Deadline: All materials for promotion to Senior Lecturer must be received before Jan 15, 2019.

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

   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 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. Copies of previous reappointment recommendations from the department.

6. Department Recommendation

7. 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:

1. **Sample 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**
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 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, MP3s, video files, links, JPGs, 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

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.

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 publications, MP3s, 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 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.).