Deadline: All materials must be received by the Dean of Faculty before October 15, 2015.

For all personnel recommendations to be reviewed by the Advisory Committee, we request that the original set of materials, plus one copied set (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 binders, 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

3. Copies of all **Activities and Service Summaries** filed by the candidate in prior years – please arrange 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. **The Department Recommendation** including supporting material and any dissenting views which members of the department may wish to submit when unanimity is lacking. In making recommendations, the department should consider carefully each of the criteria stated as College policy in Faculty Legislation. Care should be taken to follow the procedures described. The department should indicate the process of consultation followed within the department about each recommendation, the amount of information made available to those on leave and the degree of their involvement in the decision process. The information provided about the candidate should cover the full period of the time he or she has spent at Mount Holyoke. Any documents submitted in earlier years should be resubmitted if the department wishes these to be included in the present review.
The Advisory Committee and the President may also review materials from earlier years should they feel it necessary.

6. **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.

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

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). Letters from institutions in the Five College consortium are sometimes appropriate, but should not usually 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 (not an email printout). No more than six letters should be solicited at any time, and **all** solicited letters must be included in the dossier.

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, audio and video tapes or disks, slides of works of art, etc. Syllabi are helpful though not required.

11. 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 prior to the recommendation (with the exception of the first semester at Mount Holyoke unless the candidate has returned first semester evaluations) 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     _____ Professor

_____ Associate     _____ Associate

_____ Senior Lecturer     _____ Senior Lecturer

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 $250 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.

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 $250 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 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.).