



DATE: May 13, 2025

TO: Department Chairs/Program Coordinators and Administrative Assistants/Coordinators

FROM: Kathleen Howard
Acting Provost and Dean of the Faculty

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, and other faculty/instructional staff 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 or the Associate Dean of the Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention.*** If you have any questions or concerns about these procedures, please talk to me before you start work on the dossier.

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 to 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 and responses are coming in, and while the full file is being circulated by the tenured members of your department. We will continue to review dossiers using Interfolio, which provides a secure platform for dossier preparation and allows for the electronic submission of external reviews and letters of recommendation from both department and non-department Swarthmore colleagues. As a reminder, chairs are not given access to Interfolio during the time that candidates are uploading their documents. This is to ensure candidates can upload the dossier they desire and to make sure it is not unduly influenced by any senior member of the department. ***Thus, I recommend that you meet with your candidate to ensure you are both on the same page about what documents are required and optional in the dossier. If you have any questions, please be in touch with me or the Associate Dean of the Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention.***

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. The rest of this preamble highlights elements common to all reviews. The sections that follow outline in detail the steps and documents that are required for dossier preparation. Templates are provided as appendices.

Department Stewarding the Review: The term “department” in this document refers to the unit in which a candidate was hired. In the case of a reorganization/reassignment of a department that occurred after the candidate was hired, the “department” shall include both the members of the original hiring departmental unit as well as the new department. For interdisciplinary/joint hires, the “department” will consist of current faculty from all of the departmental units that took place in the hire. For programs, the “department” refers to the steering committee of the program. In the latter two cases, specifics should be available in the original proposal to CEP for allocation of the tenure-line, or from the Provost for non-tenure positions. Candidates and chairs should clarify any questions as far in advance of the review as possible, particularly for promotion to full Professor cases where the status of the department at the time of hire is less relevant than the recent organization.

Department Review Committee and Summary Letter: Departments should all follow the same review committee policies. *All tenured members of the department/program should be a part of the full dossier review for any review done.* 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. Departments with fewer than three tenured members should consult with the Provost to find tenured colleagues outside the department who can join the review committee. The typical practice is for the department chair/program coordinator to serve as the review Chair. In certain cases, such as when the department chair is the candidate under review, the responsibilities of the review Chair outlined in this document may be assigned to another senior member of the department. Please be in consultation with my office to confirm such an arrangement.

Confidentiality and non-Confidential Elements of the Dossier: 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/their personnel file at least once a year. Because the 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* by request through the Provost’s Office. 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.*

Letters from Department Colleagues: 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. The invited colleagues should include all faculty tenured or on the tenure

track in the department (including faculty who are currently on leave) as well as regular part-time faculty. For non-tenured faculty and instructional staff (e.g., Visiting Assistant Professors, lab and language instructors) inclusion is a department decision, but the practice should be consistent across years and candidates. One consistent practice is to offer all visiting faculty and instructional staff in continuing positions the opportunity to write a letter, but stress they are not required to submit a letter if they have not worked closely with the candidate.

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 when drafting the summary statement. 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 review 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.*** The candidate and I must be kept fully informed throughout the process. In cases where there is a short evaluation period (typically one year) following the previous review, department chairs and the Provost should discuss whether it is appropriate to reuse elements of the previous dossier.

Contents

I. Tenure.....	5
II. Promotions.....	10
III. Third Year Reappointments of Tenure-Track Faculty.....	12
IV. Reappointment for Visiting Assistant Professors.....	14
Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here for more than one year).....	15
Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here for less than one year).....	15
V. Reviews for Part-Time Faculty.....	15
Regular Part-Time Faculty.....	16
VI. Reviews for Renewal of Laboratory Instructors, Language Instructors, and Lecturers.....	16
Lab Instructors and Lab Lecturers (who have been here one or more years).....	17
Lab Instructors and Lab Lecturers (who have been here less than one year).....	17
Language Instructors and Language Lecturers (who have been here one or more years).....	17
Language Instructors and Language Lecturers (who have been here less than one year).....	18
Promotion to the Rank of Senior.....	18
VII. Expedited Reviews.....	19
Appendix A: Exceptions to term lengths.....	20
A.1 Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities.....	20
A.2 COVID-19 Exception Policies for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion.....	20
Appendix B: Dossier Templates.....	21
B.1 List of Courses Taught.....	21
B.2 Links to Solicitation Emails.....	22
B.3 List of Letters of Request Sent to Department Members.....	23
B.4 List of Letters of Request Sent to Swarthmore Colleagues.....	24
B.5 List of Letters of Request Sent to Extramural Colleagues.....	25
B.6 List of Letters of Request Sent to Students and Recent Alumni.....	26
Appendix C: Tables of Dossier Materials and Timelines.....	27
C.1 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Promotion (including RPT), Tenure, and Third Year Reappointment (Tenure Track).....	27
C.2 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Reappointment of Visiting Professors, Regular Part-Time Faculty, and Instructional Staff (Lab/Language Instructor/Lecturer).....	27
C.3 Summary of Timeline for Materials Submission by Review Type.....	28
C.4 Summary of Number of Letter Writers by Review Type.....	29

I. Tenure

(Dossiers due by December 4, 2025)

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 (*Handbook for Instructional Staff*, 2024, III-A-7).** The *Handbook* excerpt (found in Appendix A) should be included in the instructions sent to all letter-writers (except students) 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 also be reminded of this policy.

Additionally, in recognition of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, **all tenure-track faculty who began teaching at the College in 2020-21 or before and who will come up for tenure through 2025-26 will have the option to extend their tenure clocks by one year.** An excerpt of the memo from CPT can be found in Appendix A. The decision to extend the tenure clock rests entirely with the candidate and should not be influenced by the department or program.

The *Handbook for Instructional Staff* outlines the criteria that we use in tenure decisions. The following is excerpted from section III-A-7 (August 2024 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. Included in all dossiers should be the department's statement of scholarly expectations. (This statement should, of course, be shared with all candidates for tenure from their first year at the College.) This will help guide departments, external evaluators, and the Committee on Promotion and Tenure as they review the candidate's dossier and make their evaluation.
2. A summary letter from the 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.

3. A statement invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service as well as future goals and plans in these areas. While this statement is not mandatory, it is commonly submitted by candidates and has proved very useful to the CPT, which will receive the views of many others about the candidate's professional ability and accomplishments. Experience has shown that such a statement 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. It should be no more than 5 pages long. Please encourage candidates to give sufficient time and care to this.

This statement also offers the candidate an opportunity to give the CPT his/her/their own views, possibly making comments he or she would not wish to be read by tenured department members. Therefore, it is possible to submit the statement– or a version of it – directly to the Provost's Office, to be read only by the CPT. Normally, a candidate includes it in the dossier to be shared within the department, but this is not required. **Candidates should clarify what is to be shared with the department and external evaluators from what is to be shared with CPT only.**

This statement is not necessarily 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. Many candidates (and some external reviewers) have requested that a letter 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 statement 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 candidates should work with the department administrative assistant to specify which readers will receive the candidate's statement(s).

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 also be noted here.
6. Copies of syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters (others if desired).
7. Letters about the candidate requested from colleagues in the candidate's department, including the Chair. Please review the introduction pages in this document for details on who should be included ("Letters from Department Colleagues", p. 2). Departmental colleagues should receive the following pieces of the dossier to consider when writing their letter: the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate), and publications.

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 name half of these colleagues outside the department and all tenured members of the department should agree on the other half. Candidates are requested to give a rank-ordered list of at least five names so that if any Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department chooses not to write, there are other colleagues to ask. Candidates may, exclude (or "veto")¹ one Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department. Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate), and publications.
9. Letters requested from six or more extramural referees in the candidate's field, who can objectively evaluate his/her/their professional achievement; these referees should hold tenured faculty positions². The candidate should be asked to name half of these extramural referees by providing a rank-ordered list of at least five names to the department (or more names, if more than the minimum number of external letters is desired). Candidates are asked to provide five names in the case that one or more of the candidate's selections cannot serve as evaluators. Candidates may "veto" two external evaluators (see footnote 1). The tenured members of the department should select the other half of the extramural referees by producing their own rank-ordered list. At least three of the extramural referees must be individuals who are *not* former mentors or present or past collaborators. The tenured members of the department 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.

Timing: in order to give external evaluators enough time to review materials and write and to accommodate those departments that do not have administrative support in the summer, please plan to contact potential extramural referees by June 30, 2025 (or sooner, if needed, to secure referees in a certain discipline) to determine their availability (see standard email inquiry in appendices; to help external referees decide their ability to evaluate the candidate, it is recommended that candidates provide a current CV to their Chair to be included as part of the email solicitation). All candidate documents should be submitted by August 15, 2025, and external evaluators should receive all documents by September 2, 2025. After that date, candidates may not submit or edit any documents/publications for external reviewers. Referees are asked to submit their letter no

¹ The list of departmental selections for letters is blind to the candidate (as is the full list of committed letter writers from the candidate's ranked-order list). A candidate's list of "vetoes", therefore, should be included with their ranked-ordered-list, as it is a veto from the general pool of available letter writers (e.g., all external referees in their field, all possible student letter writers, all non-departmental Swarthmore colleagues.). Candidates cannot veto departmental members. Candidates should not be shown the departmental selections for letter writers at any point in the process.

² Referees not meeting this criteria, but with clearly demonstrated standing in the field, such as an active scholar with recently obtained emeritus status, can be considered with Provost and Department approval.

later than October 24, 2025. External evaluators should receive the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the CV, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate), and publications. Syllabi should not be included.

10. 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. Electronic letters, including those sent through a body of an email, are acceptable. Where appropriate, the opinions of advisees of the candidate would also be helpful. The candidate should be asked to name half of the 25 students and the tenured members of the department should name the other half. Candidates may veto up to three students (see footnote 1). Students should not receive any documents within the dossier.

CPT is allowing faculty members to be able to exclude letters from (or veto) up to one class during the Spring of 2020 should they choose to do so. However, if there are students in that vetoed class who worked with the faculty member in other classes, those students will be able to write for the candidate. In other words, if there are students who have taken only the spring 2020 class with a faculty member and that faculty member has vetoed that class, the department will ensure that those students who took only the vetoed class will not be invited to write.

Note: In the case of tenure reviews, letters should be solicited from students representing all of the years that a candidate has taught at the College, with some preference for those years since the last review. In all cases, both currently enrolled students and recent alumni can (and should) be solicited.

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, but there should be approximately equal numbers of students solicited that were chosen by the candidate and by the department. 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.

11. A list of individuals who have been asked to write letters for the candidate as described in paragraphs 7, 8, 9, and 10 above. This is to be completed by the academic administrator of the review. Please indicate which individuals had responded by the time you reached your final recommendation and which had not. For each student correspondent please list whether the student was chosen by the candidate or the department, the student's major, year of graduation, 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.) See Appendix B for an example.
12. The candidate's published scholarship/creative works and an accompanying bibliography of these publications, listed in chronological order. Candidates can include scholarship that they believe demonstrates their contribution to the field, including work published before joining Swarthmore College, as far back as scholarship that contributed to their PhD Thesis. The

optional candidate statement can be used to guide reviewers through the work. Candidates should refer to their department's statement of scholarly expectations for additional clarity on what materials can/should be included. For example, while CPT does not have a restriction on unpublished work, some departments require that only published (or accepted to be published) work be included in the dossier. If there are questions, please clarify the department's policy with the Chair.

Update period: candidates may submit an **updated CV and/or updated publication materials** (see item #12) for **exclusive review by CPT from November 26, 2025 through December 2, 2025**. This update period acknowledges the dynamic nature of the candidate's dossier and allows candidates to demonstrate to CPT any work completed during the fall semester. The updated publication materials should follow the same criteria outlined in item #12 above.

In requesting letters from each category of respondent, the Chair must use a standard letter (see appendices). The candidate and the Provost must approve any non-cosmetic variations in advance. If variations to the standard letter are used, 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 solicitation 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 responses. Chairs must exercise great caution in responding to such requests. As a general rule, Chairs and senior members of the department 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.

All materials should be uploaded to Interfolio. Any originals or hardcopy versions of documents should be sent to the Provost's Office for permanent disposition. To preserve confidentiality, I strongly urge you not to keep a copy of the file in the department.

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.

Any variation from the model outlined for tenure dossiers should be discussed with the Associate Dean of Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention and/or the Provost.

Please plan to submit tenure dossiers by the deadline of December 4, 2025. 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 December 4, 2025)

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 involves 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 (or previous promotion) 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 a bibliography. Student letters, too, should be solicited only 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 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, it would then be appropriate to consider deferring the review.

Once you have consulted with the candidate, you must notify me, no later than April 1, of your interest in proceeding with a promotion review. At that point, we can decide together on the appropriateness of a review.

Preparation of dossiers for promotion to one of the senior ranks should **follow the model of tenure dossiers outlined in Section I: Tenure. All elements apply here with modifications to items 8 and 10 as specified below:**

8. Letters about the candidate requested from **four** (not six as in the tenure dossiers) or more Swarthmore colleagues outside the candidate's department, in fields both "related to" and "remote from" the candidate's field. The candidate should name half of these colleagues outside the department and all tenured members of the department should agree on the other half. Candidates are requested to give a rank-ordered list of at least five names so that if any Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department chooses not to write, there are other colleagues to ask. Candidates may "veto" one Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department (see footnote 1). Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the

CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate), and publications.

10. Letters from approximately **20** (not 25 as in the tenure dossier) 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. Electronic letters, including those sent through the body of an email, are acceptable. Where appropriate, the opinions of advisees of the candidate would also be helpful. The candidate should be asked to name half of the 20 students and the tenured members of the department should name the other half. Candidates may veto up to three students (see footnote 1). Students should not receive any documents within the dossier.

Note: For promotion reviews, letters should be solicited from students taught since the tenure review. In all cases, both currently enrolled students and recent alumni can (and should) be solicited.

Note: You will need to request letters from a larger number of students in order to receive the 20 required for the dossier; both your list and that of the candidate should be longer, at least 20 names each, but there should be approximately equal numbers of students solicited that were chosen by the candidate and by the department. 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.

Any variation from the model outlined for promotion dossiers should be discussed with the Associate Dean of Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention and/or the Provost.

Promotion dossiers should also be sent to my office by December 4, 2025.

III. Third Year Reappointments of Tenure-Track Faculty **(Dossiers due January 20, 2026)**

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 the 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.

The deadline for submitting a complete reappointment dossier to me is January 20, 2026. It is critical, therefore, that you collect materials for the dossier during the fall semester.

Preparation of dossiers for third year reappointment should **follow the model of tenure dossiers outlined in Section I: Tenure. All elements of the dossier apply here with modifications to items 8, 9, and 10 as specified below:**

8. Letters about the candidate requested from **four** (not six as in the tenure dossiers) or more Swarthmore colleagues outside the candidate's department, in fields both "related to" and "remote from" the candidate's field. The candidate should name half of these colleagues outside the department and all tenured members of the department should agree on the other half. Candidates are requested to give a rank-ordered list of at least five names so that if any Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department chooses not to write, there are other colleagues to ask. Candidates may "veto" one Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department (see footnote 1). Per the guidelines of the Provost's Faculty Mentor Program, the candidate's officially assigned mentor should not be asked to write for the third-year review (though may be invited in subsequent reviews since the partnership lasts through the third year). Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate), and publications.
9. Letters requested from **five** (not six as in the tenure review) extramural referees in the candidate's own special field, who can objectively evaluate his/her/their professional achievement; these referees should hold tenured faculty positions at their institutions. The candidate should be asked to name two of these extramural referees by providing a rank-ordered list of at least five names to the department (or more names); those individuals will be asked to write evaluations. Candidates are asked to provide five names in the case that one or more of the candidate's selections cannot serve as evaluators. The tenured members of the department should select the other three extramural referees by producing their own rank-ordered list. At least three of the extramural referees must be individuals who are *not* former mentors or present or past collaborators. The tenured members of the department must select at least two of these unaffiliated referees. Candidates may "veto" two external evaluators (see footnote 1).

Timing: in order to give external evaluators enough time to review materials and write and to accommodate those departments that do not have administrative support in the summer, please plan to contact potential extramural referees by **June 30, 2025** (or sooner, if needed to secure referees in a certain discipline) to determine their availability (see standard email inquiry in appendices; to help external referees decide their ability to evaluate the candidate, it is recommended that candidates provide a current CV to their Chair to be included as part of the email solicitation). All candidate documents should be submitted by August 29, 2025, and external evaluators should receive all documents by September 15, 2025. After that date, candidates may not submit or edit any documents/publications for external reviewers. Referees are asked to submit their letter no later than November 7, 2025. External evaluators should receive the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the CV, the candidate statements (if desired by the candidate), and publications. Syllabi should not be included.

10. Letters from approximately **25 of the candidate's total students or 25% of students taught (whichever is smaller)** 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. Electronic letters, including those sent through a body of an email, are acceptable. Where appropriate, the opinions of advisees of the candidate would also be helpful. The candidate should be asked to name half of the students solicited and the tenured members of the department should name the other half. Candidates may veto up to three students (see footnote 1). Students should not receive any documents from the dossier.

Note: You will need to request letters from a larger number of students in order to receive the 25/25% required for the dossier; both your list and that of the candidate should be longer, at least 25/25% names each, but there should be approximately equal numbers of students solicited that were chosen by the candidate and by the department. 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: 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. **The candidate and department should select 5 students apiece** (or more if it would help meet the threshold of 25/25% stated above) **from the courses taught in this fifth semester.** At the end of the fall semester, you should solicit letters from these selected students.

Update period: candidates may submit an **updated CV and/or updated publication materials for exclusive review by the Provost from January 14, 2026 through January 16, 2026.** This update period acknowledges the dynamic nature of the candidate's dossier and allows candidates to demonstrate to the Provost any work completed during the fall semester. The updated publication materials should follow the same criteria outlined in item #12 from Section I.

In addition to the modifications above, it should be noted that the dossier is forwarded to the Provost after the Departmental Review (not the CPT). Any variation from the model outlined for

third-year reappointment dossiers should be discussed with the Associate Dean of Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention and/or the Provost. **Third-year review dossiers should be sent to my office by January 20, 2026.**

IV. Reappointment for Visiting Assistant Professors

While most visiting faculty appointments are considered terminal and non-renewable, the Provost in consultation with departments may approve reappointment after the initial term. The reappointment does not necessarily need to be with the same duties/terms as the original appointment. In such cases, a review is required to decide on reappointment. While there is some variation from case to case, providing some uniformity in both materials required for such reviews and the timing of the review process provides clearer expectations for the candidates and structure for the departments. Commonly, reappointments are requested with the annual departmental staffing survey in the Fall semester of the last year on contract. If approved by the Provost, the Expedited Review process (Section VII) will be utilized. For reappointments approved prior to the final year (e.g., to replace a faculty member on prolonged leave), the guidance below will be followed. In both cases, the criteria for reappointment will be the same.

Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here for more than one year) (Dossiers due January 21, 2026)

The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments relevant to the duties of the position, including teaching and position as a scholar in the field
3. Department colleague letters invited from all members of the department or program, including the Chair. Colleagues should receive the following dossier materials: the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement, and any scholarship material submitted.
4. Student Letters from at least 10 of the candidate's students, including those currently enrolled and recent graduates. At least 20 students should be solicited with the candidate naming half the students and the tenured members of the department selecting the other half.
5. Syllabi from courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters
6. List of courses taught at Swarthmore College, as described in Section I #5.
7. A summary letter from the 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. See Section I #2 for details.
8. Optional: any scholarship or creative works since the start of the current appointment

For reviews approved during the final academic year of an appointment, there is not enough time to solicit and evaluate individual letters. Departments will be provided a timeline under the Expedited Review (Section VII) process.

Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here for less than one year)

Departments seeking to review first-year visiting faculty for reappointment should follow the expedited review in Section VII (“Expedited Reviews”).

V. Reviews for Part-Time Faculty

Review for reappointment or non-reappointment of part-time faculty members (see *Handbook for Instructional Staff*, Section III-A-16) will vary by position. Chairs of departments employing part-time faculty (that are not described by the procedure below) with a spring decision deadline should make an appointment with me to discuss the matter **before** December 3, 2025.

Regular Part-Time Faculty

Regular Part-Time Faculty (as described in *Handbook for Instructional Staff*, Section III-A-16a) are appointed for periods of one to five years. Reappointment decisions for these members of the instructional staff are generally made in the penultimate year of appointment. Reviews for reappointment into these positions will follow the procedure outlined in Section V (“Reappointment for Visiting Assistant Professors”). Given the varying responsibilities of individuals in these positions, the Provost, in collaboration with the Department, may request additional elements be solicited for the dossier. For example, many of these positions carry an administrative component and/or require substantial interaction with non-instructional staff. In these situations, the Provost may request letters be solicited from members of the staff, or from members of the community outside of the department. Note: because the nature of administrative appointments varies across the College and are appointed at the discretion of the Provost, the aspects of the administrative portion of the appointment are typically evaluated separately and on an annual basis, similar to other administrative positions at the College.

As stated in *Handbook for Instructional Staff*, Section III-A-16a, regular part-time faculty are eligible for promotion on the same basis as full-time members of the faculty. (However, RPTs are not required to stand for promotion.) These reviews will follow the procedure outlined in Section II (“Promotions”). While reappointment decisions focus on teaching and service (and administrative work where applicable), decisions to promote faculty carry additional expectations of scholarship and/or production of creative works. Departments, in consultation with the Provost, should provide specific guidance on these expectations. This should be provided in writing and be done well in advance of a potential promotion application (ideally, at the time of initial appointment). These expectations will guide the candidate in the preparation of materials, letter writers reviewing the candidate’s scholarship/creative work (both external referees and departmental colleagues), and finally the CPT in their review of the full dossier.

Reviews for promotion should coincide with reappointment decisions when possible. Exceptions to this should be discussed with the Provost. In situations where a candidate is being reviewed for promotion and reappointment, the procedure for Section II (“Promotion”) will be utilized to

generate the dossier, with the CPT using the dossier to decide on Promotion and the Provost using the dossier to decide on reappointment.

VI. Reviews for Renewal of Laboratory Instructors, Language Instructors, and Lecturers

(Dossiers due February 13, 2026)

Reappointment decisions for these members of the instructional staff are generally made in the final year of appointment (see *Handbook for Instructional Staff*, Section III-A-17). Consistent with the focus of these positions on teaching, a dossier should be prepared according to the following guidelines. Instructional staff positions outside of language or lab positions will follow a similar structure; contact the Provost's Office for details.

Lab Instructors and Lab Lecturers (who have been here one or more years)

Reappointment decisions for lab instructors and lab lecturers who have been here for one or more years will be due to the candidates by March 1 (or the first business day after March 1 if it falls on a weekend), if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments relevant to the duties of the position, including teaching and other departmental responsibilities
3. Department colleague letters from department or program colleagues who work with the candidate. Colleagues should receive the following dossier materials: the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement, and the lab/assignment materials (if submitted).
4. Student Letters from at least 10 of the candidate's students, including those currently enrolled and recent graduates. At least 20 students should be solicited with the candidate naming half the students and the tenured members of the department selecting the other half.
5. Syllabi, or comparable materials, from courses and labs taught in the most recent 4 semesters. These materials should demonstrate the candidate's role in the curriculum and need not have been authored by the candidate.
6. List of all courses and labs taught at Swarthmore College, as described in Section I #5.
7. A summary letter from the 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. See Section I #2 for details.
8. Optional: materials demonstrating curriculum development since the start of the current appointment, such as lab materials or assignments written or rewritten by the candidate

Lab Instructors and Lab Lecturers (who have been here less than one year)

Reappointment decisions for lab instructors and lab lecturers who have been here for less than one year will be due to the candidates by March 1 (or the first business day after March 1 if it

falls on a weekend), if possible. The review dossier should follow the instructions above with the following exceptions:

4. Student letters solicited from all of the candidate's students from the first semester at the college
5. Syllabi, or comparable materials, from courses and labs taught in the current year. These materials should demonstrate the candidate's role in the curriculum and need not have been authored by the candidate.

Language Instructors and Language Lecturers (who have been here one or more years)

Reappointment decisions for language instructors and language lecturers who have been here for one or more years will be due to the candidates by March 1 (or the first business day after March 1 if it falls on a weekend), if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments relevant to the duties of the position, including teaching and other departmental responsibilities.
3. Department colleague letters from those within the language program in which the candidate teaches. Colleagues should receive the following dossier materials: the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement, and the assignment/course materials (if submitted).
4. Student Letters from at least 10 of the candidate's students, including those currently enrolled and recent graduates. At least 20 students should be solicited with the candidate naming half the students and the tenured members of the department selecting the other half.
5. Syllabi from courses taught or co-taught in the most recent 4 semesters. These materials should demonstrate the candidate's role in the curriculum and need not have been authored by the candidate.
6. List of courses taught or co-taught at Swarthmore College, as described in Section I #5
7. A summary letter from the 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. See Section I #2 for details
8. Optional: materials demonstrating curriculum development since the start of the current appointment, such as assignments or course materials written or rewritten by the candidate

Language Instructors and Language Lecturers (who have been here less than one year)

Reappointment decisions for language instructors and language lecturers who have been here for less than one year will be due to the candidates by March 1 (or the first business day after March 1 if it falls on a weekend), if possible. The review dossier should follow the instructions above with the following exceptions:

4. Student letters solicited from all of the candidate's students from the first semester at the college

5. Syllabi from courses and labs taught in the current year. These materials should demonstrate the candidate's role in the curriculum and need not have been authored by the candidate.

Promotion to the Rank of Senior

Individuals in a lecturer or instructor role may be considered for promotion after a minimum of 10 years of College service at the rank of lecturer or instructor. The recommendation for promotion comes from the department and should coincide with the reappointment review. Departments should outline criteria for promotional considerations in their recommendation to the Provost, and share these criteria with candidates in advance of eligibility for promotion. Individuals with less service at the College may be considered for promotion to senior only if they carry substantial prior teaching and/or relevant professional experience and have the unanimous support of the tenured members of their department and the approval of the Provost. Individuals who have fewer than 7 years of service at the College are generally not considered for promotion to Senior.

Individuals at the rank of senior carry a similar workload to others within the position of lecturer or instructor. In addition, senior lecturers/instructors are expected to take on more substantive leadership roles within the department and, on occasion, may be called on to participate in a College-level initiative related to their expertise.

VII. Expedited Reviews

There are times in which departments and programs have to fill an instructor position not on our normal review schedule (e.g., due to an approved leave during the current academic year). In such cases, a department or program may wish to reappoint a current visiting faculty or instructional staff member to teach for additional semesters at the College. Conducting a full review, under those circumstances, is not feasible due to the time required to solicit and collect individual letters. In such cases, with the explicit permission of the Provost, a candidate can be reviewed using an "expedited review" process to be handled in collaboration with the Provost's Office. Faculty and instructional staff who are on continuing appointments (e.g., tenure-stream, RPT, and continuing instructional staff) should not be reviewed using the expedited process. The expectations and criteria considered during the expedited review should not differ from the normal reviews outlined above. Please contact the Associate Dean of the Faculty for Diversity, Recruitment, and Retention for a timeline.

The expedited review should include the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement (optional) invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments relevant to the duties of the position, including teaching and position as a scholar in the field
3. Relevant syllabi (up to the most recent 4 semesters)
4. The department chair (or a designated senior department faculty member) will sit in on one of the classes of the candidate and provide a written **review of teaching**.

5. The department chair submits a summary letter that summarizes the balanced opinion of all tenured members of the department. Note that this is a separate document from the review of teaching listed above. See Section I #2 for details.
6. Optional: any scholarship or creative works since the start of the current appointment

The Provost will use these documents to make a final decision on the review of the candidate and possible reappointment, according to the approved timeline.

cc: Valerie Smith, President of Swarthmore College
Faculty Members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure

Appendix A: Exceptions to term lengths

A.1 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 April 1 the semester preceding 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. Amended by the Faculty, November 10, 2023)

A.2 COVID-19 Exception Policies for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

The following is an excerpt from CPT's January 2021 memo providing exceptions to policies in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The portion related to the extension of the tenure clock for faculty on the tenure-track during the 2020-21 academic year is provided below:

To: Official-Faculty
From: The Committee on Promotion and Tenure
Date: January 1, 2021

...

1. All tenure-track faculty will have the option to extend their tenure clocks by one year.

a. This includes all tenure track faculty who began teaching in 2020-21 or before and who have been slated to come up for tenure through 2025-26.

b. Faculty members choosing to delay their tenure clocks under this process (Covid-delay) must inform the department/program and the Provost's office no later than February 1 of the year in which they are scheduled to submit their dossiers, whether they will extend their tenure clock by one year. For example, if a faculty member is scheduled to submit their dossier for tenure in the summer of 2021, they must inform their chair and the Provost's Office of their intentions by February 1, 2021. If a faculty member is scheduled to submit in the summer of 2022, they must inform their chair and the Provost's Office by February 1 of 2022 of their intentions. *The decision to extend a tenure clock will be the candidate's decision alone, will result in an additional year added to their contract, and will have no bearing on the tenure decision itself.*

...

Appendix B: Dossier Templates

B.1 List of Courses Taught

**Leonardo DaVinci
Tenure Dossier
December 2018**

Courses and Seminars taught by Leonardo DaVinci

Term	Course	Title	Enrollment
Spring 2011	CHEM 045 01	Phys Chem: Energy and Change	5
Spring 2011	CHEM 045 A	Phys Chem: Energy & Change-Lab	5
Spring 2011	CHEM 094 02	Research Project	0
Spring 2011	CHEM 096 02	Research Thesis	1
Spring 2011	CHEM 105 01	Quantum Chemistry/Spectroscopy	7
Spring 2011	CHEM 180 02	Honors Research Thesis	0
Fall 2010	CHEM 010 01	Fdns of Chemical Principles	51
Fall 2010	CHEM 010 02	Fdns of Chemical Principles	42
Fall 2010	CHEM 010 B	Gen Chem Lab 1:15-4:30	23
Fall 2010	CHEM 094 01	Research Project	0
Fall 2010	CHEM 096 01	Research Thesis	1
Fall 2010	CHEM 180 02	Honors Research Thesis	0
Spring 2010	CHEM 045 01	Phys Chem: Energy and Change	15
Spring 2010	CHEM 045 A	Phys Chem:Energy & Change-Lab	8
Spring 2010	CHEM 045 B	Phys Chem:Energy & Change-Lab	7
Spring 2010	CHEM 093 01	DirRd: Quantum Chemistry	1
Spring 2010	CHEM 094 02	Research Project	0
Spring 2010	CHEM 096 02	Research Thesis	0
Spring 2010	CHEM 180 02	Honors Research Thesis	0

B.2 Links to Solicitation Emails

To find copy/paste versions of the solicitation emails please follow the links listed below. With the exception of Extramural Email Solicitation, these letters should be sent through Interfolio. Extramural scholars should be contacted directly by chairs. Once they have agreed to serve, an invitation letter is sent through Interfolio when the materials are ready.

Emails to Swarthmore Colleagues inside the Candidate's Department

- Tenure
- Promotion to Professor (tenured)
- Third Year Reappointment (tenure track)
- Promotion for Regular Part-Time Faculty (non-tenure)
- Reappointment for Lab or Language Instructor
- Reappointment for Visiting Assistant Professor or Regular Part-Time Faculty

Emails sent to Swarthmore Colleagues outside the Candidate's Department

- Tenure
- Promotion (Professor, tenured)
- Third Year Reappointment (tenure track)
- Promotion for Regular Part-Time Faculty (non-tenure)

Emails sent to Extramural Scholars

- Tenure Email Solicitation
- Promotion Email Solicitation
- Third Year Reappointment Email Solicitation
- Promotion for Regular Part-Time Faculty (non-tenure) Email Solicitation
- Tenure
- Promotion to Professor (tenured)
- Third Year Reappointment (tenure track)
- Promotion for Regular Part-Time Faculty (non-tenure)

Emails sent to Swarthmore Students and Alumni

- Tenure
- Promotion to Professor (tenured)
- Third Year Reappointment (tenure track)
- Promotion for Regular Part-Time Faculty (non-tenure)
- Reappointment for Lab or Language Instructors
- Reappointment for Visiting Assistant Professor or Regular Part-Time Faculty

B.3 List of Letters of Request Sent to Department Members

Letter of request sent to Department Members:

Colleague	Date Received
Albert Einstein	October 15, 2018
Isaac Newton	October 16, 2018
Marie Curie	October 15, 2018
Charles Darwin	November 1, 2018
Katherine Johnson	October 12, 2018
Stephen Hawking	October 14, 2018

B.4 List of Letters of Request Sent to Swarthmore Colleagues

Letter of request sent to Swarthmore Colleagues:

Colleague	Department	Date Received
*Jacques Cousteau	Biology	October 15, 2018
John Dalton	Chemistry	October 16, 2018
*Jane Goodall	Anthropology	October 15, 2018
B.F.Skinner	Psychology	November 1, 2018
Ivan Pavlov	Psychology	October 12, 2018
* René Descartes	Mathematics	October 14, 2018

* selected by candidate

B.5 List of Letters of Request Sent to Extramural Colleagues

Letter of request sent to Extramural Colleagues:

Colleague	Institution/Address	Date Received
*Michael Faraday	State University University, PA, 12345	October 15, 2018
Galileo Galilei	State College Collegetown, PA, 12345	October 16, 2018
*Marie Maynard Daly	City University University City, PA, 12345	October 15, 2018
Sigmund Freud	City College University, PA, 12345	November 1, 2018
Carl Sagan	National College Collegetown, PA, 12345	October 12, 2018
*W.E.B. DuBois	National University University City, PA, 12345	October 14, 2018

*selected by candidate

B.6 List of Letters of Request Sent to Students and Recent Alumni

Letters of Request sent to Students and Recent Alumni									
Last Name	First Name	Class Year	Major	Term	Subject	Crse	Grade	Date Received	Honors
*Astudent	John	2013	Sp Maj: Chemical Physics	Fall 2010	BIOL	45	A-	10/11/2017	Highest Honors
Bstudent	Erica	2015	Chemistry	Fall 2010	BIOL	10	C	11/5/2017	
				Spring 2010	BIOL	45	B+		
*Cstudent	Joseph	2010	Psychology	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	C	9/22/2017	
*Dstudent	Pamela	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	B		
				Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B+		
Estudent	Sanjay	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B+		
*Fstudent	Susan	2015	Chemistry	Spring 2010	BIOL	45	C-	10/11/2017	
*Gstudent	Erik	2010	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B-	11/5/2017	
Hstudent	Anna	2013	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B+	9/22/2017	
Istudent	Juan	2014	Sp Maj: Chemical Physics	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B-	10/11/2017	
*Jstudent	Yei	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	A		Highest Honors
Kstudent	Nicholas	2015	Biology	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	CR	9/22/2017	
				Fall 2010	BOIL	45	B+		
Lstudent	Olivia	2013	Chemistry	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	B+		
Mstudent	Alex	2014	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	A-	9/22/2017	Honors
*Nstudent	Sarah	2013	Sp Maj: Chemical Physics	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	C	10/11/2017	

Must list all students who have been solicited (even if they did not respond). Leave the “Date Received blank” if they did not respond. Indicate candidate selections with an asterisk(*). If a student took multiple courses with the candidate, list each on its own line.

Appendix C: Tables of Dossier Materials and Timelines

C.1 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Promotion (including RPT), Tenure, and Third Year Reappointment (Tenure Track)

Letter Writer	Documents
Extramural Scholars	Department's Statement of Scholarly Expectations, CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship (as directed by the candidate), Publications
Swarthmore Departmental Colleagues	Department's Statement of Scholarly Expectations, CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship (as directed by the candidate), Syllabi, Publications
Swarthmore Non-Departmental Colleagues	Department's Statement of Scholarly Expectations, CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship (as directed by the candidate), Syllabi, Publications
Students	None

C.2 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Reappointment of Visiting Professors, Regular Part-Time Faculty, and Instructional Staff (Lab/Language Instructor/Lecturer)

Letter Writer	Documents
Swarthmore Departmental Colleagues	CV, Candidate's Statement, Syllabi, List of Courses/Labs Taught, and Publications/Lab Assignments/Course Materials (where applicable)
Students	None

C.3 Summary of Timeline for Materials Submission by Review Type

Tenured, tenure-track, and RPT (promotion) reviews

Review Type	External evaluator requests sent	Candidate documents due	All letter requests sent	All letters due	Department review period	Update period	Dossier due to Provost / CPT	Decision due to Candidate
Tenure and Promotion (including RPT Promotion)	6/30	8/15	9/2	10/24	10/29-11/26	11/26-12/2	12/4	After February Board of Managers meeting
3rd Year Reappointment (Tenure Track)	6/30	8/29	9/15	11/7	11/17-1/16	1/14 - 1/16	1/20	2/16 ³

Non-tenure (VAP, RPT, Instructional Staff) reviews

Review Type	Candidate documents due	All letter requests sent	All letters due	Department review period	Dossier due to Provost	Decision due to Candidate
Faculty Reappointment (VAP and RPT)	9/12	9/29	11/14	11/25-1/16	1/21	2/16 ²
Instructional Staff Reappointment (here 1+ year)	10/24	11/10	1/16	1/20-2/12	2/13	3/2 ⁴
New Instructional Staff Reappointment (here <1 year)	11/17	12/8	1/16	1/20-2/12	2/13	3/2 ³

³ First business day after 2/15

⁴ First business day after 3/1

C.4 Summary of Number of Letter Writers by Review Type

Except where noted, the department and candidate each select half of the selected letter writers.

Review Type	Department Colleague	Non-Department Colleague	External Evaluator	Student
Tenure	All colleagues, as specified in the introduction to this document	6	6	25 (solicit at least 50)
Promotion (including RPT Promotion)		4	6	20 (solicit at least 40)
3rd Year Reappointment (Tenure Track)		4	5 (2 chosen by the candidate, 3 chosen by the department)	25 (solicit at least 50) or 25% (solicit 50%) of students taught, whichever is smaller Solicit an additional 10 from the 5th semester (Fall of the review year)
Faculty Reappointment (VAP and RPT)	All colleagues, as specified in the introduction to this document	N/A	N/A	10 (solicit at least 20)
Instructional Staff Reappointment (here 1+ year)	See Section VI	N/A	N/A	10 (solicit at least 20)
New Instructional Staff Reappointment (here <1 year)	See Section VI	N/A	N/A	10 (solicit at least 20)