GUIDELINES FOR THE PROMOTION PROCESS
2018-19

Deadline: All materials must be received by the Dean of Faculty before January 15, 2019.

A conversation between the chair and the Dean of Faculty is encouraged early in the process of bringing an associate professor forward for promotion to full professor.

For all personnel recommendations to be reviewed by the Advisory Committee, we request that one original set of materials (three-hole punched) and one electronic version be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculty. Nine copies of books and other supporting material that cannot be scanned should be submitted. The Dean of Faculty's office will provide tabbed binders to aid in the submission of the materials. If you have any administrative questions on this process, or want to arrange pick up of your binder, please call the office at ext.2372 for assistance. The Dean of Faculty will be available for consultation on any questions. Chairs and candidates should consult Faculty Legislation for the College's full policies and procedures.

The department must provide the following materials:

1. Departmental Recommendation Summary (form attached)

2. Curriculum Vitae – Use format and order as follows:
   - Department
   - Name of Candidate
   - Education: Degrees, Dates Received, Institution
   - Teaching Experience (most recent first): Mount Holyoke College, Other Institutions
   - Compositions, Performances, Publications, Works of Art (most recent first, with full citations)
   - Lectures and Papers Delivered
   - Professional Organizations and Activities
   - Other Relevant Experience

   Please distinguish single-authored from co-authored work; peer reviewed vs. non-peer reviewed publications; and PI from co-PI administered grants.

3. Copies of all Activities and Service Summaries filed by the candidate since tenure, in chronological order (earliest first).

4. Record of Associate Professor Conversation(s)

5. Letters from External Evaluators for Tenure – copies of letters from external evaluators written during the tenure review process.

6. Department Recommendation

7. Letter to External Evaluators written by the Dean of Faculty requesting outside evaluation (example attached). The Dean of Faculty will send out the initial request to the external evaluators. The department should provide to the Dean of Faculty the list of names with
email addresses. The list of names should include order preference and delineate department and candidate lists (see #8).

8. **Letters from External Evaluators:** The College requires between four and six letters from external referees, two or three from a list prepared by the candidate, and two or three from a list prepared by the department and/or program. Referees should be leaders in the candidate's field, ideally at the rank of full professor, and holding an academic appointment at a range of peer or more highly-ranked institutions. Understanding of the liberal arts college context is often an advantage, while letters from scholars in research universities can also add to a candidate's scholarly credibility. **Letters should be sought from individuals who have no compromising relationship with the candidate (mentor, student, collaborator, co-author, former colleague, familial attachment, commercial ties).** The sample letter to external evaluators requests that the evaluator explicitly state their relationship with the candidate. Letters from institutions in the Five College consortium are sometimes appropriate, but should not outnumber evaluations from a wider range of institutions. There may be exceptions to these guidelines, and any such exceptions should be justified in the department's statement Outside letters should be on letterhead and signed. **Scans of signed letters on letterhead sent via email will be accepted.** No more than six letters should be solicited at any time, and all solicited letters must be included in the dossier. All material sent to external reviewers must also be included as part of the file to Advisory.

When the department submits its recommendation, these letters, and other material to the Advisory Committee in the fall, it is also asked to submit brief biographical information about the outside referees. Noting major works or accomplishments of a letter-writer is important, but the Advisory Committee is especially interested in the rationale the department used in selecting referees (e.g. Professor X has taught and done research for many years at a college similar to Mount Holyoke; Professor Y is one of the most highly regarded people in the candidate's specialty, etc.).

Please remain mindful that we are asking for scholarly evaluations, not recommendations. The Advisory Committee's experience is that critical comments, far from harming the cause, usually enhance the credibility of outside assessments.

9. **Letters from Other Departments or Programs** are encouraged from departments or programs with which the candidate is affiliated, formally or informally, whether or not required by Faculty Legislation.

10. All **Other Supporting Documentation** considered by the department, such as enrollments, articles and other publications, MP3s, video files, links, JPGs, etc. Syllabi are very helpful.

11. **SUGGESTED:** A **Statement from the Candidate** discussing (1) scholarly/professional plans for the next five years in relationship to past scholarly/professional activities, and (2) ideas about future and past contributions to the curriculum, and to other aspects of the life of the department and of the College.

12. In addition to the above, the Office of the Dean of Faculty will provide the Advisory Committee with **Student Evaluations of Teaching** for all semesters since tenure and a teaching history.
DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Department: ________________________________ Date: ______

Name of candidate: _______________________________________

RECOMMENDATION (check all applicable boxes):

_____ For Reappointment
_____ Against Reappointment
_____ For Tenure
_____ Against Tenure
_____ For Promotion to the rank of ________________
_____ Against Promotion

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM VOTE:

- Tenured faculty vote on reappointment recommendations for all other faculty in their department or program.
- Tenured faculty vote on recommendations for tenure, regardless of the rank of the candidate.
- Tenured faculty of higher rank vote on recommendations about promotion for faculty of lower rank.
- Senior Lecturers vote in cases involving Lecturers and Senior Lecturers.

Number of faculty voting at each level: Number eligible to vote:

_____ Professor
_____ Associate
_____ Senior Lecturer

_____ Professor
_____ Associate
_____ Senior Lecturer

Vote Tally ____________________

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENT(S) OR PROGRAM(S):

_____ Consulted department/program in which candidate holds joint appointment or occasionally or regularly teaches.

_____ Letter requested from (Department/Program name) ________________________________

STUDENT EVALUATIONS:

_____ Read by department (check if yes)

Signature of Department Chair __________________________ Date __________
SAMPLE LETTER TO OUTSIDE EVALUATORS

Dear Professor ________,

Mount Holyoke College is currently reviewing the work of Professor X who is under review for promotion at Mount Holyoke College. I am writing to ask if you would be willing to assist us in this important review by providing an evaluation of Professor X’s scholarly work. College legislation requires that we seek evaluation of his/her/their work from a small number of people such as you, who can comment with knowledge and authority on the scholarly competence and significance of his/her/their research, and who can place his/her/their work in the context of his/her/their particular field. We will rely heavily on these outside evaluations in assessing his/her/their scholarly achievement and potential. We are not asking you to advise us on the conclusion of whether we should or should not recommend him/her/them for promotion.

Our general criteria for evaluating all faculty members are growth as a scholar and effective teaching. We take into account that Mount Holyoke is a liberal arts college and that the teaching load is somewhat heavier than that in a university. Contributions to the life of the College, the work of the Department, and the affairs of the larger community, though secondary, are also considered.

Attached, please find a Professor X's CV, as well as a list of materials submitted for external review.

If you are willing to serve as a reviewer, I would need confirmation that you do not presently have, or have had within the past four years, a working relationship with the candidate. According to Mount Holyoke College guidelines, reviewers should not include anyone who knows the candidate personally or professionally in such a way that their opinion of the candidate's work might be predicted on the basis of their prior relationship. Reviewers should not include anyone who has been a member of the candidate's dissertation committee, post-doctoral advisor, designated professional mentor, or co-author in the past four years.

After receiving that confirmation and disclosure of any additional relationship, we can send you the materials for your review. We would need to receive your review letter by December 1. Your letter of evaluation will be held in strict confidence and will be available only to the senior members of the candidate's department; the College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotion; the President; and the Trustee Committee on Education. We ask that your letter be signed and on letterhead. It can be mailed or scanned and sent via email to the Department Coordinator, [NAME and ADDRESS].

While I know that we cannot adequately compensate you for this important work, Mount Holyoke College provides a $150 honorarium to our external reviewers.

I very much appreciate your consideration of this request and hope that you will be able to assist us in evaluating Professor X's work. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jon Western, Dean of Faculty
ADVICE ABOUT SELECTING AND USING EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

The “judgment of scholars in the same field at other institutions” is sought because such persons can provide a detached view of the candidate's work. They need not be personally acquainted with the candidate, but they do need to be persons who will comment with knowledge and authority about the range and depth of scholarly competence demonstrated in the candidate's writings, performances, or works of art. By seeking outside opinions one hopes to see the candidate's work in the context of his or her discipline, and to gain an understanding of that work's significance when viewed from the perspectives of scholars within that discipline. We know our colleagues very well in the context of Mount Holyoke. We seek to learn how their work is perceived in the wider world. This is particularly important when a candidate's “home” department encompasses more than one discipline.

Each referee must be provided with a copy of the candidate's vitae, publications, and works submitted for or awaiting publication. For candidates in the creative arts, evaluators should be sent audio and/or video files, links, JPGs, or other representations of the candidate's work sufficient for evaluators to judge.

Outside evaluators who are not members of the Five-College community are offered an honorarium of $150 as a token of our appreciation.

Each referee will be asked to include a brief statement regarding their relationship (if any) with the candidate in their letter.

Each referee will be assured that his or her comments about a candidate will be held in strict confidence, and will be available only to those persons who must recommend the candidate, or who must act upon the recommendation made (i.e., the tenured members of the department or the ad hoc committee; the Advisory Committee on Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions; the President; and the Trustee Committee on Education).

Four letters of the sort described above from referees who have taken the trouble to review and evaluate a candidate's scholarly competence will be far more valuable than a larger number of less carefully prepared comments. Please remain mindful that we are asking for scholarly evaluations, not recommendations. The Advisory Committee's experience is that critical comments, far from harming the cause, usually enhance the credibility of outside assessments.

When the department submits its recommendation, these letters, and other material to the Advisory Committee in the fall, it is also asked to submit brief biographical information about the outside referees. Noting major works or accomplishments of a letter-writer is important. But the Advisory Committee is especially interested in the rationale the department used in selecting referees (e.g. Professor X has taught and done research for many years at a college similar to Mount Holyoke; Professor Y is one of the most highly regarded people in the candidate's specialty, etc.).