Subject: Guidelines for the Review of Candidates for Reappointment  
Date: June 29, 2015  
To: Department Chairs and Program Directors  
From: Katherine Rowe  
Provost and Dean of the Faculty

I am writing to you in your capacity as Department Chair or Program Director regarding the upcoming tenure-track reappointment review(s) in your department/program. Faculty reappointment reviews are one of the most important responsibilities of department chairs and program directors. The following summary outlines specific procedures and requirements, including those specified in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College that chairs/directors, senior colleagues, and departments/programs must follow, with the aim of maintaining consistency across the college and providing useful information to the Provost and the President. I have also included a chart summarizing the timeline and tasks for the review.

Candidates for reappointment in your department/program are indicated on the H1 form(s) enclosed. We appreciate the thoughtfulness you and your colleagues bring to this process and the effort you commit to ensuring consistency in our procedures for evaluation. The Smith faculty community has a compelling interest in departmental/program reappointment processes that are as fair, open, and consistent as we can make them.

KR/hs

cc: Candidates for Reappointment
Summary of Chair/Director Responsibilities for Reappointment Reviews

1. **Role of the Chair/Director.** The Chair or Director is responsible for carrying out the departmental evaluation of each candidate for reappointment in accordance with the current *Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College*, sections I.B.2. and II. *passim*.

2. **Participation.** Unless there are compelling reasons, all members of the unit eligible to vote on reappointment shall participate, including those on leave or sabbatical.

3. **Communication.** The Chair or Director is responsible for contacting the candidate early in the academic year of the departmental consideration and no later than November 1:
   a. to discuss departmental procedure for the review;
   b. to discuss classroom visits (a copy of your department’s procedures for evaluating teaching is enclosed) and to work out a mutually acceptable time-table for these;
   c. to give the candidate the opportunity to suggest names of possible referees outside of the department who could provide evaluation of his or her scholarly work;
   d. to discuss the candidate’s dossier materials, which are due December 1 for those candidates whose work will be sent to outside reviewers or February 1 for those who will not have outside reviewers.

4. **Outside referees.** Smith reappointment guidelines do not mandate evaluations of a candidate’s scholarly work from outside referees. Nevertheless, departments and/or candidates may consider requesting such evaluations from two or three referees agreed upon by the department and the candidate. The department is responsible for all communication to the outside reviewers. A suggested form for letters requesting these outside evaluations is enclosed for your information. Please note that we do not pay an honorarium to outside reviewers.

5. **Classroom visits.** Please pay special attention to the scheduling of classroom visits. Dates of each visit should be worked out between the candidate and the visitors *well in advance*, and care should be taken that *at least two* voting members visit any single class-session. Ideally such visits should serve both an evaluative and an advisory function. Each senior member who observes the teaching of a junior member should provide the candidate with specific feedback and suggestions in writing. The candidate may respond to the feedback in writing if he or she chooses to do so.

6. **“Institutional considerations.”** The Chair or Director is responsible for consultation with the Provost regarding the statement of institutional considerations which must be included in the letter of reappointment from the President to the candidate. Please review the candidate’s initial appointment letter to determine whether any changes are needed.

7. **Interdepartmental programs.** The department chair is to ascertain from the candidate whether she or he is participating in the work of any interdepartmental program(s). If so, the department chair should notify the director(s) of the program(s) about the upcoming review. In cases where the program has review procedures on file for affiliated members, the procedures should be followed. In other cases, you should invite programs to participate in the review by contributing a letter to the department about the pedagogical and/or scholarly work of the candidate, as well as on his/her overall contributions to the work of the program(s).
8. **Letter of recommendation.** Following the departmental evaluation, the Chair or Director is responsible for conveying to the Provost a letter of recommendation by **May 1, 2016**, which contains the following:
   a. A description of the procedures followed, including those related to class visits, the procurement of outside evaluations, the construction of the candidate’s file, the role played by letters from (other) programs in which the candidate participates, and the annual meetings of the chair and senior members with the candidate.
   b. The statement of institutional considerations which was developed in consultation with the Provost and has the express consent of the majority of those members of the department eligible to vote on the reappointment.
   c. An evaluation of the candidate’s performance and promise in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, including the range of views—both positive and negative—expressed by the voting members. **The utmost candor is required here: the candidate, the department, and the college are all ill-served by its absence.**
   d. A statement of the number of qualified department members voting in favor of, and against, reappointment and the range of views regarding the preferred duration of appointment.

The Provost reviews the departmental reappointment letter before the final version is submitted in case the language about the department's expectations about research needs to be clarified. Please submit this to the Provost by April 15.

9. **Additional materials.** The Chair’s or Director’s letter of recommendation should be accompanied by the following:
   a. A completed H1 form.
   b. The dossier that was reviewed by the department.
   c. Copies of letters from outside referees and interdepartmental programs, if any have been solicited.

10. **Candidate copy.** A copy of the Chair’s or Director’s letter of recommendation, accompanied by a summary of the evaluations of outside referees (if solicited), should be sent to the candidate.
### Timeline for 2015-16 Reappointment Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 2015</td>
<td>Provost sends memos to all tenure-track faculty members scheduled for 2015-16 reappointment reviews and their chairs/directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Deans meet with reappointment candidates. Deans meet with chairs/directors of reappointment candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2015</td>
<td>Date by which chairs/directors are expected to meet with reappointment candidates regarding the upcoming review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2015</td>
<td>Candidate’s dossier materials due to chair/director for those candidates whose work will be sent to outside reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2016</td>
<td>Candidate’s dossier materials due to chair/director for those candidates who will not have outside reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5, 2016</td>
<td>Outside reviewer letters due (if solicited).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2016</td>
<td>Draft version of departmental recommendation letter due to Provost for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2016</td>
<td>Departmental recommendation letter, H1 form, candidate’s dossier, outside reviewer letters (if solicited), and interdepartmental program letters (if solicited) are due to the Provost’s office. Chair/director provides candidate with a copy of the departmental recommendation letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2016</td>
<td>Date by which candidates and departments are required to receive notification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>