Deadline: All materials for promotion to Senior Lecturer must be received before Jan 15, 2018.

Chairs and candidates should consult the Handbook of Faculty Legislation for the College’s policies and procedures on promotion to Senior Lecturer.

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. The Dean of Faculty's office will provide tabbed binders to aid in this process. (Please note that copies of supporting material such as articles and nine copies of books (if any) that cannot be scanned should be submitted as well.) If you have any administrative questions on this process, or want to arrange pick up of your binders, please call the office at ext. 2372 for assistance. The Dean of Faculty will be available for consultation.

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, Date 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

   CVs should 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 in prior years, in chronological order (earliest first).

4. A copy of each **Summary of Annual Conversation** between the candidate and the department chair for years prior to the recommendation, in chronological order (earliest first). Please include a copy of any response from the candidate to the chair. Be sure all those present at the annual conversation have signed the document.

5. **Department Recommendation**

6. **Letters are encouraged from departments or programs with which the candidate is affiliated**, formally or informally, whether or not required by legislation.

**In addition, in some cases departments should provide:**

7. **Sample of Letter to External Evaluator** written by department chair requesting outside evaluation (example attached).
8. **Letters from External Evaluators**

Faculty legislation recognizes there are varying expectations for lecturers across campus when it states that a department “…must clarify the relative importance it accords teaching, scholarship, and service in its evaluation of lecturers, and what type and degree of scholarly development it requires.” For this reason, legislation leaves the decision about whether or not to solicit external letters with individual departments. The need for or lack of need for such letters is implied, however, both in the initial specification of the lecturer position and also in the criteria of evaluation indicated in annual conversations with the candidate. In general, if scholarly productivity is expected of a candidate in a lecturer position, it would be useful for the Advisory Committee to see external letters that contextualize and evaluate the candidate's research.

9. **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 the College.

10. All other **Supporting Documents** considered by the department, including enrollments, external letters (if any), publications, audio and video tapes or disks, slides of works of art, etc. **Syllabi are very helpful.**
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

Number eligible to vote:

______ 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

Our department has been reviewing the work of ________ and will formulate a recommendation to the President in September regarding an appointment with tenure. I am writing to ask if you would be willing to assist us in this most important task by providing an evaluation of Professor’s _____ scholarly work. College legislation requires that we seek evaluations of her work from a small number of people such as you, who can comment with knowledge and authority on the scholarly competence and significance of her research, and who can place her work in the context of her particular field. We will rely heavily on these outside evaluations in assessing her scholarly achievement and potential. We are particularly interested in your comments on the quality rather than the quantity of her written work. We are not asking you to advise us on the conclusion of whether we should or should not recommend her for a tenured appointment.

Our general criteria for evaluating all faculty members are growth as a scholar and effective teaching. We take into account the fact 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.

I have enclosed a copy of Professor’s ______ curriculum vitae. As you will see, her scholarly works are in the areas of _____________. We would welcome your comments on all her work; but if you prefer, you may restrict your comments to particular aspects of it.

I do hope you will be able to help us with this important decision. If so, I would be pleased to send you copies of the relevant papers and her book. Since the Department must review the comments of outside reviewers, such as yourself, and submit its recommendation in late September, it would be most helpful if we could receive your signed letter by September 1. Your letter of evaluation will be held in strict confidence and will be available only to the senior members of the Department, the College’s Advisory Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions, the President, and the Trustee Committee on Education. The Advisory Committee asks for a signed letter, on letterhead, by mail.

The College allows us to offer a $150 honorarium as a small token of our appreciation for your efforts. In order to facilitate processing the honorarium, we would appreciate your sending to us your home address and social security number or you can call the Department Assistant at XXXX to provide by phone.

My colleagues and I very much hope that you are able to assist us in evaluating Professor’s ______ work. We thank you for giving the matter your consideration.
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.

In the case of promotion to senior lecturer, the standard of scholarly work as defined in the job description and used for criteria in annual conversations should be specified.

Each referee should 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 slides, videos, DVDs, CDs, 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 should 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 Spring, 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.).