DATE: May 13, 2015

TO: Department Chairs and Administrative Assistants/Coordinators

FROM: Thomas A. Stephenson
Provost

RE: Preparing Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion Dossiers

This memo – revised annually, so please read carefully – outlines procedures for your preparation of dossiers for the following personnel decisions: tenure, promotion, reappointment prior to tenure, other faculty reappointments, and regular part-time faculty reappointments. This memo should be shown to every candidate in these categories and any questions a candidate may have should be answered by you as Chair or referred to me. If you have any questions or concerns about these procedures, please talk to me before you start work on the dossier. This memo does not concern the non-faculty teaching staff, such as Lecturers and Laboratory Instructors, addressed in the Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, Section III-A-16, though some of the same procedures may be used for them.

I very much appreciate the time and effort that you will put into assembling a dossier that will be the basis for decisions of the greatest importance for us as an academic community. You may rely heavily on the efforts of your department’s administrative assistant, but ultimately you, as Chair, are responsible for the contents of the dossier and for submitting it on time. I know that Chairs take this charge most seriously. I also trust that you are mindful of the need to safeguard the confidentiality of the process, while requests are going out in the mail and responses are coming in, and while the full file is being circulated by the tenured members of your department. If external reviewers are faxing in evaluations, please be sure you arrange for secure reception.

Through the years the Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) has defined the following procedures, which have proved to result in the most informative and reliable dossiers. Department colleagues should write individual letters out of their own experience (including their review of the candidate’s curriculum vitae and published material) and should not see student letters and letters from extramural colleagues before writing their own letters. Please note that, having written before reading student and extramural letters, department colleagues may contribute an addendum to their letters after reading new material. (While in the past some departments followed slightly different procedures, we are now requiring consistency.)

The CPT also requires a summary of the department’s conclusions regarding the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and participation in the community. This evaluation should be reported in a letter from the Chair, along with a description of the process used by the department in reaching its decision. Experience has shown that the best way for tenured members of a
department to reach this departmental summary opinion is through discussion after each tenured member of the department has read the complete dossier, including letters from departmental colleagues.

The important principles are that the members of the department write their letters of evaluation from their own experience and that all issues raised in these letters be thoroughly discussed by the tenured members of the department. It is also essential that all members of the department and all candidates fully understand the procedures to be followed in assembling a dossier. Before a department Chair uses any alternatives to these established procedures, she or he must discuss the entire matter frankly with the candidate and also receive approval from me. It is absolutely necessary that the candidate and I be kept fully informed throughout the process.

I. **Tenure (Dossiers due by Monday, November 30, 2015)**

Although there are exceptions, tenure decisions are normally made during the penultimate year of a candidate's probationary period, most typically in the sixth year, for faculty beginning at the assistant professor level. **I do want to draw your attention to the provision for deferring a tenure or reappointment review because of parenting responsibilities, which was approved by the Faculty in May 2006 (Handbook, 2011, III-A-7, p. 132).** The *Handbook* excerpt (appended at the end of this document) that is sent to all letter-writers (except students) should include this paragraph, so that reviewers are aware that the expectations for professional achievement in such a case should not differ from what they would have been had the probationary period been shorter. Members of the department should be reminded of this policy, too.

The *Handbook for Instructional Staff* outlines the criteria that we use in tenure decisions. The following is excerpted from section III-A-7 (June, 2011 edition):

> The decision to grant tenure to a faculty member is one of the most important decisions made by the College. It has three general characteristics. It is fundamentally a forward-looking decision in which judgments about the future needs of the College and the future performance of the individual are emphasized. It is also a comparative decision in which evaluation for tenure is regarded as part of an effort to identify the best person available for the position, with no governing presumption in favor of reappointment with continuous tenure. It is ultimately an integral decision about performance and potentiality, in which a comprehensive judgment is likely to amount to more than simple addition of separate, specific aspects of performance, despite its dependence upon their appraisal.

> The principal criteria in decisions about reappointment with continuous tenure are teaching and scholarship. Other contributions to the College community and, where relevant to the College's purposes, service in the larger community will also be considered. Balance in the composition of the department concerned and of the faculty at large, as well as preservation of flexibility in the educational program of the College, are important considerations.
An individual’s promise as a teacher is judged in the light of demonstrated ability to teach, including the ability to inspire students to acquire knowledge and to think critically as well as the ability to convey knowledge clearly and cogently based on mastery of the subject. Promise as a scholar is evaluated in terms of an individual’s potential contribution to the creation of new knowledge or to the reorganization in creative ways of existing information. Scholarship will be considered in the light of publications, effective research, or other activities (such as professional consulting and advising) that contribute to the advancement of knowledge. In considering teaching and scholarship together, strong teaching is regarded as the first responsibility of the College; but strong teaching is not to be equated with popularity, nor is it regarded as probable in the absence of strong scholarship. Service to the institution, to the College or larger community, or to society directly is considered as an extension of professional responsibility to the conditions and consequences of teaching and learning and may be taken into account as it pertains to the purposes and program of the College.

The need for the College to maintain an appropriate balance and distribution of range of experience, ranks and fields of specialization within departments and the faculty at large, as well as room for change and development in departmental and College programs, may affect a faculty member’s prospects for continuous tenure apart from the evaluation of individual performance and promise. The College tries to anticipate such problems (which are partly concomitants of tenure) as far in advance as possible and to inform potentially affected individuals of them promptly, but in any case the implications of such structural factors apparent at the time of decision about reappointment with tenure are important. (Adopted by the faculty 23 May 1973; approved by the Board of Managers, 1 June 1973. See also faculty minutes of 12 May 1976. Amended by the faculty 15 February 1984. Amended by the Board 25 February 1984.)

The tenure decision is based on a full dossier on the candidate, which is sent to the Provost for use by the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The tenure dossier may be used as a model for dossiers assembled in anticipation of all decisions having to do with renewal and promotion, but typically the tenure dossier is more searching than any others. Although individual Chairs, after consultation with the candidate and me, may include additional materials, the following are the basic elements of the dossier:

1. A Table of Contents. Please use the attached sample Table of Contents as a template for yours and be sure that all materials are assembled in that order. Uniformity helps the Committee with the review process and with referring to materials as they meet. Once the full file is assembled, number each page and include the page number for each section in this table. Please note that each dossier will be duplicated in the Provost’s office for members of the CPT. It is therefore preferable that a dossier not be submitted in a binder and that letters not be printed out two-sided, if possible. Please include typed copies along with any handwritten letters.
2. A summary letter from the department Chair, stating the department's balanced opinion of the candidate. All tenured members of the department should read and jointly discuss the dossier before the Chair writes the summary letter. The Chair's letter should indicate how the department's opinion was reached, e.g., what sort of discussion or consultation took place, which of the tenured members were present, whether drafts of the Chair’s letter were read by tenured members with an eye toward possible revision, and whether they approved the final version.

**NOTE ON CONFIDENTIALITY.** The College considers reappointment and promotion dossiers to be confidential and does not allow candidates to read them. Under Pennsylvania law, however, any employee may, on request, have access to her/his personnel file at least once a year. Because the department Chair is required to prepare the summary letter as part of her/his duties, and because this letter presents the departmental evaluation of the candidate for tenure, promotion, or reappointment, it is considered to be part of the candidate's personnel file and thus may be read later by the candidate. The Chair is nonetheless responsible for protecting the identities of those who write for the dossier and must take care not to give specific names, or other identifying information when quoting or otherwise characterizing views.

3. A letter invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments in teaching and scholarship, as well as a statement of future goals and plans in both areas. This letter is not mandatory, but has proved very useful to the CPT, which will receive the views of many others about the candidate's professional ability and accomplishments. This letter offers the candidate an opportunity to give the Committee his or her own views, possibly making comments he or she would not wish read by tenured department members. Therefore, it is not normally to be read by the department. A candidate may, however, request that it be shared within the department, in which case that is permissible. Experience has shown that such a letter can be quite important, e.g., explaining prospects for completion and publication of projects that have developed more slowly than anticipated or defining priorities and positioning oneself in a field. Please encourage candidates to give sufficient time and care to this.

Normally the letter is not shared with external reviewers. These reviewers are asked to comment on the significance of the candidate's professional accomplishment in the context of their specialized field. **Some candidates (and some external reviewers) have requested that a statement placing the candidate's professional accomplishments in the context of an overall strategy or direction should be included in the materials provided to reviewers.** At the discretion of the candidate, such a document can be included, and can be an excerpt of the letter prepared for the Committee/department. If provided to external reviewers, this document should be part of the dossier reviewed by the department and the Committee.
The candidate’s letter should indicate to which readers it is directed. It should be no more than 5 pages long.

4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae.

5. A list of all courses and seminars taught in each semester by the candidate for the last six years or since arrival at Swarthmore (whichever is shorter), indicating how many students took each course or seminar. Directed readings and thesis supervision should be noted here, too.

6. Copies of syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters (others if desired).

7. Letters about the candidate requested from all colleagues in the candidate's department, including the Chair.

8. Letters about the candidate requested from six or more Swarthmore colleagues outside the candidate's department, in fields both "related to" and "remote from" the candidate's field. The candidate should be asked to name about half of these colleagues outside the department.

9. Letters requested from six or more extramural referees in the candidate's own special field, who can objectively evaluate his or her professional achievement. A candidate should be asked to name about half of these extramural referees by providing a list of three names to the Chair (or more names, if more than the minimum number of external letters is desired); those individuals will be asked to write evaluations. (If one or more of the candidate's selections cannot serve as evaluators, the candidate will be asked to provide alternates.) At least three of the extramural referees must be individuals who are not former mentors or present or past collaborators. The department Chair must select at least two of these unaffiliated referees.

Occasionally, extramural referees ask if a telephone opinion will suffice, but only signed, written opinions will be included in the dossier. A pdf letter is acceptable, if signed.

Off-prints or photocopies of pertinent scholarship (or, e.g., slides of visual work) should be prepared by the department and sent to evaluators to facilitate their review. Manuscript material may be included, if the candidate wants that to be recognized. Some departments have found it useful to distribute all such material using SwatFiles.

**Timing:** in order to give external evaluators enough time to review materials and write, please plan to contact potential extramural referees by July 1, 2015 to determine their availability (see standard email inquiry; do not send the vitae at this point). Materials should be available to the extramural referees by July 15, 2015. Referees are asked to respond no later than November 1, 2015 (or sooner, as your schedule for discussions dictates).
10. Signed letters from approximately 25 of the candidate's students, including those currently enrolled and recent graduates, those who have done extensive work with the candidate, those who have taken introductory courses, those who are very strong students, and those whose performance was average or weak. Where appropriate, the opinions of advisees of the candidate would also be helpful. The candidate should be asked to name about half of the 25 students.

**Note:** Occasionally, letters may be solicited at the candidate’s request from less recent graduates, e.g., who have gone on in the field. Most letters, however, should be from students taught since the previous review.

**Note:** You will need to request letters from a larger number of students in order to receive the 25 required for the dossier; both your list and that of the candidate should be longer, at least 25 names each. You probably will need to send a reminder to those who have not replied. If you send a reminder, be sure that you send it to all those whose letters are still outstanding.

**Note:** Re. e-mailed letters: you will need to get the author to come by your office and sign it, or send a follow-up hard copy or a pdf version with a signature. It is essential that letters on which a critical decision may ride – for or against – be of certain authorship.

11. A list of individuals who have been asked to write letters for the candidate as described in paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and 9 above. Please indicate which individuals were chosen by the candidate and which were chosen by you, and which of the individuals had responded by the time you reached your final recommendation and which had not. **For each student correspondent please list the student's major, year of graduation, and whether or not the student was in Honors, which courses each student took with the candidate, the years in which the courses were taken, and the grades. (Shadow grades for CR/NC work are not necessary.)** In addition to being compiled on a list, the information for each student should also be placed on each student's letter.

12. A list of the candidate's published scholarship, plus any unpublished manuscripts being included with the dossier.

**TO BE SUBMITTED UNDER SEPARATE COVER** (not within the dossier): One copy of the candidate's published scholarship, plus any unpublished manuscripts the candidate may wish to submit, along with a listing of the same. These materials will be held in the Provost’s Office and made available for review by the CPT.

In requesting letters from each category of respondent, the Chair must use a standard letter (attached). The candidate and the Provost must approve any non-cosmetic variations in advance. The dossier should include copies of each type of letter used. Except for external reviewers (see #9, “Timing” above), please allow 4-6 weeks between the time a soliciting
letter is sent and the date by which a reply is requested. Late correspondents should be reminded in writing or, if absolutely necessary, by phone.

On occasion, respondents will request additional information or clarification about the content of their response. Department Chairs must exercise great caution in responding to such requests. As a general rule, Chairs should limit their discussion with respondents about their reviews to the mechanical aspects of the process. In ambiguous situations, consultation with the Provost is essential.

Please send the originals of all documents to the Provost's Office for our permanent file. I strongly urge you not to keep a copy of the file in the department, in order to help preserve confidentiality.

Appropriate material from the third year reappointment dossier may be submitted by either the department Chair or the Provost with approval of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

You may receive unsolicited materials, e.g., letters from students not chosen by you or the candidate. The usual practice has been to include them in the dossier, but in a clearly separate category; they may be weighed differently. If you are uncertain how to proceed, ask me and I will consult with the CPT.

Please plan to submit tenure dossiers by the deadline of Monday, November 30, 2015. This is important because frequently the cases that are the most complicated and time-consuming for departments are also the most complicated and time-consuming for the Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

II. Promotions (dossiers due Monday, November 30, 2015)

Promotion to Associate Professor or full Professor is normally, but not always initiated by the candidate's department. While tenure and reappointment decisions must be made by stipulated deadlines, there is no requirement that promotion reviews occur at any fixed point. The candidate's experience and accomplishments will usually determine the timing: consideration for promotion to Associate Professor usually coincides with a tenure review, and candidates for full Professor are not usually eligible until they are in their eighth year as Associate Professor. This later review need not automatically take place in the eighth year, though we expect that faculty achievements will warrant promotion no later than the tenth year as an Associate Professor.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is not automatic, but based on professional accomplishment, teaching, and service; achievement in all three areas is expected. In this context, professional accomplishment means a significant contribution to the field, as demonstrated by one or more of the following: (a) scholarly publication, or artistic production; (b) service to the profession, such as editing, writing textbooks, and organizing conferences; and (c) sustained intellectual engagement. A promotion review entails an
external review of the evidence for professional accomplishment; this accomplishment must be substantial and in a form that can be evaluated by off-campus referees. The promotion evaluation should focus on activities since tenure was awarded. Please be sure to ask departmental colleagues and external referees to comment on work since tenure and provide the latter with copies of pertinent material, rather than counting on familiarity or expecting evaluators to search out bibliography. Student letters, too, should be solicited only or principally from students taught since tenure.

In the spring, before a candidate for promotion to full Professor submits materials for circulation, including to external reviewers, the department Chair and the candidate should agree on what will be included in the dossier. Should all the planned scholarly materials not be ready for assessment the following fall, it would then be appropriate to consider deferring the review.

Once you have consulted with the candidate, you must notify me, no later than June 15, of your interest in proceeding with a promotion review. At that point we can decide together the appropriateness of a review.

Preparation of dossiers for promotion to one of the senior ranks should follow the model of tenure dossiers, with additions or other variations that seem appropriate to the Chair, the candidate, and me. Promotion dossiers should also be sent to my office by November 30, 2015.

III. Third Year Reappointments (of tenure-track faculty)

Since a decision to reappoint at this time commits the College to eventual consideration of the candidate for an appointment with continuous tenure, it is particularly important. The initial appointment to the College is made for a four-year period with a review to be completed in February of the third year (Handbook for Instructional Staff, Section III-A). If this review results in a positive decision, the faculty member will be reappointed for three additional years (thus extending through the seventh), be eligible for a sabbatical in the fourth year, and be considered for tenure in the sixth year. It is particularly important to include in the third year reappointment dossier enough evidence about quality of teaching so that we can reach a detailed understanding of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. This evidence will be the basis of the part of my post-reappointment "feedback" conversation with the candidate that concerns any aspect of teaching that needs to be improved before the tenure decision is made. It is also important that this third year review not be misunderstood by anyone involved to stand in place of the tenure decision itself. A major difference between the two is that the third year reappointment is a matter determined by the department, the Provost and the President, while the tenure decision also involves the college-wide Committee on Promotion and Tenure (and the Board of Managers). A tenure decision may take into account, to a greater extent than does the third year reappointment decision, certain elements identified in the Handbook for Instructional Staff (Section III-A) that go beyond our central concerns with teaching and scholarship. In particular, if you and your colleagues have any concerns about how the candidate is functioning as a citizen of
your department, or the College, this is the point to bring it up: if a candidate is remiss about returning papers or making office hours, misses meetings, does not participate to your satisfaction in the intellectual life of the department, is difficult about choice and timing of classes, anything that might become an issue in a tenure decision, we need to address it with the individual now.

Except in special circumstances (e.g., stopping the clock because of parenting responsibilities, see Handbook For Instructional Staff, 2011, p. 132), notice of reappointment is owed by the College to the faculty member by February 15 of the third year of a four-year appointment. Unless you have questions, please begin planning now to gather written evidence for the department's recommendations, making it available to me as soon as possible, but no later than Friday, January 22, 2016. However, since we wish to include evidence from the candidate's fifth semester, it is important for some part of the dossier to reflect work done during that term. While you should begin to collect materials for the dossier during the fall semester, you should wait until after completion of the fall semester to solicit some of the information. For example, it would be appropriate during the fall semester to request letters from Swarthmore colleagues outside the candidate's department, extramural referees, and letters from the subset of the candidate's former students who are not taking courses from the candidate during the fall. At the end of the fall semester, you should contact those students who took the candidate's courses in the fall and at the same time ask for letters from departmental colleagues. I am aware that you will have little time to collect these letters, but it is important to have the candidate's fifth semester represented in the file and still have the file in my office by January 22, 2016.

IV. Other Reappointments

Other reappointment decisions, regarding faculty members not in tenurable positions, are owed to candidates by February 15, 2016, if possible. See Handbook for Instructional Staff, Section III-A-14.) Experience has shown us enough variation from case to case to make uniform procedures inappropriate, but in every instance the guiding principle should be to gather enough information about the candidate on which to base a sound decision, without the redundancy that might result from following a prescribed format. Chairs should discuss in advance and in detail with the candidate and the Provost the precise nature of the plans for review.

V. Review for Renewal of Part-time Members

Review for renewal or non-renewal of part-time faculty members (see Handbook for Instructional Staff, Section III-A-15) will be guided by the procedures outlined in Section IV ("Other Reappointments") above. Chairs of departments employing part-time faculty with a spring decision deadline should make an appointment with me to discuss the matter before Monday, December 1, 2015.

Again, my warm thanks for the efforts you will put into preparing these dossiers.
cc: Valerie Smith
    Faculty Members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure
Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities

A tenure-track faculty member may postpone the third-year reappointment and/or tenure review in response to the interruptions to a career occasioned while at Swarthmore by maternity, the birth of a child to the individual’s spouse or same-sex partner, or the adoption of a child under five years of age. Each occasion, even if a maternity or parental leave is not taken (see section III.B.5.a), shall entitle the faculty member to postpone a review by one year, but not more than two years in total may be taken before the tenure decision. Notice of intention to defer a review must be given to the department chair and the Provost by September 1 of the academic year in which the review would otherwise occur. One or two years of postponement shall not prompt an increased expectation of achievement for the review, which will accord with the normal standards for the third-year and tenure reviews respectively. (Approved by the Faculty, May 4, 2006)
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Courses and Seminars taught by Leonardo Da Vinci:

Fall 2010
- ARTH 045 Life Drawing 19 students
- STUA 098 Dialogues in Perception 12 students
- ARTH 034 Foundation 5 students

Spring 2011
- ARTH 005 Modern Art 11 students
- ARTH 041 Building an Empire 15 students

Fall 2011
- ARTH 001B The Architect & History 19 students
- STUA 001 Senior Workshop 12 students
- ARTH 030 Mecca to Modernity 5 students

Spring 2012
- ARTH 005 Modern Art 11 students
- ARTH 041 Building an Empire 15 students

Fall 2012
- ARTH 001B The Architect & History 19 students
- STUA 001 Foundation 12 students
- ARTH 030 Mecca to Modernity 5 students

Spring 2013
- ARTH 005 Modern Art 11 students
- ARTH 041 Building an Empire 15 students

Fall 2013
- ARTH 001B The Architect & History 14 students
- STUA 001 Foundation 13 students
- ARTH 030 Mecca to Modernity 8 students

Spring 2014
- ARTH 005 Modern Art 9 students
- ARTH 041 Building an Empire 18 students

Fall 2014
- ARTH 004 Western Survey 16 students
- ARTH 014 Oil Painting 12 students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 012</td>
<td>Modern Art</td>
<td>9 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 019</td>
<td>Building an Empire</td>
<td>14 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUA 011</td>
<td>The Potter’s Wheel</td>
<td>10 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring 2015**
Standard Letter
Tenure

Swarthmore Colleagues Inside the Candidate's Department

Dear ____(NAME)____:

As you know, during the present academic year, ____(NAME)____ will be considered for an appointment with continuous tenure.

May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, Section III-A-7, pp. 130-132) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)____'s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her by ____(DATE)____. I would appreciate your sending a signed, hard copy.

I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear (NAME):

As you know, during the present academic year, (NAME) will be considered for promotion to Professor.

As in our tenure decisions, we evaluate teaching, scholarship and service to the community as we weigh promotion to Professor. May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, Section III-A-7, pp. 130-132) and to offer your view of (NAME)’s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her by (DATE). I would appreciate your sending a signed, hard copy.

I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Letter of request sent to Department Members:

Art Colleague #1
Date Received

Art Colleague #2

Date Received
Dear (NAME):

As you know, during the present academic year, (NAME) will be considered for an appointment with continuous tenure.

May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, Section III-A-7, pp. 130-132) and to offer your view of (NAME)’s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her by (DATE). I would appreciate your sending a signed, hard copy.

I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear ____(NAME)____:

As you know, during the present academic year, ____(NAME)____ will be considered for promotion to Professor.

As in our tenure decisions, we evaluate teaching, scholarship and service to the community as we weigh promotion to Professor. May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, Section III-A-7, pp. 130-132) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)____’s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her by ____(DATE)____. I would appreciate your sending a signed, hard copy.

I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Letter of request sent to Swarthmore Colleagues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swat Colleague #1, Department</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swat Colleague #2, Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swat Colleague #3, Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swat Colleague #4, Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swat Colleague #5, Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swat Colleague #6, Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* selected by candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear ________:

Professor (NAME) will be considered for an appointment with continuous tenure in the Department of _________ at Swarthmore College during the 2015-2016 academic year. We would be most grateful if you could serve as an external reviewer of (his/her) scholarly work as part of this process.

If you agree to participate, I will send you a packet containing the curriculum vitae, printed copies of relevant scholarship and a brief description of the criteria that we use in these evaluations. These materials should reach you by July 15, 2015. We will require your written evaluation of this work no later than (DATE).

I hope that you are able to assist us and will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Thank you.

Department Chair
Dear ________:

Professor (NAME) will be considered for promotion to Professor in the Department of _________ at Swarthmore College during the 2015-2016 academic year. We would be most grateful if you could serve as an external reviewer of (his/her) scholarly work as part of this process.

If you agree to participate, I will send you a packet containing the curriculum vitae, printed copies of relevant scholarship and a brief description of the criteria that we use in these evaluations. These materials should reach you by July 15, 2015. We will require your written evaluation of this work no later than (DATE).

I hope that you are able to assist us and will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Thank you.

Department Chair
Standard Letter  
Tenure  
Extramural Scholars

Dear ____(NAME)____:  

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our review of Professor ____(NAME)____, who will be considered for an appointment with continuous tenure in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the 2015-2016 academic year. Professor ____(NAME)____'s curriculum vitae is enclosed, along with photocopies of the relevant scholarship.

The enclosed statement from our Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, (Section III-A-7, pp. 130-132) is intended to provide you with considerations that carry weight with us as we decide whether to appoint a faculty member with continuous tenure. In our process we also collect input from current and former students, department colleagues and colleagues from other departments within the College. We specifically request your assistance in our evaluation of his/her scholarly and professional contributions and of his/her potential for future contributions to the field. Your expert opinion is critical to our understanding of ____(NAME)____'s qualities as a scholar, her/his professional accomplishments and standing within the field.

May I ask you please for your view of ____(NAME)____'s work by ____(DATE)____. I would appreciate your sending a signed hard copy of your analysis. In your letter, please describe any capacity in which you know ____(NAME)____.

I fully appreciate the commitment of time and effort required by this evaluation. We are very grateful for your willingness to lend your expertise to this critical decision.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write or telephone me. Many thanks for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear (NAME):

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our review of Professor (NAME), who will be considered for promotion to Full Professor in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the 2015-2016 academic year. Professor (NAME)'s curriculum vitae is enclosed, along with photocopies of the relevant scholarship.

The enclosed statement from our Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2011, (Section III-A-7, pp. 130-132) is intended to provide you with considerations that carry weight with us as we decide whether to promote a faculty member to Professor. (As in our tenure decisions, we evaluate teaching, professional accomplishment and service to the community as we weigh promotion to Professor.) In our process we also collect input from current and former students, department colleagues and colleagues from other departments within the College. We specifically request your assistance in our evaluation of his/her scholarly and professional contributions and of his/her potential for future contributions to the field. Your expert opinion is critical to our understanding of (NAME)'s qualities as a scholar, her/his professional accomplishments and standing within the field.

May I ask you please for your view of (NAME)’s work by (DATE). I would appreciate your sending a signed hard copy of your analysis. In your letter, please describe any capacity in which you know (NAME).

I fully appreciate the commitment of time and effort required by this evaluation. We are very grateful for your willingness to lend your expertise to this critical decision.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write or telephone me. Many thanks for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Letter of request sent to Extramural Colleagues:

* Extramural Colleague #1
ADDRESS

* Extramural Colleague #2
ADDRESS

Extramural Colleague #3
ADDRESS

* Extramural Colleague #4
ADDRESS

Extramural Colleague #5
ADDRESS

Extramural Colleague #6
ADDRESS

* selected by candidate

Date Received

___________

___________

___________

___________

___________

___________
Dear (NAME):

During the present academic year (NAME) will be considered for an appointment with continuous tenure at Swarthmore, essentially an appointment that will last until his/her retirement from active professional life.

As part of the review a representative group of students is asked to write letters reflecting on their experiences with the candidate. I am writing to you now to request that you write in this capacity. Your comments on (NAME) as a teacher and as a faculty member inside and outside the classroom will be of great help to those involved in making the decision as to tenure. College policy is that your letter will be read by the tenured faculty in the department and the members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, but not by (NAME). About one-half of the students asked to write letters have been chosen by (NAME); I have chosen the other half. (NAME) will not know whether you have chosen to respond to this request or what you have written.

May I ask you to let me have your letter about (NAME), which must be signed on a hard copy, by (DATE).

If you have questions, please write or telephone me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear (NAME):

During the present academic year (NAME) will be considered for promotion to Professor. (This is the highest rank within the Swarthmore faculty.)

As part of the review a representative group of students is asked to write letters reflecting on their experiences with the candidate. I am writing to you now to request that you write in this capacity. Your comments on (NAME) as a teacher and as a faculty member inside and outside the classroom will be of great help to those involved in making the decision as to promotion. College policy is that your letter will be read by the tenured faculty in the department and the members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, but not by (NAME). About one-half of the students asked to write letters have been chosen by (NAME); I have chosen the other half. (NAME) will not know whether you have chosen to respond to this request or what you have written.

May I ask you to let me have your letter about (NAME), which must be signed on a hard copy, by (DATE).

If you have questions, please write or telephone me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Letter of request sent to students and recent alumni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>COURSE/YR</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Student B. Back, ’11</td>
<td>ARTH</td>
<td>005/S03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Einstein, ’08</td>
<td>ARTH</td>
<td>005/S02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL Minor</td>
<td>098/F01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>001/F03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* R.A. Student, ‘10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.M. Kule, ‘03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art C. Student, ‘03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Al E. Monee, ’05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gross Student, ‘09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Student, ‘08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Ann T. Septic, ‘07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rose Bush, ’05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Parrish Hall, ‘06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Painter Student, ‘06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B. Gone, ’08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sonny Day, ’03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Manella, ’04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Cool, ’09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sue Z. Que, ’10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* U.R. Student, ’07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Howard, ‘10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil E. Streets, ’09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Holly Bush, ’11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. M. Student, ‘11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Y. B. Student, ’06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* X. Student, ’05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Dee, ’04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* selected by candidate

Must include at least 25 student/alumni letters, approximately half of which were chosen by the candidate and approximately half chosen by Chair
25 Student letters here

Each letter should include a note/label including course and grade (see upper right of this page)