

TENURE & PROMOTION TIMELINE FOR 2011-12 CANDIDATES

| | |
|---|--|
| January 18, 2011 | Tenure & Promotion Workshop |
| March 1, 2010 | <p>II.B.1.e. of <i>Policy</i>: Tenure track faculty members who become parents during the probationary period will automatically receive a one-year extension of the probationary period.</p> <p>Tenure track faculty members who wish to decline the extension will notify the Provost by March 1 in order to be considered for tenure in the fall of that calendar year.</p> |
| March 2011 | President sends letter to all candidates eligible to stand for tenure and promotion in the next academic year (copies to chairs/directors). |
| April 2011 | Deans meet with tenure and promotion candidates. Deans and General Counsel meet with chairs/directors of tenure and promotion candidates. |
| April 2011 | President sends memo to chairs/directors of all associate professors eligible to stand for promotion in the next academic year (copies to associate professors). |
| April 2011 | Deans meet with promotion candidates. Deans and General Counsel meet with chairs/directors of promotion candidates. |
| May 1, 2011 | Tenure and promotion candidates and departments each submit a list of four (minimum) potential outside reviewers. |
| May 2011 | Tenure & Promotion Workshop (faculty members may attend as often as they wish) |
| June 1, 2011 | Promotion candidates and departments each submit a list of four (minimum) potential outside reviewers. |
| May/June 2011 | Outside reviewer lists are reviewed and approved by President and Provost. |
| May/June/July/August 2011 | Requests for participation are sent to potential outside reviewers. Follow-up and additional requests are made. Four reviewers are secured for each candidate (2 from candidate list and 2 from department list). |
| September 8, 2011 (first day of classes) | <p>Candidates submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 2 copies of the dossier for the Committee; – 8 copies each of the curriculum vitae, statement, and record of teaching form for the Committee; – 4 copies of the dossier labeled for outside reviewers; – 1 copy of the dossier directly to the department (2 copies, if the department is large). |

TENURE & PROMOTION TIMELINE FOR 2011-12 CANDIDATES

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| mid-September 2011 | Dossiers, accompanied by a letter from the President outlining evaluation criteria, are mailed to outside reviewers. |
| September 2011 | Memo sent to candidates providing names of outside reviewers (copies to chairs/directors). |
| September 2011 | Committee's monthly meetings begin. |
| October/November 2011 | Two Committee members are assigned as readers for each candidate. Committee members begin reading of dossiers. |
| November 1, 2011 | Outside reviewer letters are due. |
| October/November 2011 | Upon receipt, copies of outside reviewer letters are sent to chairs/directors. |
| December 1, 2011 | Departmental recommendations, H2 (promotion), and H3 (tenure) forms are due. |
| December 1, 2011 | No new materials may be added to the dossier. |
| October/November/ December 2011 | Committee members receive for each candidate: CV, statement, record of teaching, course critiques, outside reviewer letters, unsolicited letters of recommendation, and departmental recommendations. |
| Mid-December 2011 | Committee meets for first review of all cases. |
| December 22, 2011 | Date by which departments receive notification if they are required to meet with the Committee in January. (Individuals also may request a meeting with Committee for January.) |
| January 15, 2012 | Last day to submit new information regarding materials already in dossier. |
| January 15, 2012 | Last day Committee will receive unsolicited letters. |
| January 2012 | Committee meets for discussions, meetings with departments and candidates, and deliberations. (Meetings can continue into February.) |
| March 2012 | Board of Trustees meets to review and approve recommendations of the Committee. |
| March 3, 2012 | Outcome letters are delivered to candidates by courier. |
| June 1, 2012 | Date by which candidates and departments are required to receive notification. |

Dear «eval_salutation»,

To expedite matters, I send you via e-mail the following letter from Provost Schuster requesting your participation in the «review_for» review of «cand_title» Professor of «cand_dept», «cand_firstname» «cand_lastname». Your positive response would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Hayley Spizz

May 1, 2011

«eval_name_»
«eval_address_1»
«eval_address_2»
«eval_address_3»
«eval_address_4»
«eval_address_5»

Dear «eval_salutation»:

«cand_firstname» «cand_lastname», «cand_title» Professor of «cand_dept» at Smith College, is being considered for «review_for» in 2011-12, and your name has been suggested as a colleague in the field who might be consulted for an outside review of «cand_pronoun» work.

I am writing to inquire whether it would be possible for you to help us by undertaking a review of «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s scholarship and sending us your comments on it by November 1, 2011. It is the policy at Smith College to secure only four outside reviewers for a candidate; thus an evaluation from you would constitute 25% of «cand_pronoun» external review. It is also our policy to request letters from colleagues who do not know the candidate well, so that collaborators and Ph.D. advisors or committee members will not be included among the four outside reviewers. If you are able to help in this review, a packet of materials, including a curriculum vitae, a personal statement by the candidate, and copies of «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s recent publications will be sent to you as soon as possible after September 8.

We would be glad to receive your response via email to Hayley Spizz, Secretary to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, at hspizz@smith.edu, or by phone to (413) 585-3005. We place a heavy burden on colleagues these days, and I am sure that you receive many requests of this type each year. Nonetheless, if you were able to put aside some time for us, I would very much appreciate your help. If you have any questions about this process, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marilyn R. Schuster
Provost and Dean of the Faculty

MRS/hs

September 8, 2011

«eval_name_»
«eval_address_1»
«eval_address_2»
«eval_address_3»
«eval_address_4»
«eval_address_5»

Dear «eval_salutation»:

Thank you very much for agreeing to provide the Committee on Tenure and Promotion with an assessment of the work submitted by «cand_firstname» «cand_lastname». The Committee will be considering «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname» for «review_for». The members of the Committee would be grateful for your frank assessment of «cand_pronoun» scholarly achievement and promise. We have found that the evaluations that are most helpful to us are those that comment on the substance of the dossier in some detail and that place the contributions of the candidate in a larger context. The following questions provide guidelines in evaluating «cand_pronoun» scholarship, as reflected in the enclosed work or from your personal knowledge.

- Do you know this candidate, and, if so, for how long and in what capacity?
- How does the research rank in quality in comparison to that of others in «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s field at similar stages in their careers?
- What are some of its specific strengths and weaknesses?
- How would you assess its originality, methodological soundness, reliability, and significance to «cand_pronoun» field?
- Are you familiar with the journals/publishers in which «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s work appears? If so, how would you assess their quality?
- Do you see in «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s work evidence of scholarly growth and promise since receipt of the Ph.D.?

- Would you please comment on how collaborative work is viewed in this field? If you have any knowledge of «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s contribution to jointly authored works, please provide your assessment of «cand_pronoun» contributions in those works.

«eval_name »

September 8, 2011

Page Two

The Committee welcomes any additional comments you may wish to make on «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s professional achievements. I would like to add that, in reaching its decision, the Committee considers a number of factors in addition to scholarship, including achievement in teaching and service to the college, which we are not asking you to evaluate.

The «cand_dept» Department must make its formal recommendation on the question of «review_for» for «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname» by December 1, 2011. Therefore, we would appreciate **receiving your comments by November 1** so that the Department can consider them in making its recommendation. Please send your comments to:

**President Carol T. Christ, Chair
Committee on Tenure & Promotion
College Hall 206
Smith College
Northampton, MA 01063
Attention: Hayley Spizz**

Our Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College requires that the candidate and the Department be apprised of the names of the outside evaluators, and further stipulates that your letter will remain confidential with the members of the Department eligible to vote on this candidate and with the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The Committee would find it helpful if you would send us a copy of your own curriculum vitae.

My colleagues on the Committee and I appreciate your willingness to help us with our consideration of «cand_firstname» «cand_lastname» for «review_for».

Sincerely,

Carol T. Christ, Chair
Committee on Tenure and Promotion

CTC/hs

September 8, 2011

«eval_name_»
«eval_address_1»
«eval_address_2»
«eval_address_3»
«eval_address_4»
«eval_address_5»

Dear «eval_salutation»:

Thank you very much for agreeing to provide the Committee on Tenure and Promotion with an assessment of the work submitted by «cand_firstname» «cand_lastname». The Committee will be considering «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname» for «review_for». The members of the Committee would be grateful for your frank assessment of «cand_pronoun» artistic achievement and promise. We have found that the evaluations that are most helpful to us are those that comment on the substance of the dossier in some detail and that place the contributions of the candidate in a larger context. The following questions provide guidelines in evaluating «cand_pronoun» artistic work, as reflected in the enclosed work or from your personal knowledge.

- Do you know this candidate, and, if so, for how long and in what capacity?
- How does the work rank in quality in comparison to that of others in «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s field at similar stages in their careers?
- What are some of its specific strengths and weaknesses?
- Do you see in «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s work evidence of artistic growth and promise during «cand_pronoun» period of teaching at Smith College?
- Please provide us with an evaluation of the venues at which «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s work has been exhibited or performed.
- Would you please comment on how collaborative work is viewed in this field? If you have any knowledge of «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s contribution to jointly authored works, please provide your assessment of «cand_pronoun» contributions in those works.

«eval_salutation»
September 8, 2011
Page Two

The Committee welcomes any additional comments you may wish to make on «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname»'s professional achievements. I would like to add that, in reaching its decision, the Committee considers a number of factors in addition to scholarship, including achievement in teaching and service to the college, which we are not asking you to evaluate.

The «cand_dept» Department must make its formal recommendation on the question of «review_for» for «cand_prefix» «cand_lastname» by December 1, 2011. Therefore, we would appreciate **receiving your comments by November 1** so that the Department can consider them in making its recommendation. Please send your comments to:

**President Carol T. Christ, Chair
Committee on Tenure and Promotion
College Hall 206
Smith College
Northampton, MA 01063
Attention: Hayley Spizz**

Our Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College requires that the candidate and the Department be apprised of the names of the outside evaluators, and further stipulates that your letter will remain confidential with the members of the Department eligible to vote on this candidate and with the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The Committee would find it helpful if you would send us a copy of your own curriculum vitae.

My colleagues on the Committee and I appreciate your willingness to help us with our consideration of «cand_firstname» «cand_lastname» for «review_for».

Sincerely,

Carol T. Christ, Chair
Committee on Tenure and Promotion

CTC/hs