department decision is negative and AC determines that department did not make procedural error and did not use 3 inappropriate criteria, candidate does not have right to appeal decision.
- If department does not appeal negative AC decision, RAB may initiate review by majority vote. Review limited to discussion of reports by department and AC. May remand to AC but may not overturn decision.
- Generally no new evidence is allowed.

WILLIAMS

T&P committee

- Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP).

Hiring

- No information.

Reappointment

- CAP reviews performance and progress of each non-tenured faculty member each fall, whether or not reappointment is pending.

Tenure procedures

- Usually after 5 years.
- Faculty member keeps personnel file in Office of the Dean of Faculty up to date – via form like our FAR.
- CAP considers recommendations from department, transmits its own recommendation to President, who makes recommendation to Board or Trustees.
- Negative decision is communicated orally to faculty member by department chair or Dean, confirmed in writing.

Tenure criteria

- No precise weights, but teaching and scholarship are of central importance and “exceptional strength in both is usually a requirement.” Tenure is a “comprehensive judgment about past performance and future potential.”
- “Above all, interest in and talent for sound and effective teaching of undergraduates and promise of continuing growth in ability to do so.”
- “Demonstrated capacity to contribute to the arts or scholarship in the appropriate field and a perception of its relation to liberal learning.”
- “Significant usefulness and contribution to the College community – student advising, committee service, and so forth.”
- “No presumption in favor of reappointment with continuous tenure.”
- May also consider College’s future curricular needs, number and age of faculty in department, etc.

Promotion procedures

- CAP conducts formal review of associate professors in 4th year at rank, dean discusses with candidate.

- Promotion-to-Full-Professor Report is issued to associate professor in 5th (and 10th if applicable) year at rank.
- Report should outline expectations associate professor will need to meet for promotion.
- Annual updates follow, spelling out which expectations have/have not been met.
- External assessments of scholarship may be solicited.

Promotion criteria

- “Also depends on an assessment of teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievement, and contribution to the needs of the College.”
- “Have they so far fulfilled the prediction of success in teaching, scholarship, and service that was made in granting them tenure?”
- “Maintained record of pedagogical excellence and has continued to develop as a teacher.”
- “Has remained active and productive as a scholar or artist, energetically and deeply committed to scholarly or artistic work.”
- “Has continued to contribute to college community and has been able to assume the responsibility that comes with tenure in an effective and professional manner.”

Grievance procedures

- Procedural, not substantive issues, as well as violations of academic freedom or discrimination.
- No burden of proof on college for non-reappointment. College is to be “accorded the widest latitude consistent with academic freedom, equal opportunity, and the standards of fairness in discharging its responsibility to recruit and retain the best qualified faculty within its goals and means.”
- Review procedures only for “extraordinary cases” of “improper consideration or of failure to accord adequate consideration.”
- Upon receipt of negative decision, faculty member may request written statement of reasons. Before such a statement is issued “an office of the College shall advise the faculty member of the possibly adverse consequences of being given such a statement.”
- May request Dean for reconsideration, in writing within 2 months; Dean responds within 6 weeks.
- If reconsideration not granted or if confirms earlier decision, faculty member may petition Chair of the Steering Committee to initiate review.
- Steering Committee appoints review committee consisting of 5 members chosen from Steering Committee and Faculty Review Panel (at least one and at most 2 are non-tenured faculty; at least 1 is member of Steering Committee).
- Informal investigation, majority vote on issues of procedural matters and ultimate findings, within 2 months. Will not substitute own judgment on substantive matters. May only investigate “process by which original judgment was reached” and “charge that improper consideration or inadequate consideration” was involved.
- If find petitioner has established “a prima facie case of improper consideration”, Steering Committee in consultation with petitioner and President appoints hearing committee for formal investigation. Hearing Committee consists of 3 members of Steering Committee (or Faculty Review Panel). Burden of proof is on petitioner. In other cases, Review Committee reports its findings in writing (with or without recommendations) to President and petitioner.