



DATE: May 3, 2021

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

FROM: Sarah Willie-LeBreton
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, 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.

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 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 are able to 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 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. 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.)

Departments should all follow the same review committee policies. ***As in AY2020-2021, for AY2021-2022, 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.

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 or program coordinator 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.

The sections that follow outline in detail the steps and documents that are required for dossier preparation. Templates are provided as appendices.

Contents

I. Tenure	4
II. Promotions	9
III. Third Year Reappointments (of tenure-track faculty)	11
IV. Other Reappointments	13
Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here one or more years)	13
Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here less than one year)	14
Expedited reviews:	14
V. Review for Renewal of Part-time Members	14
VI. Review for Renewal of Laboratory Instructors, Language Instructors and Lecturers	15
Lab Instructors and Lab Lecturers (who have been here one or more years)	15
Lab Instructors and Lab Lecturers (who have been here less than one year)	15
Language Instructors and Language Lecturers (who have been here one or more years)	15
Language Instructors and Language Lecturers (who have been here less than one year)	16
VII. Appendix A: Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities	17
VIII. Appendix B: Dossier Templates	18
8.1 List of Courses Taught	18
8.2 Links to Solicitation Emails	19
8.3 List of Letters of Request Sent to Department Members	20
8.4 List of Letters of Request Sent to Swarthmore Colleagues	21
8.5 List of Letters of Request Sent to Extramural Colleagues	22
8.6 List of Letters of Request Sent to Students and Recent Alumni	23
IX. Appendix C: Tables of Dossier Materials and Timelines	24
9.1 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Promotion & Tenure Dossiers	24
9.2 Summary of Timeline for Materials Submission by Review Type	25

I. Tenure

(Dossiers due by Friday, December 3, 2021)

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*, 2019, III-A-7, p. 132). The *Handbook* excerpt (found in Appendix A) 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 (January, 2019 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.)

In addition, due to the COVID-19 pandemic of spring, 2020, **all tenure-track faculty who began teaching 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.** The decision to extend the tenure clock rests entirely with the candidate and should not be influenced by the department or program.

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 a summary of 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 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 statement invited from the candidate to provide commentary on experiences and accomplishments in teaching and scholarship, as well as future goals and plans in both 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. Please encourage candidates to give sufficient time and care to this.

This statement also offers the candidate an opportunity to give the CPT his or her own views, possibly making comments he or she would not wish 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 likely 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 candidate's statement 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. 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 "veto" one Swarthmore colleague outside the candidate's department provided the candidate submits a reasonable explanation for why that individual should not write for them. Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: 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 own special field, who can objectively evaluate his or her professional achievement; these referees should hold tenured faculty positions at their institutions. 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); 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.) 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 provided the candidate articulates the concern for why that individual should not write for them.

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, 2021 (or sooner, if needed to secure referees in a certain discipline) to determine their availability (see standard email inquiry in appendices; do not send the vitae at this point). All candidate documents should be submitted by August 13, 2021 and external evaluators should receive all documents by August 27, 2021. After that date, candidates may not submit or edit any documents/publications for external reviewers. Referees are asked to respond no later than October 29, 2021. External evaluators should receive the department's statement of scholarly expectations, the CV, the extramural research and candidate statement (if desired by the candidate) and publications. Syllabi should not be included. Candidates may submit an updated CV and/or supplementary documents for exclusive review by CPT from November 29, 2021 through December 3, 2021. 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.

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 provided the candidate articulates why the student should not write. Students should not receive any documents within the dossier.

CPT is allowing faculty members who come up for tenure in 2020-2021 through 2024-2025 and who began teaching here in 2019-2020 or earlier, 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, we 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. 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 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 6, 7, 8, and 9 above. **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, the grades. (Shadow grades for CR/NC work are not necessary.)**
12. A list of the candidate's published scholarship, plus any unpublished manuscripts being included with the dossier.

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 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 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. I strongly urge you not to keep a copy of the file in the department, in order to help preserve confidentiality.

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 Friday, December 3, 2021. 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 Friday, December 3, 2021)

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 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, 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 1, 2021, 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 except for the following:

1. 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 provided the candidate submits a reasonable explanation for why that individual should not write for them. Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate) and publications.
2. 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 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 20 students and the tenured members of the Department should name the other half. Candidates may veto up to three students provided the candidate articulates why the student should not write. 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 3, 2021.

III. Third Year Reappointments (of tenure-track faculty) **(Dossiers due Friday, January 21, 2022)**

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*, 2019, p. 134), notice of reappointment is owed by the College to the faculty member by February 15 of the third year of a four-year appointment. The deadline for submitting a complete reappointment dossier to me is Friday, January 21, 2022. 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 except for the following:

1. 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 provided the candidate submits a reasonable explanation for why that individual should not write for them. Colleagues outside the department should receive the following pieces of the dossier: the CV, syllabi for courses taught in the most recent 4 semesters, the candidate statement (if desired by the candidate) and publications.
2. 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 or her 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.) 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 provided the candidate articulates the concern for why that individual should not write for them.

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, 2021** (or sooner, if needed to secure referees in a certain discipline) to determine their availability (see standard email inquiry; do not send the vitae at this point). All candidate documents should be submitted by **August 27, 2021** and external evaluators should receive all documents by **September 11, 2021**. After that date, candidates may not submit or edit any documents/publications for external reviewers. Referees are asked to respond no later than **November 12, 2021**. External evaluators should receive the CV, the extramural research and teaching statements (if desired by the candidate) and publications. Syllabi should not be included. Candidates may submit an updated CV and/or supplementary documents for exclusive review by the Provost from **January 17, 2022 through January 21, 2022**. 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.

3. 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 provided the candidate articulates why the student should not write. Students should not receive any documents within 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.

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 21, 2022.

During the fall semester, it is appropriate 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. 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. 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 submitted to my office by January 21, 2022.

IV. Other Reappointments

Other reappointment decisions, regarding faculty members not in tenurable positions, are owed to candidates by February 15, 2022, if possible. See *Handbook for Instructional Staff*, Section III-A-15.) While there is some variation from case to case, providing some uniformity in both materials required for such reviews and timing of the review process provides more clear expectations for the candidates and structure for the departments. To this end, beginning in academic year 2020-2021, reviews of faculty members not in tenurable positions will follow the following guidelines:

Visiting Assistant Professors (who have been here one or more years)

Reappointment decisions for visiting assistant professors who have been here for one or more years will be due to the candidates by February 15, 2022, if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement

3. Department colleague letters from all members of the department or program
4. Student Letters (20 solicited – 10 chosen by candidate and 10 chosen by department- with a goal of no less than 10)
5. Syllabi from courses over the last 2+ years
6. List of courses taught
7. Optional: any scholarship or creative works

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

Reappointment decisions for visiting assistant professors who have been here for less than one year will be due to the candidates by February 15, 2022, if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement
3. Department colleague letters from all members of the department or program
4. Student course evaluations from first semester at college
5. Syllabi from courses over the last year
6. List of courses taught
7. Optional: any scholarship or creative works

Expedited Reviews:

There are times in which departments and programs have to scramble to find an additional instructor not on our normal review schedule (e.g., someone needs to take a medical or family leave). In such cases, a department or program may wish to reappoint a current visiting faculty or instructional staff member to teach for one additional semester/year at the College.

Conducting a full review under those circumstances is not always feasible -- especially if the faculty or instructional staff member has only just begun their one-year appointment at the College or the College learns of the staffing need late in the spring semester.

In such cases, with the explicit permission of the Provost, a candidate can be reviewed using an “expedited review” process to be handled through Interfolio. Faculty and instructional staff who are on continuing appointments may not be reviewed using the expedited process. Such a process involves the following:

- A. The candidate would upload their CV, any relevant syllabi, and an optional candidate statement to Interfolio
- B. The chair of the department or program (or a designated senior department/program faculty member) would sit in on one of the classes of the candidate and write up a review of the candidate’s teaching also to be uploaded to Interfolio
- C. The department chair would draft a departmental summary letter to be signed by all tenure-track members of the department outlining the department’s review of the candidate also to be uploaded to Interfolio
- D. The Provost would then use these documents to make a final decision on the review of the candidate and possible reappointment.

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-16) 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 December 4, 2021**.

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

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:

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, 2022, if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement
3. Department colleague letters from department or program colleagues who work with the candidate
4. Student Letters (20 solicited – 10 chosen by candidate and 10 chosen by department-with a goal of no less than 10)
5. Syllabi from courses and labs taught over the last 2+ years
6. List of courses and labs taught
7. Optional: lab materials and/or assignments written or rewritten

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, 2022, if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement
3. Department colleague letters from department or program colleagues who work with the candidate
4. Student professor evaluations from first semester at college
5. Syllabi from courses and labs taught over the last year
6. List of courses and labs taught
7. Optional: lab materials and/or assignments written or rewritten

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

Reappointments 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, 2022, if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement
3. Department colleague letters from those within the language program in which the candidate teaches
4. Student Letters (20 solicited – 10 chosen by candidate and 10 chosen by the program- with a goal of no less than 10)
5. Syllabi from courses taught or co-taught over the last 2+ years
6. List of courses taught or co-taught
7. Optional: assignments and/or course materials written or rewritten

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, 2022, if possible. The review dossier should include the following components:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Candidate Statement
3. Department colleague letters from those within the language program in which the candidate teaches
4. Student professor evaluations from first semester at college
5. Syllabi from courses taught or co-taught over the last year
6. List of courses taught or co-taught
7. Optional: assignments and/or course materials written or rewritten

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

VII. Appendix A: 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)

VIII. Appendix B: Dossier Templates

8.1 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

8.2 Links to Solicitation Emails

To find copy/paste versions of the solicitation emails please follow the links listed below:

Emails to Swarthmore Colleagues inside the Candidate's Department or Program

- Tenure Letter
- Promotion Letter
- Third Year Reappointment Letter
- Promotion Letter for Regular Part Time faculty (non-tenure)
- Reappointment/Review of Lab & Language Instructors who have been here 1+ year
- Reappointment/Review of Lab & Language Instructors who have been here less than 1 year
- Reappointment/Review of Visiting Assistant Professors who have been here 1+ year
- Reappointment/Review of Visiting Assistant Professors who have been here less than 1 year

Emails sent to Swarthmore Colleagues outside the Candidate's Department or Program

- Tenure Letter
- Promotion Letter
- Reappointment Letter
- Promotion Letter for Regular Part Time faculty (non-tenure)

Emails sent to Extramural Scholars

- Tenure Email Solicitation
- Promotion Email Solicitation
- Third Year Reappointment Email Solicitation
- Promotion Letter for Regular Part Time faculty (non-tenure) Solicitation
- Tenure Letter
- Promotion Letter
- Third Year Reappointment Letter
- Promotion Letter for Regular Part Time faculty (non-tenure)

Emails sent to Swarthmore Students and Alumni

- Tenure Letter
- Promotion Letter
- Third Year Reappointment Letter
- Promotion Letter for Regular Part Time faculty (non-tenure)
- Reappointment/Review of Lab and Language Instructors who have been here 1+ year
- Reappointment/Review of Lab & Language Instructors who have been here less than 1 year
- Reappointment/Review of Visiting Assistant Professor who have been here 1+ year
- Reappointment/Review of Visiting Assistant Professor who have been here less than 1 year

8.3 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

8.4 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

8.5 List of Letters of Request Sent to Extramural Colleagues

Letter of request sent to Extramural Colleagues:

Colleague	Address	Date Received
*Michael Faraday	1234 University Avenue University, PA, 12345	October 15, 2018
Galileo Galilei	5432 College Avenue Collegetown, PA, 12345	October 16, 2018
*Marie Maynard Daly	1234 College Avenue University City, PA, 12345	October 15, 2018
*Sigmund Freud	1234 University Avenue University, PA, 12345	November 1, 2018
Carl Sagan	5432 College Avenue Collegetown, PA, 12345	October 12, 2018
*W.E.B. DuBois	1234 College Avenue University City, PA, 12345	October 14, 2018

*selected by candidate

8.6 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	45	C	11/5/2017		
*Cstudent	Joseph	2010	Psychology	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	C	9/22/2017		
*Dstudent	Pamela	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	B	10/11/2017		
Estudent	Lakisha	2014	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B+	11/5/2017		
Fstudent	Sanjay	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B+	9/22/2017		
*Gstudent	Susan	2015	Chemistry	Spring 2010	BIOL	45	C-	10/11/2017		
*Hstudent	Erik	2010	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B-	11/5/2017		
Istudent	Anna	2013	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B+	9/22/2017		
Kstudent	Juan	2014	Sp Maj: Chemical Physics	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B-	10/11/2017		
*Lstudent	Yei	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	A	11/5/2017	Highest Honors	
Mstudent	Nicholas	2015	Biology	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	CR	9/22/2017		
Nstudent	Jorge	2010	Chemistry	Fall 2010	BOIL	45	B+	10/11/2017		
Ostudent	Olivia	2013	Chemistry	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	B+	11/5/2017		
Pstudent	Alex	2014	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	A-	9/22/2017	Honors	
*Qstudent	Sarah	2013	Sp Maj: Chemical Physics	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	C	10/11/2017		
Rstudentn	Rachel	2015	Chemistry	Fall 2010	BIOL	45	C	11/5/2017		
*Sstudent	Ashley	2010	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B	9/22/2017		
*Tstudent	Tai	2013	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	B+	10/11/2017		
*Ustudent	Joshua	2014	Chemistry	Fall 2010	BIOL	45	B+	11/5/2017		
Vstudent	Daniela	2013	Sp Maj: Chemical Physics	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	C-	9/22/2017		
Wstudent	Benjamin	2015	Chemistry	Spring 2010	BIOL	45	B-	10/11/2017		
Xstudent	Corin	2010	Chemistry	Fall 2010	CHEM	45	B+	11/5/2017		
Ystudent	Cecilia	2013	Chemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	B-	9/22/2017		
Zstudent	Nicole	2014	Sp Maj: Biochemistry	Spring 2010	CHEM	45	A	10/11/2017	High Honors	

***selected by candidate**

Must include **all student/alumni letters**, approximately half of which were chosen by the candidate and approximately half chosen by the tenured members of the department

NOTE: YOU MUST LIST ALL STUDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN SOLICITED, WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE RESPONDED.

IX. Appendix C: Tables of Dossier Materials and Timelines

9.1 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Promotion & Tenure Dossiers

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, Syllabi and publications
Swarthmore Non-Departmental Colleagues	CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship (as directed by the candidate), Syllabi and publications
Students	Nothing

9.2 Summary of Timeline for Materials Submission by Review Type

Review Type	External evaluator letter requests sent	Candidate documents for dossier due	All letter requests	All letters due	Department / Program review period	Update period	Dossier due to Provost/ CPT	Candidate informed of decision
Tenure -AND- Promotion Review	6/30	8/13	8/27	10/29	10/29-11/29	11/29-12/3	12/3	After Feb BoM meeting
3rd Year Reappointment (Tenure Track Candidates) -AND- Regular Part-Time Faculty	6/30	8/27	9/11	11/12	11/12-1/17	1/17 - 1/21	1/21	2/15
Reappointment of VAPs (here 1+ year)	NA	8/27	9/27	11/24	11/25-1/24	NA	1/24	2/15
Reappointment of VAPs (here less than 1 year)	NA	12/1	12/1	12/31	1/1-1/24	NA	1/24	2/15
Lab and Language Instructors/ Lecturers (here 1+ year)	NA	11/1	11/1	1/15	1/15-2/15	NA	2/15	3/1
Lab and Language Instructors/ Lecturers (here less than 1 year)	NA	11/30	11/30	1/15	1/15- 2/15	NA	2/15	3/1