

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR: POLICIES OF PEER INSTITUTIONS

Bowdoin College

F. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

The College expects that associate professors will serve in rank for a period of six (6) years to be eligible for promotion to the rank of professor. Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure does not necessarily imply further promotion.

Promotion to the rank of professor will be based on evaluation of teaching, scholarly and artistic engagement, and contributions to the College community since the time of the tenure review. **Although tenured faculty have a particular obligation to assume their fair share of the responsibility for the governance and intellectual and artistic life of the College, such contributions do not substitute for the primary criteria for promotion – continuing excellence in teaching and in scholarly or artistic work.**

Associate professors may be considered for promotion to the rank of professor sooner than the normal period of time in recognition of unusual scholarly and teaching distinction.

In departments which have fewer than two faculty members in the rank of professor, the Dean for Academic Affairs will appoint one or two professors, as needed, from those in that rank at the College to serve as evaluators. Professors will be appointed in consultation with the Chair of the Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure.

The procedures to be followed and materials collected for review for promotion to the rank of professor are similar to those for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

Reviewing subcommittees consist, however, of Professors in both the department and the Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure.

Recommendations for promotion to the rank of full professor are usually made in the spring of the faculty member's sixth year as associate professor. The assembling of materials for review leading to the necessary recommendations will usually begin during the fall of the faculty member's sixth year of service as associate professor.

Eligible candidates must inform the Dean for Academic Affairs office of their intent to undergo review by September 1 of that year.

Information about potential reviewers of written material should be submitted to the Dean for Academic Affairs by October 1 (this and other deadlines may be extended under unusual circumstances) of the fall term prior to the review semester. By November 1 of the fall term, copies of the materials to be reviewed should be submitted to the Dean for mailing to reviewers, who will be asked to complete their reviews in writing by January 15 of the academic year in which the review will be conducted.

The Dean for Academic Affairs invites candidates to submit, by November 1, the names with current email addresses (if known) of up to 10 students they have supported, mentored, or advised at Bowdoin who might or might not have been enrolled in their courses; these students will be invited to respond to a retrospective questionnaire on the faculty member's support, mentoring, or advising. This list is optional; non-submission of a list will not reflect negatively in the review process.

The candidate will provide the department and the Dean for Academic Affairs with a self-evaluative statement and other materials of relevance by January 15 of the review semester. Reviews of a candidate's scholarly or artistic work provided by external reviewers will be made available to the professors in the department at their request.

The department evaluation and recommendation will be made available both to the candidate and to the Dean for Academic Affairs by February 20.

The subcommittee on promotions of the Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure will then meet to review and discuss in detail all of the materials submitted and collected. These will include:

1. The department's or committee's letter or letters.
2. The materials reviewed by the department or committee, including the materials submitted by the candidate.
3. Evaluative statements on file from the time of tenure, including the tenure recommendation letters from the department; the Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure; and the Dean.
4. Letters from the reviewers of the candidate's scholarly or artistic work.
5. Letters from members of the Bowdoin faculty who wish to comment on the candidate's fitness for promotion as well as those letters that have been individually solicited by the chair of the Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure.
6. Letters from a single sample of students enrolled in the candidate's courses and independent studies over the previous five years. These letters will be solicited by the chair of the Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure according to a method prescribed by the Committee and copies will be shared with the department or review committee.
7. Feedback solicited from students supported, mentored, or advised by the candidate and invited to respond to a questionnaire on these forms of support. This evidence is optional for the candidate and is intended to supplement other aspects of the teaching portfolio, providing a more complete picture of the candidate's teaching practices in support of student learning.
8. A departmental roster showing the terms of appointment for all members of the department, or in the case of a joint appointment, departmental and program rosters.

No later than April 15, the Dean for Academic Affairs will inform each candidate for promotion of the recommendation of the subcommittee on promotions, and the reasons therefore, together with the Dean's own recommendation before conveying these recommendations to the President. The President has discretionary authority to authorize or not authorize promotion.

Carleton College

1.
 - A. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR (Tenured faculty) – Promotion to full professor is a college-wide recognition of the post-tenure accomplishments of its faculty. Consideration for promotion focuses on a candidate's intellectual engagement and achievement in teaching, scholarship and/or creative work, and service, and on the promise of continuing contributions to the College.
2. By the end of the second year following the granting of tenure, the faculty member will write a biennial report summarizing recent professional activities and plans for future development. A conversation among the candidate, the provost, and the available full professors of the department will follow soon thereafter to ensure good communication

about appropriate levels of support for teaching, service, and scholarship. A conversation will also take place among the candidate, the provost, and the available full professors of the department after the submission of the fourth year biennial report. At the end of the sixth year, the candidate will submit an expanded biennial report and a current c.v.

3. During the fall term of the seventh year following the granting of tenure, the available full professors in the candidate's department will read and discuss the candidate's biennial reports and c.v. Full professors in the candidate's department will submit a joint letter reflecting the departmental perspective(s) on the candidate's professional activities after having consulted with the candidate, all tenured faculty in the department and appropriate other faculty.
4. Before making decisions, the provost and the president will review and discuss the biennial reports, the c.v., and the departmental letter with two full-professor members of the Faculty Personnel Committee. If there are unanswered questions or serious reservations concerning the candidate's promotion, then the provost and the president shall convene a meeting to discuss the candidate's case with the two FPC members and all the available full-professor members of the department. If the provost and the president make a positive decision, they will recommend the candidate's promotion to the Board of Trustees.

NOTE: For faculty tenured in 2014 or after (and those tenured from 2011-2013 who choose this option), the following procedure will apply:

C. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR (Tenured faculty) – Promotion to full professor is a college-wide recognition of the post-tenure accomplishments of its faculty. Consideration for promotion focuses on a candidate's intellectual engagement and achievement in teaching, scholarship and/or creative work, and service, and on the promise of continuing contributions to the College.

5. By January 1 of the third year after tenure, the faculty member will write a Post-Tenure Prospectus, and a subsequent First Post-Tenure Meeting will follow as soon as possible thereafter. The Post-Tenure Prospectus should include both reflections on accomplishments (in teaching, research, creative work and service), and plans for the near future. It should include a current c.v. It should speak to the faculty member's research or creative agenda, and should include a basic timeframe that will be followed for pursuing research, writing, and presenting scholarly and/or creative work. The Prospectus will outline expected changes, developments or enhancements to pedagogy, curricular development, etc. It should reflect the nature of the service work done by the candidate for promotion not only within the college and community, but also at the broader level of professional service (such as membership or leadership in professional organizations, etc.) Candidates will submit a portfolio of supplemental materials, like syllabi, scholarship, etc.
6. The First Post-Tenure Meeting should include all full professors in the faculty member's department, or on his/her review committee, and will be called by the provost, who will also be present. During the meeting, the full professors of the department/committee, the provost, and the candidate will engage in a discussion of the Post-Tenure prospectus. They will give feedback on the feasibility of the candidate's plans. Together, the candidate, provost, and department members should identify additional resources (if any) that are needed to accomplish those plans. Written feedback will be provided to the candidate, the provost, and the department in the form of an outline of notes from the meeting taken by

the chair of the department (if a full professor) or another full professor designated by the provost. These will not be prescriptive, but will rather serve as a written record of the conversation that was held. All members of that meeting will sign off on the notes to ensure that they adequately and accurately reflect the conversation.

7. During the fall term of the seventh year following the granting of tenure the faculty member will normally submit a Prospectus for Promotion to Full Professor. It will follow the same outline as the Post-Tenure Prospectus, but also will include specific reflection on how the candidate has progressed relative to the plans outlined in the Post-Tenure Prospectus and in the subsequent First Post-Tenure Meeting. **With their Prospectus for Promotion to Full, candidates will submit a portfolio that includes materials such as syllabi, scholarly publications, creative work, conference papers, etc.**
8. The full professors in the candidate's department or review committee will meet with the candidate during the Fall of the candidate's seventh year to discuss the Prospectus for Promotion to Full. This meeting is meant to ensure the collaborative and constructive nature of the review process and to discuss the candidate's contribution to the department's overall curriculum. **The department will review the candidate's scholarship or creative work so that they will be able to help the FPC contextualize the candidate's scholarly work.**
9. Following that meeting, the chair of the department (if a full professor) or another full professor designated by the provost, will prepare a letter, signed by all full professors in the department, summarizing the department's views on the Prospectus and dossier, and they will submit that letter to the provost. At the provost's discretion, the candidate and the provost may meet to discuss the candidate's Prospectus.
10. Before making decisions, the provost and the president will review and discuss the prospectus and dossier, the c.v., and the departmental letter with two full-professor members of the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC). If there are fewer than two full professors currently on the FPC, former members of the FPC will be asked to help evaluate the materials, to ensure that there are always at least two faculty representatives involved in this process. If there are unanswered questions or serious reservations concerning the candidate's promotion, then the provost and the president shall convene a meeting to discuss the candidate's case with the two FPC members and all the available full-professor members of the department or review committee. If the provost and the president make a positive decision, they will recommend the candidate's promotion to the Board of Trustees.

When a department has fewer than two full professors (or in other exceptional circumstances such as joint appointments), a Special Promotion Committee will be formed. This committee will function as full professors of a department for purposes of recommendation for promotion. The committee will normally be formed when a faculty member is awarded tenure. The provost and vice president for academic affairs will appoint the committee in consultation with the candidate and his or her department and/or program chair and with the advice of the Faculty Personnel Committee.

In the event of a decision to delay promotion, the provost will meet with the candidate and a full professor representing the department (usually the chair) to discuss the reasons for the delay and to formulate a revised plan. The candidate will be reconsidered for promotion the following year or later, as determined by the candidate in consultation with the provost.

Modification of timing: The above schema is to be considered normal. In exceptional circumstances, should the candidate, the provost, or the department wish to propose early or late consideration, such a request could be made. The timing for early consideration, for example, would involve the submission of the sixth-year report at the end of the fifth year.

Claremont McKenna

Promotion to Full Professor is also an important decision, because that academic rank is the highest a faculty member may attain. Persons who hold the position of Full Professor should therefore exemplify the teacher-scholar model and show by the quality of their own work a capacity to judge the work of others.

3.2.4.3 Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor should not be automatic. Before promotion to Full Professor occurs, clear signs should exist that a candidate's teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities are growing, not slackening, and that the candidate's other contributions to the College have continued at a high level.

3.2.5.4 Information on Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Schedule

The Dean of the Faculty gives all new and untenured faculty on tenure tracks, and all tenured faculty who have not reached the rank of Full Professor, information on the procedure and general schedule governing tenure and promotion decisions. Each individual is also given a timetable of the expected sequence of events in the review process, including the approximate dates when the Dean of the Faculty and the APT will commence review and the APT Committee will meet to make the recommendation on tenure and/or promotion to the Board of Trustees, via the President.

For candidates not previously tenured elsewhere, decisions in regard to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor normally shall be made in the third year of the second three-year contract. Contracts offered to such individuals may include a reduction in the probationary period prior to a tenure decision to account for time served at another institution.

Candidates previously tenured elsewhere normally will be considered for tenure no later than one year before their contract ends.

Consideration for promotion to Full Professor normally will occur during the seventh year in rank as a tenured Associate Professor.

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion are informed of the initiation of the review process before it begins and in time for them to compile and submit any necessary information and materials.

3.2.5.5 Review Procedures

The Dean of the Faculty begins the process by notifying candidates that they are eligible for consideration, asking if the candidates desire to be considered, and if so, requesting that the candidates submit a statement of their achievements in teaching, scholarship and research, and service, with supporting materials. A candidate's personal statement and curriculum vitae should follow guidelines available in the Dean of the Faculty's office. A candidate may request an earlier date of consideration, or a later date of consideration. A request for early consideration should also include a statement of achievements. (Sabbaticals and other leaves are normally included in years of service if they clearly contribute to the faculty member's professional advancement and are in the interests of the College.)

Requests for consideration for promotion, tenure, or reappointment are normally submitted on or about July 1. These requests will be accompanied by the candidate's statement and supporting materials. Any anticipated delay from the circumstances of an individual case must be resolved in advance by consultation between the Dean of the Faculty, the APT Committee and/or APT-EC, and the candidate's department.

Amended by APT February 10, 2006

As part of the candidate's tenure and promotion case, the Department will provide five arm's length reviews of the candidate's scholarship, and could provide up to three additional arm's-length or non-arm's length reviews. Normally, letters should be solicited by mid-July, and evaluators should be asked to submit their reviews in no more than one month of the receipt of the materials. The candidate shall suggest four names of potential referees. The candidate should also have the opportunity to advise the chair of names of individuals who might not be suitable referees. The Department may still seek to solicit letters in spite of the candidate's objection, but the candidate's objection to an evaluator must be noted in the departmental report. The department's list of potential referees should be drawn up after the receipt of this information from the candidate for tenure or promotion. It is the College's policy to protect the confidentiality of referees during the tenure process.

Amended by APT December 9, 2008

At least three of the total letters received must be from evaluators selected by the Department. Ideal outside evaluators are objective, credible, and highly respected in their field. To the degree possible, evaluators should be Full Professors. The five arm's length letters must come from evaluators who have no personal relationships with the candidate and are free from bias, including bias due to personal or professional relationships with the candidate. The department report should explain each evaluator's credentials, and, in any instance where a professional relationship exists or has existed between the evaluator and the candidate, the department report must describe that relationship. If the APT Committee or APT-EC concludes that specific letters could be viewed as insufficiently objective, it may ask the department or the FIS to obtain additional letters.

Adopted by APT April 7, 2006

The letters sent by the department to outside reviewers soliciting evaluations of the candidate's scholarship shall:

- Indicate whether the candidate is seeking tenure and/or promotion to either Associate Professor or Full Professor; ask the reviewer not whether the candidate would be promoted or granted tenure at the reviewer's institution but rather ask for an evaluation of the quality of the candidate's work and its significance, a comparison of the candidate to others at a similar stage in their careers, and a judgment concerning what the candidate can be expected to do in the future;
- Include the candidate's curriculum vitae, personal statement on scholarship, and scholarly materials agreed upon by the candidate and the department;
- Request from the reviewer a curriculum vitae and ask that the letter of evaluation briefly explain any relationship the reviewer may have with the candidate;
- Indicate that the department would be pleased to provide, if the reviewer so wishes, other materials listed on the vitae but not included with the letter;
- NOT include a list of the candidate's other evaluators;
- Be reviewed and approved by the APT-EC before they are sent. (A model letter, to which departments may add relevant information, is available from the Dean of the Faculty's office.)

When the Dean of the Faculty receives the candidate's statement and supporting materials, the Dean presents them to the APT-EC for a preliminary review (but no preliminary recommendation) in order to determine if the department should be requested to consider particular issues in its report. The APT-EC may also take into account other available information in making such a request. The Dean then requests a report from the department. The departmental report shall include not only a recommendation on tenure and/or promotion, but also a well-developed description and evaluation of the supporting factual evidence and of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

The department is expected normally to complete and submit its report to the APT-EC by October 15. In cases when the tenure process starts significantly later than July 1, completion of the departmental report will be expected within ten weeks of the submission of the candidate's materials to the Dean of the Faculty. Departments that fail to meet the deadline shall normally be judged to thereby have established their lack of interest in the results. The APT-EC should proceed to establish an FIS which shall assume the charge of the departmental review process, including the power to recommend.

Approved by APT May 17, 1979

Amended by APT December 12, 2008

The departmental report shall generally assess the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure, and must address the specific issues and questions posed by the APT-EC. Where feasible, the department report shall also provide a reasonable representation of both majority and minority views in the department. (A model departmental report template is available from the Dean of the Faculty's office.) In particular, the report shall include in the following order:

- a. A summary of the Department's recommendation and assessment, including the Department's vote, who was present for the vote, and who served on the review committee(s), including who was primarily responsible for each section of the report.
- b. A brief overview of the candidate's history, including when the candidate arrived at CMC, what the candidate's appointment was upon arrival, a biographical review, relevant information from prior CMC evaluations, and a statement assessing whether the candidate has met the academic need specified in the original search request and job description.
- c. A detailed assessment of the candidate's teaching based on a study of the candidate's course syllabi, grade distributions, an examination of student course evaluations, and interviews with a range of students (preferably a minimum of 12-15 students) who have taken the candidate's courses. The Dean of the Faculty's office has on file the standard interview instrument that the department is to utilize, with the understanding that it can be modified to meet the department's particular needs. Assessment of course evaluations should include a tabular comparison of the candidate's numerical scores with departmental and College averages controlled for core classes and electives across at least the following questions: instructor effectiveness, instructor recommended, learned a great deal, and course intellectually and academically challenging. The Department shall include information about all courses taught by the candidate at CMC. Comments should be solicited from alumni who are former students of the candidate. Each faculty member preparing for tenure consideration may be observed in the classroom by departmental colleagues. The Department will regulate the precise number and the timing of these observations according to its best judgment.
Approved by APT May 9, 1996
Amended by the Faculty November 16, 2015
- d. A substantive discussion of the candidate's scholarship that (a) describes in jargon-free language the candidate's research, (b) assesses its quality through a careful analysis of its argument and significance (as opposed to mere reference to the reputation of the journals and presses in which it has appeared), (c)

evaluates the candidate's past scholarly productivity and future research agenda and scholarly potential, (d) summarizes the evaluations (as well as the names, scholarly credentials and relationship, if any, to the candidate) of at least five outside reviewers on the candidate's scholarship. Individual comments from reviewers must not be attributed, and names and identifying characteristics of reviewers must be redacted from the departmental report when it is provided to the candidate. This summary must include both positive and negative points raised by the reviewers. If there are significant differences among reviewers, the report should note which of the evaluators are from the Department's list and which from the candidate's list, as well as which are arm's length and which (if any) are not. The full original letters should be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty's office along with the report.

If it is a tenure case, the research section should be written with reference to the Department's published standards for tenure, and a copy of those standards should be included as an appendix to the report.

e. A report of the candidate's service to the department, the College, the Claremont Colleges, the candidate's academic discipline, and the broader society. The APT Committee intends that these aspects of "service" will be considered in evaluating the teaching and scholarship of faculty members at CMC. This means sharing in the traditional administrative responsibilities of the College, including:

Service to Students through involvement in independent studies, thesis supervision, counseling, formal and informal extracurricular activities, and broad contribution to students' intellectual growth.

Service to One's Profession, such as holding office in a professional association and participation in conferences.

Service to the Outside Community, where related to one's scholarly pursuits.

The report should compare the candidate's level of service with the departmental norm and should take into account which service opportunities have been available.

Middlebury College

d. Review for Promotion to Professor

This review, which normally takes place no earlier than the fifth and no later than the tenth year (eighth year for faculty who were awarded tenure prior to 2011) following appointment to tenure, considers whether a candidate should be promoted to full professor and looks at continued excellence in teaching, achievement in scholarship, and service to the institution.

i. The Candidate

(a) To arrange with the department chair, or chair's designate, an appropriate schedule of classroom visits.

(b) If the candidate so desires, to invite other colleagues to visit classes.

(c) To submit to the department chair and to the Promotions Committee in a timely manner a complete vita, course syllabi, and other materials requested, as well as materials that the candidate thinks pertinent. For example, a faculty member may request the inclusion of personal comments or other materials with the course response forms which they believe may be useful in the interpretation of the forms. To submit to the program director, when relevant, a complete vita, syllabi from relevant courses, and an example of scholarly work.

(d) To submit to the Promotions Committee scholarly publications, and/or other appropriate evidence of scholarship or artistic achievement

(e) To arrange with members of the Promotions Committee an appropriate schedule of classroom visits.

(f) To write a self-evaluation that assesses the individual's career at Middlebury since promotion to tenure. The report should include an updated curriculum vitae, a schedule of courses taught since the previous review, and the faculty member's assessment of his or her research, teaching, publications and/or artistic performances, and service to the College. It should also contain a proposal for future professional development. The self-evaluation should be accompanied by pertinent publications, reviews of publications, and/or records and reviews of artistic performances, and it may, in addition, include letters of testimony from department chairs, program directors, colleagues, and/or outside professionals in the field.

(g) To furnish the Promotions Committee with a list of scholars or artists outside Middlebury who would be appropriate to evaluate the candidate's professional achievements. (This is not required for faculty who were awarded tenure prior to 2011.)

ii. Promotions Committee

(a) To have one of its members serve as a liaison to the faculty member during the review and to meet with the faculty member early in the term of the review, and later during that term if necessary or if requested by the candidate to explain the procedures for the review, answer any questions, and receive additional information the candidate considers pertinent to the review; the liaison will report on all conversations and relay full information to the full Promotions Committee. If the candidate requests as such, the liaison will arrange a meeting between the candidate and the full Promotions Committee.

(b) To review the teaching program, scholarly work, and administrative and other College service during the period since the granting of tenure.

(c) To examine the candidate's course response forms, publications, and other material submitted for the review.

(d) To have one or more of its members visit the candidate's classes.

(e) To solicit the recommendation of the candidate's department.

(f) To solicit, when relevant, the recommendation of the candidate's program.

(g) To solicit, as it deems appropriate, the opinions of students or recent alumni.

(h) To solicit from scholars outside the College an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or artistic production.

(i) To recommend to the president and provost whether or not the candidate should be promoted.

iii. Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty (VPAA/DoF)

(a) To collect and make available material requested by the Promotions Committee.

(b) To be available for consultation by the Promotions Committee, the president, and the provost.

(c) To ensure that the candidate knows the identity of all those scholars outside the College from whom the Promotions Committee seeks an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship.

iv. Department Chair

(a) To recommend, after reviewing the candidate's course response forms, making a classroom visit or visits, and reviewing the written recommendations of departmental colleagues who are full professors, whether or not the candidate should be promoted on grounds of continued excellence in teaching, achievement in scholarship, and service to the institution.

v. Program Director

(a) When relevant, to recommend, after consultation with programmatic colleagues who are full professors, and after classroom visit(s), whether or not the candidate should be promoted on grounds of continued excellence in teaching, achievement in scholarship, and service to the institution.

vi. Dean for Faculty Development and Research (DFDR)

(a) In the case of a review of a department chair or program director, to assume the role of chair or director for that review.

vii. Department Faculty Members who Hold the Rank of Professor

(a) To submit a letter of recommendation, when requested, to the Promotions Committee, with a copy to the department chair, that speaks to those aspects of a candidate's work with which he or she is familiar. Tenured faculty are expected to provide a letter upon request of the Committee, whether on academic leave or not.

(b) Upon the invitation of a candidate, to observe a class or classes and to meet with the candidate to discuss his or her performance in the class, with suggestions for possible improvement. Such meetings will be held before the end of the term during which the visits take place.

viii. President and Provost

(a) To become familiar with the candidate's case.

(b) To consult with the Promotions Committee and to discuss with the committee its recommendation.

ix. President

(a) To make the final decision and to notify the candidate.

e. Ten-Year Review

The ten-year review assesses professional achievements and service to the College and its curriculum since promotion to full professor, or since the last ten-year review, and seeks to aid in formulating plans for further growth and development.

i. The Candidate

(a) To write a self-evaluation that assesses the individual's career at Middlebury since promotion to full professor or since the last ten-year review. The report should include an updated curriculum vitae, a schedule of courses taught since the previous review, and the faculty member's assessment of his or her research, teaching, publications, and/or artistic performances, and service to the College. It should also contain a proposal for future professional development. The self-evaluation should be accompanied by pertinent publications, reviews of publications, and/or records and reviews of artistic performances, and it may, in addition, include letters of testimony from department chairs, program directors, colleagues, and/or outside professionals in the field.

ii. Reappointments Committee

(a) To have one of its members meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's report and any supporting material presented.

(b) To visit classes or to view videotapes of classroom performance if the Reappointments Committee considers it appropriate or should the candidate so request.

(c) To solicit, as it deems appropriate, the opinions of students or recent alumni.

(d) To consult course response forms.

(e) To consult, as it deems appropriate, the department chair, program director, or other senior colleagues.

(f) To draft a letter expressing its conclusions from the review. This letter will be sent first to the faculty member who may choose to respond to the Reappointments Committee's letter in writing and/or to request a meeting with the committee. The Reappointments Committee will then submit to the provost and the VPAA/DoF copies of the revised letter and any written response from the faculty member.

iii. Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty (VPAA/DoF)

(a) To meet with the Reappointments Committee when requested.

(b) As appropriate, to recognize unusually distinguished service, or to consider action with respect to problems that have become apparent during the review.

(c) To discuss, as appropriate, with the faculty member under review ways in which the College might help that person attain his or her goals for professional growth.

Pomona College

Responsibilities of the Department

Each department must file with the Dean of the College's office a policy as to who participates in the review process concerning initial departmental assessments, contract renewals, tenure and promotion to associate professor, and promotion to full professor. This policy should be discussed and decided by the department. At the end of the spring semester prior to a fall review (and at the end of the fall semester prior to a spring review), the department chair will determine, in consultation with other members of the department as appropriate, and in light of the department's policy, those department members who will participate in the review. Faculty on tenure-track appointments who have not yet received tenure, and faculty on multi-year, non-tenurable contracts who have not been promoted to the rank of associate professor, may choose to recuse themselves from any level of personnel review. Tenured associate professors and associate professors on non-tenurable contracts may choose to recuse themselves from reviews for promotion to full professor. Those choosing to recuse themselves from a personnel review will not read the file compiled by the candidate and the department, will not participate in the department meeting or sign the department letter, will not submit a confidential individual letter to the Faculty Personnel Committee, and will not be interviewed by the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) subcommittee (see *Faculty Personnel Committee Review of the Candidate*, below). The same will apply to those who are asked, or who choose, to recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest. The department may also decide to limit reviews for promotion to full professor to those holding the rank of full professor; in these cases, those excluded from the review by the action of the department will not have access to the file compiled by the candidate and the department and will not participate in the department meeting or sign the department letter, but may submit a confidential individual letter to the Faculty Personnel Committee and may be interviewed by the FPC subcommittee.

The department then assembles appropriate surveys of student views of the quality of the candidate's teaching (see *Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness*, below) and solicits outside scholarly or artistic opinion (see *Evaluation of Scholarly and/or Artistic Accomplishment*, below).

Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The Faculty Personnel Committee requires that all department recommendations pertaining to contract renewal, advancement to tenure, and promotion include evidence as to the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching.

Toward this end, teaching evaluations are conducted during the final two weeks of each semester in all courses taught by professors who may in future be reviewed for contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion. Given that learning goals vary widely according to course, field, and discipline, the professor is welcome to devise an evaluation form for each class in consultation with the department and the Teaching & Learning Committee, as appropriate. Each separate evaluation form must be approved by the Dean of the College before distribution to students. Professors have the option of paper evaluations or electronic evaluations. For paper evaluations, the professor designates a student in each course to distribute the forms, collect them, and return them to the departmental academic coordinator. The professor should not be present, and students should be advised that their evaluations are anonymous and will not be shared with him or her until after grades have been submitted for the semester. If the professor chooses electronic evaluations, the evaluations will be conducted during class time. The professor will provide an electronic link to the form, and the responses will be collected digitally. The completed evaluations are to be stored in a secure location within the department, and a copy provided to the professor after that semester's grades

have been submitted.

In addition, in the semester before a Faculty Personnel Committee review, the department chair will write to solicit a written teaching evaluation from all students in all courses, including independent studies, taught by the candidate since his or her last review. Senior thesis advisees should also be solicited. Additionally, the candidate may request that the chair solicit letters from major advisees. A template for the chair's solicitation letter is provided in the Appendix to Chapter II, Section B, of this Faculty Handbook. Departures from this template must be approved by the Dean of the College with the agreement of the candidate. It is suggested that the students be solicited no later than May 1 (or November 1 for spring reviews). These students should be asked to identify the courses taken and terms during which they took courses with the faculty member, as well as their College. The Registrar can supply the necessary student names. A copy of the letter of solicitation should be included in the dossier that is eventually sent to the Dean and the Faculty Personnel Committee. Students may submit their letters of evaluation by electronic mail. The

Department Chair will have the responsibility to maintain the confidentiality of all student letters while they are under review by the department/program members. Anonymous letters cannot be used in the review. The chair should send two reminders to each non-responding student.

The candidate is not responsible for the solicitation of student evaluations for review purposes, and should not discuss the review with prospective student reviewers, in order to make it possible to provide the fairest possible evaluation.

Evaluation of Scholarly and/or Artistic Accomplishment

In addition to the evaluation of scholarly and/or artistic accomplishment made by other Pomona College faculty and summarized in the department's recommendation to the Faculty Personnel Committee, the department will seek written appraisals from recognized experts outside the College. A template for the chair's letter to these outside referees is provided in the Appendix to Chapter II, Section B, of this Faculty Handbook. Departures from this template must be approved by the Dean of the College with the agreement of the candidate. Although known for their scholarly or artistic expertise, some among these outside referees should be working in or familiar with liberal arts colleges comparable to Pomona College. The names of the outside referees proposed by the department from both the candidate's and the department's lists, along with a rationale for their selection, must be submitted to the Dean for approval before the chair formally solicits their evaluation of the candidate's work. The department chair should obtain written evaluations from three such persons for reappointment reviews, or for reviews of faculty on rolling contract, and from six for tenure or promotion reviews. (As noted above under *Responsibilities of the Candidate*, in the former case, two of these evaluators should be chosen from a list submitted by the candidate; in the latter case, three.)

In soliciting scholarly or artistic judgments, departments should endeavor to provide primarily new referees for each review of a candidate. Letters from referees suggested by the candidate should be so identified in the dossier. Note that Pomona College does not pay an honorarium to reviewers for faculty.

Preparation of a Departmental Letter

By August 15 (or January 15 for spring reviews), the chair makes the materials the candidate has prepared, along with the course evaluations and the letters from students and outside reviewers, available for review by the department and the Faculty Personnel Committee. The chair calls a meeting of members of the department to discuss the faculty member's case, and then prepares for the Faculty Personnel Committee a

written recommendation letter framed so as to reflect the views of the department. Department members who are on leave are normally expected to participate in all stages of reviews. They may opt out when travel plans or other leave activities would impair their ability to read the file, take part in the departmental discussion, or submit a confidential individual letter to the Faculty Personnel Committee. (The choice to opt out because one is on leave is not the same as recusal. For recusal, see “Responsibilities of the Department,” above.) If faculty members on leave do not participate in one stage of the process, they do not participate at all. The departmental letter should be based upon a consideration of the evidence in light of all of the criteria for reviews. It is intended that this letter be frank and that differences of opinion between members of the department be noted. All confidential materials which are reviewed shall be kept confidential by the department members.

Any members of the department who are eligible to sign the departmental letter but who do not sign this letter because it does not fully represent their opinions must each submit a separate statement of their opinions to the Faculty Personnel Committee as an addendum to the departmental letter. This addendum will be made available to the other department members who participated in the review. (For its availability to the candidate, see *Discussion of the Departmental Letter with the Candidate*, below.) The departmental recommendation is delivered by September 15 (or February 1 for spring reviews) to the Dean of the College, who makes it available to the members of the Faculty Personnel Committee.

By September 22 (or February 8 for spring reviews), each individual participating in the review, including the chair, submits a confidential individual letter to the Dean of the College expressing his/her views of the case. Failure to submit such an individual letter by this date will be interpreted by the Faculty Personnel Committee as full support for the departmental letter (or for any dissenting addendum signed by that faculty member). The Dean makes these confidential individual letters available to the Faculty Personnel Committee, but they are not shared with the candidate, the chair, or other department members. At this point, the department’s dossier should be considered complete, though additional previously solicited reviews can be added until the subcommittee report is written.

Faculty members may have connections with other programs or departments, either intercollegiate (for example, Chicano/a–Latino/a Studies Department, Intercollegiate Department of Africana Studies, Gender and Women’s Studies, Asian American Studies) or within Pomona College. The first type of connection is a formal joint appointment, where the faculty member is contractually connected to a home department or program at Pomona College and to a second department or program, intercollegiate or within Pomona College. The second type is affiliation, where the faculty member is contractually connected to a department at Pomona but the job description included and subsequent teaching continued a participation in another program or department. The third is an entirely voluntary association between a faculty member and a second department or program, without any inclusion in the job description or necessary continuing association in the form of teaching involvement. All confidential materials which are reviewed shall be kept confidential by the members of any additional program or department that participates in the review.

If the candidate is jointly appointed, then the second program or department must either assemble its own dossier or have the chair or coordinator and at least three other members of the program or department review the dossier assembled by the first department or program, and must write an independent letter of evaluation of the candidate or participate with the first department in writing a joint letter. The first and second department or program decide these matters together before beginning to assemble a dossier. The program or department members who reviewed the dossier must either sign the letter or send a separate letter documenting their opinions. The letter may be signed (or a separate letter sent) only by program or department members who have reviewed the dossier.

If an affiliation between the candidate and a second program or department was included as part of the job description when the faculty member was hired, and if there is a current ongoing teaching involvement with the second program or department, then a letter commenting upon the candidate's performance will be part of the dossier for review by the Faculty Personnel Committee. The candidate may decide whether the second program or department chair and up to three faculty members may review the departmental dossier. Letters written without departmental dossier review may be signed by the program coordinator or department chair, but they are expected to reflect the opinion of the other members of the program or department. If the department or program does review the departmental dossier, then those who reviewed it must either sign the letter or send a separate letter documenting their opinions; the letter may be signed (or a separate letter sent) only by program or department members who have reviewed the dossier.

If an association with another department or program was initiated voluntarily by the faculty member, he or she may decide whether that department or program will be included in the review process. If it is included in the review, its contribution will be in the form of a letter commenting upon the candidate's performance with respect to that program or department, and there will be no assembly of a dossier. If the candidate agrees, the program coordinator and up to three program members may review the dossier assembled by the candidate's first department. If not, then the letter will be written purely from the perspective of the faculty in the second program or department. Letters written without dossier review may be signed by the program coordinator or department chair, but they are expected to reflect the opinion of the other members of the program or department. If the department or program does review the dossier, then those who reviewed it must either sign the letter or send a separate letter documenting their opinions; the letter may be signed (or a separate letter sent) only by program or department members who have reviewed the dossier.

If in any case involving participation in more than one program or department, either intercollegiate or within Pomona College, there is a divided recommendation, the Faculty Personnel Committee will weigh the merits of the evidence and will make its own recommendation.

Progress toward Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of full professor is based entirely on meritorious performance of duties according to the "Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure" that are listed above. A nomination may be made by an individual's department chair or by any member of the Cabinet. In the fourth year in rank, associate professors meet with the Dean of the College and a senior colleague (chosen in consultation with the Dean) to discuss their plan toward meeting the standards for promotion to the rank of professor. A written summary of the meeting will be shared by the Dean of the College with the associate professor, who may at their discretion share the summary with the department/programs that will be involved in the promotion process. In order to guard against oversights, the College will contact associate professors reaching the eighth year in rank to revisit their path toward promotion to rank of professor.

Because promotion depends on merit, elevation to rank of professor is not automatic. When a promotion is not deemed appropriate, the Faculty Personnel Committee endeavors to provide informed and helpful advice to the candidate, in order to indicate what activities will enhance the prospect of a successful candidacy in the future. This advice will be conveyed orally to the candidate by the Dean of the College,

and a written summary will be provided to the candidate and placed in the candidate's file in the office of the Dean of the College for consideration by the candidate's department, the subcommittee, and the Faculty Personnel Committee in the candidate's next review for promotion to the rank of full professor. Normally, candidates will be considered for promotion only once in a two-year period.

The preparation for the review for promotion to full professor takes place during the fall semester; the Faculty Personnel Committee conducts its part of the process during the following spring semester.

Faculty Personnel Committee Review of the Candidate

To encourage full candor in both written and oral communications, members of the subcommittee and the Faculty Personnel Committee overall will treat with confidentiality the views and information presented or discussed in the review. They may consult with the Dean of the College or the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs but otherwise will not discuss a review outside the formal deliberations of the subcommittee or of the Faculty Personnel Committee. The candidate shall take no action to compromise the confidentiality of confidential views or information presented to the subcommittee and the Faculty Personnel Committee by his or her outside or inside evaluators consulted in the review. A subcommittee of three Faculty Personnel Committee members reviews the department's recommendation. Ordinarily, the subcommittee includes two members who were elected from the same division as the department making the recommendation and one member elected from another division. A member of the Faculty Personnel Committee who is also a member of the candidate's department may not serve on this subcommittee. In addition, to the extent possible, no member of the Faculty Personnel Committee will serve on more than six subcommittees during any one semester. The subcommittee assignments will be approved by the full Faculty Personnel Committee prior to reviewing cases.

The subcommittee brings to bear the perspective of the College as a whole, and it may supplement the evidence provided by the department, including by conducting confidential interviews of individual faculty members. The Faculty Personnel Committee subcommittee, informed by the full dossier, will use its best efforts to give advance notice to the candidate and any others who are to be interviewed of major issues the subcommittee believes will be addressed in the interviews. As part of its review, the subcommittee always interviews the candidate and invites him or her to respond to any major issues that have been identified. If other persons are interviewed, the candidate is interviewed last. After the candidate's interview, he or she may provide the subcommittee within 48 hours a written response addressing any issues that have arisen. This response will be taken into account by the subcommittee and will be part of the permanent record. Should additional negative information arrive at any stage following the interview and before the subcommittee report is submitted to the full Faculty Personnel Committee, the candidate must be re-interviewed and allowed to respond, with a further 48 hours given to the candidate to submit a written response if he or she wishes to do so. The subcommittee writes for the Faculty Personnel Committee a confidential memorandum which is signed by all members of the subcommittee.

In a case of promotion to full professor, the process begins with evidence collection in the fall and the Faculty Personnel Committee conducts its part of the process in the spring immediately following. The subcommittee, in addition to the three members of the Faculty Personnel Committee, includes two members of the Cabinet who are not members of the candidate's department. These two members of the Cabinet are appointed by the Agenda Committee of the Cabinet, after it has consulted with the Dean of the College. As in other reviews, the chair of the subcommittee is a member of the Faculty Personnel Committee. The participating Cabinet members attend the entire meeting of the Faculty Personnel Committee at which the vote is taken, but do not vote, though they may participate in the discussion.

Normally, a full professor is the chair of a subcommittee considering promotion to full professor.

The subcommittee presents its statement of the case to the full Faculty Personnel Committee, which, after consideration of the evidence and discussion of the case, takes a secret ballot vote. Elected members of the Faculty Personnel Committee who are the candidate's departmental colleagues and others who might have a possible conflict of interest will not be present for that part of the discussion and will not vote on that case. In case of doubt, the Dean of the College or, if necessary, the President should be consulted about possible conflicts of interest. The President, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, and the Associate Dean of the College who serves as Diversity Officer do not participate in reviews within their department but do participate in the Faculty Personnel Committee consideration of those reviews. The vote to accept or reject the subcommittee's report constitutes the Committee's advice to the President in the case. In the event that the Faculty Personnel Committee votes to advise the President in a manner contrary to the subcommittee's report, the Dean of the College or someone else designated by the President writes a second report that expresses the change of thinking represented by the Faculty Personnel Committee's advice. This report is reviewed at a subsequent meeting of the Faculty Personnel Committee.

The Role of the President

The President, in making nominations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure to the Cabinet, reports the votes of the Faculty Personnel Committee. The Dean reads the subcommittee's report, or the second report accepted in its place, identifying the authors of the report and omitting any personal attribution of commentary. In cases of nomination for reappointment where promotion or tenure is not involved, the Dean may read a summary of the report.

Swarthmore College

II. Promotions

(Dossiers due Tuesday, December 6, 2022)

Promotion to Associate Professor or full Professor is normally, but not always initiated by the candidate's department. While tenure and reappointment decisions must be made by stipulated deadlines, there is no requirement that promotion reviews occur at any fixed point. The candidate's experience and accomplishments will usually determine the timing: consideration for promotion to Associate Professor usually coincides with a tenure review, and candidates for full Professor are not usually eligible until they are in their eighth year as Associate Professor. This later review need not automatically take place in the eighth year, though we expect that faculty achievements will warrant promotion no later than the tenth year as an Associate Professor.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is not automatic, but based on professional accomplishment, teaching, and service; achievement in all three areas is expected. In this context, professional accomplishment means a significant contribution to the field, as demonstrated by one or more of the following: (a) scholarly publication, or artistic production; (b) service to the profession, such as editing, writing textbooks, and organizing conferences; and (c) sustained intellectual engagement. A promotion review involves an external review of the evidence for professional accomplishment; this accomplishment must be substantial and in a form that can be evaluated by off-campus referees. The promotion evaluation should focus on activities since tenure (or previous promotion) was awarded. Please be sure to ask departmental colleagues and external referees to comment on work since tenure and provide the latter with copies of pertinent material, rather than counting on familiarity or expecting evaluators to search out a bibliography.

Student letters, too, should be solicited only from students taught since tenure. In the spring, before a candidate for promotion to full Professor submits materials for circulation, including to external reviewers, the department Chair and the candidate should agree on what will be included in the dossier. Should all the planned scholarly materials not be ready for assessment, it would then be appropriate to consider deferring the review.

Once you have consulted with the candidate, you must notify me, no later than June 1, 2022, of your interest in proceeding with a promotion review. At that point, we can decide together on the appropriateness of a review.

Preparation of dossiers for promotion to one of the senior ranks should follow the model of tenure dossiers outlined in Section I: Tenure. All elements apply here with modifications to items 8 and 10 as specified below:

8. Letters about the candidate requested from four (not six as in the tenure dossiers) or more Swarthmore colleagues outside the candidate's department, in fields both "related to" and "remote from" the candidate's field. The candidate should name half of these colleagues outside the department and all tenured members of the department should agree on the other half. Candidates are requested to give a rank-ordered list of at least five names so that if any Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department chooses not to write, there are other colleagues to ask. Candidates may "veto" one Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department. Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate), and publications.

10. Letters from approximately 20 (not 25 as in the tenure dossier) of the candidate's students, including those currently enrolled and recent graduates, those who have done extensive work with the candidate, those who have taken introductory courses, those who are very strong students, and those whose performance was average or weak. Electronic letters, including those sent through a body of an email, are acceptable. Where appropriate, the opinions of advisees of the candidate would also be helpful. The candidate should be asked to name half of the 20 students and the tenured members of the department should name the other half.

Candidates may veto up to three students. Students should not receive any documents within the dossier.

Note: For promotion reviews, letters should be solicited from students taught since the tenure review. In all cases, both currently enrolled students and recent alumni can (and should) be solicited.

Note: You will need to request letters from a larger number of students in order to receive the 20 required for the dossier; both your list and that of the candidate should be longer, at least 20 names each, but there should be approximately equal numbers of students solicited that were chosen by the candidate and by the department. You probably will need to send a reminder to those who have not replied. If you send a reminder, be sure that you send it to all those whose letters are still outstanding.

Any variation from the model outlined for promotion dossiers should be discussed with the Associate Dean of Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention and/or the Provost.

Promotion dossiers should also be sent to my office by December 6, 2022.

Vassar College

Promotion to Full Professor

a. Preceding Year

March 2 (1) Dean of the Faculty:

The dean of the faculty notifies faculty members when first eligible for promotion from associate professor to full professor in the next academic year with a copy to their department chairs.

April 1 (1) Faculty:

Faculty members eligible for promotion from associate to full professor in the next academic year must by this time notify the dean of the faculty of their intention to be reviewed or not for promotion, with a copy to their department chair.

(2) Faculty and Chairs:

Faculty whose review for promotion from associate to full professor requires the formation of an ad hoc committee submit to the dean of the faculty suggestions for the committee. The department chair, or senior full professor, should also submit a list.

(3) Faculty:

Faculty being reviewed for promotion from associate to full professor who would like a multidisciplinary program review must submit a request in writing to the program director with a copy to the Dean of the Faculty and the chair of the home department.

May 1 (1) Chairs or Directors and Faculty:

Chairs and faculty submit to the dean names of six outside evaluators of the research of each member of the department who is to be reviewed for promotion to full professor. The names shall be ranked in order of preference; such ranking will be among the factors considered by FASC and the dean of the faculty in the selection of evaluators. Indication must be given of the specific qualifications of the proposed evaluators to undertake the review. Brief published biographical entries from the Directory of American Scholars or other professional directories are especially helpful. Full titles and addresses must be included. The dean of the faculty and FASC in conference will make the selection of outside evaluators from the names proposed by the faculty members and the chairs.

b. Year of Review

Sept. 2 (1) Faculty PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR: Faculty being reviewed for promotion to full professor submit electronically:

c.v. and statement for outside evaluators

personal statement / research statement

teaching portfolio

publications, manuscript materials or other documentary evidence

Materials should be sent to facultyreviews@vassar.edu with a cc to the Department Chair.

Candidates will receive additional instructions on how to submit materials in advance of the review.

*NOTE: Those being reviewed by an ad hoc committee should deliver a copy of their materials to the chair of the ad hoc committee.

Nov. 2 (1) Dean

Outside evaluations due to the dean of the faculty.

Nov. 9 (1) Chairs

Chairs of departments submit to the Dean of the Faculty a signed copy of the final and fully documented recommendations for associate professors being reviewed for promotion. Partial review letters should also be submitted by this day.

NOTE: All departmental recommendations must be signed by all eligible members of the department. At the time the recommendation is submitted to the Dean of the Faculty, the candidate will be provided with a copy of the full recommendation modified so as to indicate the numerical vote but not the votes of the individual voting members. If a separate minority report is submitted, this minority report will also be provided to the candidate with the names of those signing it deleted. The chair shall also meet with the candidate to discuss this report and the remainder of the review process.

Dec. 11 (1) Dean The dean notifies chairs of any questions or objections addressed to departmental recommendations for promotions to full professor in order to allow for consultation with the president prior to final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Dec. 18 (1) President The president notifies faculty members under consideration for promotion to full professor of final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Mar. 5 (1) President The president informs those concerned of actions taken by the Board of Trustees on recommendations regarding promotion to full professor

Wellesley College

ARTICLE X. PROMOTION POLICIES

In judging qualifications of candidates for promotion, the CFA will evaluate their records for evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Reference will be made to teaching ability, scholarly strength and growth including research potential and publication, service to the College, including assumption of departmental and College-wide responsibilities, and external professional activities. In addition to published work, a promotion dossier may include work in progress. In the case of promotion to Full Professor, only teaching, scholarly activity, and service after tenure will be considered. Procedures for review are described in Article IX, Section 6.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will ordinarily occur when an Assistant Professor is granted tenure (see Article IX, Section 3.B.2). A candidate for promotion to the rank of Full Professor will ordinarily be reviewed in the seventh year in rank as Associate Professor. However, individual flexibility is appropriate in the timing of this decision. For the purpose of review in the sixth year in rank, an early promotion review may be initiated by the Reappointments and Promotion Committee on behalf of a candidate with a particularly strong record in all review categories. The Reappointments and Promotion Committee should send a letter initiating such a review to the Dean of the College by October 15 of the year in which the review will take place.

If a review does not result in promotion to Full Professor, the candidate, after consultation with his or her Reappointments and Promotion Committee, may request another review in any subsequent year. The candidate will be reviewed for merit no later than the third year after an unsuccessful promotion review.

In any event that a promotion review has not been requested by the eighth year in rank, the candidate will be reviewed for merit in that year and at three year intervals.

“Publication” is a flexible and evolving term defined according to the norms and production timetables of each discipline. It includes creative and artistic work that is presented in public venues as well as traditional scholarship.

Williams College

Section II-N: Evaluation of Associate Professors and Promotion to Full Professor

The decision concerning promotion to full professor is made by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions with the guidance of a report from the full professors of the evaluating unit.¹ Associate professors are normally considered for promotion in the sixth year in rank as associate professor, though promotion to full may take place either earlier or later than the *end of the sixth year*. Early promotion is rare. If an evaluating unit wishes to recommend promotion before the sixth year, the Promotion to Full report should be filed early, in the year in which promotion is recommended to take place. In all other cases the report is written in the sixth year. Full professors on leave must either participate fully in the evaluation process of all associate professors or submit a letter evaluating the work of each candidate.

The evaluating unit will also file an interim report concerning the progress of the associate professor since tenure in the fall of the fourth year in rank.

The fundamental question to be answered in evaluating associate professors for promotion to full professor is: have they so far fulfilled the prediction of success in teaching, scholarship, and service that was made in granting them tenure? It will be important to consider whether the associate professor has maintained a 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; and has continued to contribute to the college community and to the profession. Most generally speaking, has the candidate been able to assume the responsibility that comes with tenure in an effective and professional manner?

The Interim Progress Report

In the fall of the fourth year in rank, the full professors of the evaluating unit write a progress report for consideration by the CAP. Full professors on leave must either participate fully in the evaluation process of all associate professors or submit a letter evaluating the work of each candidate. This review is analogous to the staffing report for an untenured faculty member in a no-decision year, and forms the basis for a letter, sent to the associate professor by the CAP, commenting on the progress to date. The associate professor submits a current CV, and a brief self-assessment, and the evaluating unit includes these materials as well as SCS results in their evaluation of the associate professor's progress. The interim progress report contains a description of the associate professor's teaching, scholarship and service since tenure and a brief assessment of this work by the full professors. The evaluating unit also, in consultation with the associate professor, solicits input concerning contributions to other academic units, and includes this information in their deliberations and in their report. Should an evaluating unit be considering a recommendation of promotion to full before the sixth year, it would be appropriate for the interim report to discuss this possibility.

The Promotion-to-Full-Professor Report

The Promotion to Full report is a systematic and serious assessment of each associate professor in their sixth year in rank, to be carried out by the full professors of the evaluating unit. Full professors on leave must either participate fully in the evaluation process of all associate professors or submit a letter evaluating the work of each candidate.

The evaluating unit submits to the CAP a written evaluation of each associate professor's teaching, scholarship, and service as well as a clear account of how the evaluation was conducted. The material to be reviewed by the full professors includes but is not limited to a written self-evaluation by the associate professor, a current CV,

¹ *The "evaluating unit" refers to the academic unit, or units, that evaluated the associate professor at the time of tenure. If this unit was an evaluation committee, the Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the CAP, will name an evaluation committee made up of full professors, which will conduct the evaluation of the associate professor. If a Chair of a relevant department or program is not a full professor, the Dean of the Faculty will designate a full professor to convene the full professors in that unit and coordinate the writing of the report.*

SCS results, and, if relevant, reports on contributions to other departments or programs. The associate professor may submit additional materials, and the evaluating unit may request additional materials deemed helpful in providing a full assessment. The use of external evaluators of scholarship is rare. If external evaluators are used, they are selected in consultation with the associate professor and the full professors of the evaluating unit, and are approved by the Dean of the Faculty and the CAP.

The report includes a recommendation regarding the timing for the associate professor's promotion to full professor and sets forth explicitly the considerations and criteria on which the recommendation is based. When requested by the CAP or the evaluating unit, the full professors and the CAP will meet to discuss the case.

Years at Williams	Calendar
-------------------	----------

6th year 6th year in rank as Assistant Professor, with **tenure decision** in fall and **promotion to Associate Professor** on 7/1

7th year	1st year in rank as Associate Professor
----------	---

8th year - normally on leave 2nd year in rank as Associate Professor

9th year	3rd year in rank as Associate Professor
----------	---

10th year 4th year in rank as Associate Professor: **interim progress report** in fall

11th year	5th year in rank as Associate Professor
-----------	---

12th year - normally on leave 6th year in rank as Associate Professor: **promotion-to-full-professor decision** in January; **promotion to Full Professor** typically would occur on 7/1²

The decision by the CAP is communicated to the associate professor in writing. The CAP explains the reasons for its decision, and, when relevant, details the expectations to be fulfilled before promotion.