DATE: May 2, 2019

TO: Department Chairs and Administrative Assistants/Coordinators

FROM: Sarah Willie-LeBreton
Provost

RE: Preparing Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion Dossiers

This memo – revised annually, so please read carefully – outlines procedures for your preparation of dossiers for the following personnel decisions: tenure, promotion, reappointment prior to tenure, other faculty reappointments, and regular part-time faculty reappointments. This memo should be shown to every candidate in these categories and any questions a candidate may have should be answered by you as Chair or referred to me. If you have any questions or concerns about these procedures, please talk to me before you start work on the dossier.

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.

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

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

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

The sections that follow outline in detail the steps and documents that are required for dossier preparation. Templates are provided as appendices.
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I. Tenure
(Dossiers due by Friday, December 6, 2019)

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.)

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. **New for 2019:** 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 May 31, 2019 (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 16, 2019 and external evaluators should receive all documents by August 30, 2019. After that date, candidates may not submit or edit any documents/publications for external reviewers. Referees are asked to respond no later than November 1, 2019 (or sooner, as your schedule for discussions dictates). 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 December 2, 2019 through December 6, 2019. This update period acknowledges the dynamic nature of the candidate's dossier and allows candidate 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.

**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.

**Please plan to submit tenure dossiers by the deadline of Friday, December 6, 2019.** 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

**Promotions**

**(Dossiers due Friday, December 6, 2019)**

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 May 1, 2019, 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. Any variation from the model outlined for tenure dossiers should be discussed.
III. Third Year Reappointments (of tenure-track faculty)
(Dossiers due Friday, January 24, 2020)

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 24, 2020. It is critical, therefore that you collect materials for the dossier during the fall semester.

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 May 31, 2019 (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 30, 2019 and external evaluators should receive all documents by September 13, 2019. After that date, candidates may not submit or edit any documents/publications for external reviewers. Referees are asked to respond no later than November 15, 2019 (or sooner, as your schedule for discussions dictates). 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 CPT from January 20, 2020 through January 24, 2020. This update period acknowledges the dynamic nature of the candidate's dossier and allows candidate to demonstrate to the Provost any work completed during the fall semester.

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 24, 2020.

IV. Other Reappointments

Other reappointment decisions, regarding faculty members not in tenurable positions, are owed to candidates by February 15, 2020, if possible. See Handbook for Instructional Staff, Section III-A-15.) Experience has shown us enough variation from case to case to make uniform procedures inappropriate, but in every instance the guiding principle should be to gather enough information about the candidate on which to base a sound decision, without the redundancy that might result from following a prescribed format. Chairs should discuss in advance and in detail with the candidate and the Provost the precise nature of the plans for review.

V. Review for Renewal of Part-time Members

Review for renewal or non-renewal of part-time faculty members (see Handbook for Instructional Staff, Section III-A-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 6, 2019.

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 prepared for each review consists of letters solicited from students and alumni taught by the candidate since the last review, in numbers determined in consultation with me, along with letters solicited from departmental
colleagues. I will review the dossier and will determine the appropriate path forward in consultation with the Chair and continuing members of the department.

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)
## 8.1 List of Courses Taught

Leonardo DaVinci  
Tenure Dossier  
December 2018

Courses and Seminars taught by Leonardo DaVinci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>CHEM 045 01</td>
<td>Phys Chem: Energy and Change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>CHEM 094 02</td>
<td>Research Project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>CHEM 096 02</td>
<td>Research Thesis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>CHEM 105 01</td>
<td>Quantum Chemistry/Spectroscopy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>CHEM 180 02</td>
<td>Honors Research Thesis</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 010 01</td>
<td>Fdns of Chemical Principles</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 010 02</td>
<td>Fdns of Chemical Principles</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 010 B</td>
<td>Gen Chem Lab 1:15-4:30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 094 01</td>
<td>Research Project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 096 01</td>
<td>Research Thesis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 180 02</td>
<td>Honors Research Thesis</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 045 01</td>
<td>Phys Chem: Energy and Change</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 045 A</td>
<td>Phys Chem:Energy &amp; Change-Lab</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 093 01</td>
<td>DirRd: Quantum Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 094 02</td>
<td>Research Project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 096 02</td>
<td>Research Thesis</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM 180 02</td>
<td>Honors Research Thesis</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear ____(NAME)__,

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

May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)____’s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her/them by ____(DATE)__. I appreciate that such letters are labor-intensive. These are aspects of our work that require professionalism, thoughtfulness, and candor. The letters themselves reflect the aspirations of our academic community, and as such we are all grateful for your time and reflectiveness.

Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the Committee for Promotion and Tenure. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF.

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

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear __(NAME)__,

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

As in our tenure decisions, we evaluate teaching, scholarship and service to the community as we weigh promotion to Professor. May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) and to offer your view of __(NAME)__'s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her/them by __(DATE)___. I appreciate that such letters are labor-intensive. These are aspects of our work that require professionalism, thoughtfulness, and candor. The letters themselves reflect the aspirations of our academic community, and as such we are all grateful for your time and reflectiveness.

Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the Committee for Promotion and Tenure. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF.

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

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear ____(NAME)__,

As you know, during the present academic year, ____(NAME)__ will be considered for reappointment to their tenure-track position. This review is important as it is an opportunity to provide important feedback on strengths and weaknesses in (NAME) ’s work at Swarthmore and assess progress towards tenure.

May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)__ ’s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her/them by ____(DATE)__ . I appreciate that such letters are labor-intensive. These are aspects of our work that require professionalism, thoughtfulness, and candor. The letters themselves reflect the aspirations of our academic community, and as such we are all grateful for your time and reflectiveness.

Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF.

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

Sincerely,

Department Chair
### 8.3 List of Letters of Request Sent to Department Members

**Letter of request sent to Department Members:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleague</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Einstein</td>
<td>October 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Newton</td>
<td>October 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Curie</td>
<td>October 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darwin</td>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Johnson</td>
<td>October 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hawking</td>
<td>October 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Emails sent to Swarthmore Colleagues outside the Candidate's Department

8.4.1 Tenure Letter

Swarthmore Colleagues Outside the Candidate's Department

Dear ____(NAME)___,

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

May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)___'s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her/Them by ____(DATE)__. I appreciate that such letters are labor-intensive. These are aspects of our work that require professionalism, thoughtfulness, and candor. The letters themselves reflect the aspirations of our academic community, and as such we are all grateful for your time and reflectiveness.

Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the Committee for Promotion and Tenure. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF.

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

Sincerely,

Department Chair
8.4.2 Promotion Letter

Swarthmore Colleagues Outside the Candidate's Department

Dear ____(NAME)__

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

As in our tenure decisions, we evaluate teaching, scholarship and service to the community as we weigh promotion to Professor. May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)____ 's work in the capacity in which you have known him/her/them by ____(DATE)____. I appreciate that such letters are labor-intensive. These are aspects of our work that require professionalism, thoughtfulness, and candor. The letters themselves reflect the aspirations of our academic community, and as such we are all grateful for your time and reflectiveness.

Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the Committee for Promotion and Tenure. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF.

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

Sincerely,

Department Chair
8.4.3 Reappointment Letter

Swarthmore Colleagues Outside the Candidate's Department

Dear ____(NAME)__,

As you know, during the present academic year, ____(NAME)____ will be considered for reappointment to their tenure-track position. This review is important as it is an opportunity to provide important feedback on strengths and weaknesses in (NAME) ’s work at Swarthmore and assess progress towards tenure.

May I ask you please to review "Considerations in Reappointment with Continuous Tenure" and “Exceptions to term lengths because of parenting responsibilities” (Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) and to offer your view of ____(NAME)____'s work in the capacity in which you have known him/her/them by ____(DATE)____. I appreciate that such letters are labor-intensive. These are aspects of our work that require professionalism, thoughtfulness, and candor. The letters themselves reflect the aspirations of our academic community, and as such we are all grateful for your time and reflectiveness.

Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF.

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

Sincerely,

Department Chair
### 8.5 List of Letters of Request Sent to Swarthmore Colleagues

**Letter of request sent to Swarthmore Colleagues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleague</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Jacques Cousteau</em></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>October 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dalton</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>October 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Goodall</em></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>October 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>B.F. Skinner</em></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Pavlov</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>October 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* René Descartes*</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>October 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* selected by candidate
Dear ________,

I write to ask if you would be willing to provide an evaluation of the scholarship of Professor (NAME), who is being considered for an appointment with continuous tenure in the Department of _______ at Swarthmore College during the upcoming academic year. My colleagues and I would be grateful if, as an expert in his/her/their field, you could provide us with an assessment of their work. If you are willing and able to provide a letter and believe that you can provide an objective evaluation, please reply with your acceptance.

If you agree to serve in this capacity, you will receive an email from Interfolio providing you with an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the committee for Promotion and Tenure. These materials should reach you by August 30, 2019. We will require your written evaluation of this work no later than November 1, 2019.

The participation of scholars like you is crucial to our ability to evaluate our colleagues from a holistic perspective. Thank you for your consideration, and I will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
8.6.2 Promotion Email Solicitation

Extramural Scholar

Dear ________,

I write to ask if you would be willing to provide an evaluation of the scholarship of Professor (NAME), who is being considered for an appointment with continuous tenure in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the upcoming academic year. My colleagues and I would be grateful if, as an expert in this field, you could provide us with an assessment of their work. If you are willing and able to provide a letter and believe that you can provide a substantive evaluation, please reply with your acceptance.

If you agree to serve in this capacity, you will receive an email from Interfolio providing you with an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the committee for Promotion and Tenure. These materials should reach you by August 30, 2019. We will require your written evaluation of this work no later than November 1, 2019.

The participation of scholars like you is crucial to our ability to evaluate our colleagues from a holistic perspective. Thank you for your consideration, and I will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear ________,

I write to ask if you would be willing to provide an evaluation of the scholarship of Professor (NAME), who is being considered for an appointment with continuous tenure in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the upcoming academic year. My colleagues and I would be grateful if, as an expert in this field, you could provide us with an assessment of their work. If you are willing and able to provide a letter and believe that you can provide a substantive evaluation, please reply with your acceptance.

If you agree to serve in this capacity, you will receive an email from Interfolio providing you with an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in confidence and is only accessible to assigned review committee members. These materials should reach you by September 13, 2019. We will require your written evaluation of this work no later than November 15, 2019.

The participation of scholars like you is crucial to our ability to evaluate our colleagues from a holistic perspective. Thank you for your consideration, and I will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Extramural Scholars

Dear ____(NAME)__,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our review of Professor ____(NAME)__ , who will be considered for an appointment with continuous tenure in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the 2018-2019 academic year. Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in strictest confidentiality and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the committee for Promotion and Tenure.

We have included a link to a statement from our Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, (Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) which is intended to provide you with considerations that carry weight with us as we decide whether to appoint a faculty member with continuous tenure. As a small liberal arts college, Swarthmore is an undergraduate-only teaching institution. We value teacher-scholars, and ask that you consider candidates' scholarship in light of the following excerpt from our Handbook for Instructional Staff:

"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."

In our process we also collect input from current and former students, department colleagues and colleagues from other departments within the College. We specifically request your assistance in our evaluation of their scholarly and professional contributions and of their potential for future contributions to the field. Your expert opinion is critical to our understanding of ____(NAME)___'s qualities as a scholar, her/his professional accomplishments and standing within the field.

We would appreciate receiving your uploaded letter on ____(NAME)___'s work by November 1, 2019. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF (an electronic signature is acceptable). In your letter, please describe any capacity in which you know ____(NAME)___.

I fully appreciate the commitment of time and effort required by this evaluation. We are very grateful for your willingness to lend your expertise to this critical decision. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write or telephone me. Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear ____(NAME)____,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our review of Professor ____(NAME)____, who will be considered for promotion to Full Professor in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the 2018-2019 academic year. Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in strictest confidentiality and is only accessible to assigned review committee members and the committee for Promotion and Tenure.

We have included a link to a statement from our Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, (Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) which is intended to provide you with considerations that carry weight with us as we decide whether to promote a faculty member to Professor. As a small liberal arts college, Swarthmore is an undergraduate-only teaching institution. We value teacher-scholars, and ask that you consider candidates' scholarship in light of the following excerpt from our Handbook for Instructional Staff:

"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."

In our process we also collect input from current and former students, department colleagues and colleagues from other departments within the College. We specifically request your assistance in our evaluation of their scholarly and professional contributions and of their potential for future contributions to the field. Your expert opinion is critical to our understanding of ____(NAME)____'s qualities as a scholar, her/his professional accomplishments and standing within the field.

We would appreciate receiving your uploaded letter on ____(NAME)____'s work by November 1, 2019. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF (an electronic signature is acceptable). In your letter, please describe any capacity in which you know ____(NAME)____.

I fully appreciate the commitment of time and effort required by this evaluation. We are very grateful for your willingness to lend your expertise to this critical decision. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write or telephone me. Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,
Department Chair
Dear (NAME),

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our review of Professor (NAME), who will be considered for reappointment to their tenure-track position in the Department of __________ at Swarthmore College during the 2018-2019 academic year. Enclosed in this email is an exclusive link to the candidate's review materials (curriculum vitae and relevant scholarship). Interfolio will also prompt you to upload your letter, which will be kept in strictest confidentiality and is only accessible to assigned review committee members.

We have included a link to a statement from our Handbook for Instructional Staff, 2019, (Section III-A-7, pp. 133-134) which is intended to provide you with considerations that carry weight with us as we decide on reappointment. As a small liberal arts college, Swarthmore is an undergraduate-only teaching institution. We value teacher-scholars, and ask that you consider candidates' scholarship in light of the following excerpt from our Handbook for Instructional Staff:

"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."

In our process we also collect input from current and former students, department colleagues and colleagues from other departments within the College. We specifically request your assistance in our evaluation of their scholarly and professional contributions and of their potential for future contributions to the field. Your expert opinion is critical to our understanding of (NAME)’s qualities as a scholar, her/his professional accomplishments and standing within the field.

We would appreciate receiving your uploaded letter on (NAME)’s work by November 15, 2019. Please submit your letter as a signed PDF (an electronic signature is acceptable). In your letter, please describe any capacity in which you know (NAME).

I fully appreciate the commitment of time and effort required by this evaluation. We are very grateful for your willingness to lend your expertise to this critical decision. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to write or telephone me. Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,
Department Chair

8.6.6 Third Year Reappointment Letter

Extramural Scholars
8.7 List of Letters of Request Sent to Extramural Colleagues

Letter of request sent to Extramural Colleagues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleague</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Faraday</td>
<td>1234 University Avenue University, PA, 12345</td>
<td>October 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo Galilei</td>
<td>5432 College Avenue Collegetown, PA, 12345</td>
<td>October 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Maynard Daly</td>
<td>1234 College Avenue University City, PA, 12345</td>
<td>October 15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmund Freud</td>
<td>1234 University Avenue University, PA, 12345</td>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Sagan</td>
<td>5432 College Avenue Collegetown, PA, 12345</td>
<td>October 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.E.B. DuBois</td>
<td>1234 College Avenue University City, PA, 12345</td>
<td>October 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*selected by candidate
8.8 Emails sent to Swarthmore Students and Alumni

8.8.1 Tenure Letter

Students

Dear ____(NAME)____:

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

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

We would appreciate receiving your letter on ____(NAME)____’s work by ____(DATE)__. Please submit your letter to ____(NAME of AA/AC)____ electronically or in hardcopy by ____(DATE)__. If you have questions, please write or telephone me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear (NAME):

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

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

We would appreciate receiving your letter on (NAME)’s work by (DATE). Please submit your letter to (NAME of AA/AC) electronically or in hardcopy by (DATE).

If you have questions, please write or telephone me.

Sincerely,

Department Chair
Dear Student,

This year, (NAME) will be considered for reappointment to their tenure-track position in the Department of ____________.

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

We would appreciate receiving your letter on (NAME)’s work by (DATE). Please submit your letter to (NAME of AA/AC) electronically or in hardcopy by (DATE).

Sincerely,

Department Chair
8.9 List of Letters of Request Sent to Students and Recent Alumni

Letters of Request sent to Students and Recent Alumni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Crse</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Honors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Astudent</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Chemical Physics</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>With Highest Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bstudent</td>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cstudent</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dstudent</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Biochemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estudent</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fstudent</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Biochemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gstudent</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hstudent</td>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Biochemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jstudent</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kstudent</td>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Chemical Physics</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mstudent</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nstudent</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>BOIL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostudent</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pstudent</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td>With Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Qstudent</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Chemical Physics</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rstudent</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sstudent</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tstudent</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Biochemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ustudent</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstudent</td>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sp Maj: Chemical Physics</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wstudent</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xstudent</td>
<td>Corin</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>11/5/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ystudent</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>9/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* selected by candidate

Must include at least 25 student/alumni letters, approximately half of which were chosen by the candidate and approximately half chosen by the tenured members of the department.

NOTE: YOU MUST LIST ALL STUDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN SOLICITED, WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE RESPONDED.
### 8.10 Dossier Materials Sent to Letter Writers for Promotion & Tenure Dossiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Writer</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extramural Scholars</td>
<td>Department’s Statement of Scholarly Expectations, CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship (as directed by the candidate), Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore Departmental Colleagues</td>
<td>Department’s Statement of Scholarly Expectations, CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship, Syllabi and publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore Non-Departmental Colleagues</td>
<td>CV, Candidate's Statement of Teaching and Scholarship (as directed by the candidate), Syllabi and publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.11 Summary of Timeline for Materials Submission by Review Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Tenure/Promotion</th>
<th>3rd Year Reappointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come up for promotion/tenure due to Provost</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs send first solicitation to external evaluators</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates dossier documents due to AA/Chair via Interfolio</td>
<td>August 16</td>
<td>August 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/Chair sends dossier documents to external reviewers, Swarthmore Departmental colleagues, and Swarthmore Non-Departmental colleagues</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>September 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/Chair sends request to student letter writers</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>September 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from external reviewers due</td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from Swarthmore Departmental &amp; non-Departmental colleagues due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Committee review period begins</td>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>November 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update period for candidates to submit additional/revised materials for exclusive CPT review (must be done in consultation with AA/Chair)</td>
<td>December 2-6</td>
<td>January 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossiers due to Provost</td>
<td>December 6</td>
<td>January 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates notified of decisions</td>
<td>After February Board of Managers Meeting</td>
<td>February 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>