

# Hobart and William Smith Colleges

## Department & Program Chair Handbook

**Updated September 2009**

## Preface

All tenured members of the faculty should expect to serve as chair of their department or program at some time. But what do chairs need to know? This handbook is a compilation of vital information, general guidelines, and specific procedures for your duties as chair. Much of it is drawn from the Faculty Handbook, synthesized for your convenience; in other sections, we have relied on information from the registrar's office (our special thanks to Lorraine Heatherly).

The Department or Program Chair leads the department/program and manages its resources. These are two separate but related tasks. Management will take up a great deal of your time and attention and is crucial to the day-to-day operation of your department/program. You represent the department or program and are the "go-to" person for students, other faculty, and administration. But as chair, you also assume a leadership position among your own faculty, which involves working with them to set clear departmental or program goals while fostering a collegial environment. Your role is key in motivating department or program members to set priorities, to work together constructively and respectfully, to be effective and inspiring teachers and productive scholars.

Certainly one of the best ways to lead your department or program is to set a good example in your own teaching, professional development, and service to the Colleges. But your job as chair also calls for some special knowledge of how to get things done at the Colleges, and providing (at least some of) that knowledge is the aim of this publication.

## Table of Contents

Responsibilities of the Chair.....	4
Chairs: the official policy .....	4
Department/Program Chair Transition .....	4
Readings on the Role of Chair.....	4
Myths That Make Chairs Feel They Are Powerless.....	4
Department Chairs .....	9
ACE Website .....	11
Scheduling Courses .....	11
Procedures for Review of Requests for the Renewal and Authorization of Faculty Appointment lines.....	15
Faculty Hiring.....	17
Strategic Hiring Initiative .....	19
Hiring of Foreign Nationals.....	20
New Hire Support.....	21
Faculty Mentoring .....	22
Course Evaluations .....	23
Budgets and Expenditure Guidelines.....	24
Student employees.....	25
Travel Expense Guidelines.....	25
Campus Vehicle Pool .....	27
Facilities for Special Events and Guests.....	27
Conflict of Interest Policies .....	28
Policies and Procedures for Faculty Review .....	30
Guidelines for Initial Contract Renewal.....	30
Guidelines for Review I.....	32
Guidelines for Review II .....	38
Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor (Review III).....	47
Sabbatical and Untenured Leaves.....	55
Faculty Secretaries.....	57
Chair’s Relief Policy .....	58
Important Dates and Deadlines.....	60
Program Review Schedule.....	64
Faculty Office/Phone.....	65

Appendices .....	70
Web Links.....	70
<i>Faculty Recruiting and Hiring Handbook</i> .....	70
<i>Sexual Misconduct Policy</i> .....	70
<i>Things We Wish We Had Known Sooner!—Information, Tips and Hints for New Faculty at Hobart and William Smith Colleges (9th ed.)</i> .....	70

## **Responsibilities of the Chair**

### **Chairs: the official policy**

Chairing a department or a program is a responsibility which all members of the faculty should expect to assume at some time unless significant extenuating circumstances can be demonstrated. The position will be held for a period of three years to establish continuity and familiarity with the responsibilities of the position. An orderly rotation of the position in the department should be established by the members of the department in consultation with the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with only tenured faculty participating in the rotation of appointments. The length of tenure is three consecutive years. (*Hobart and William Smith Colleges Faculty Handbook*, revised July 2007)

### **Department/Program Chair Transition**

When one chairperson completes her or his three years of service, the transition must involve the transfer of important records, including:

- Recent position requests
- Staffing plans
- Appointment/contract renewal letters
- Faculty Review I, II, III review reports
- Dept/Program Review Reports
- Standards and Criteria (SAC) document
- Other personnel correspondence concerning course release, medical leave, tenure clock, et cetera.

## **Readings on the Role of Chair**

### **Myths That Make Chairs Feel They Are Powerless**

From the November 1999 *AAHE Bulletin* (in *Skidmore College Chairperson/Program Director Handbook*, <http://cms.skidmore.edu/dof/upload/Handbook-9-8-08.pdf>)

### **Six fallacies that stifle change — and how to overcome them**

**By Ann F. Lucas**

After decades of giving unquestioning respect, the public has become demanding, critical, and angry with higher education. Employers are dissatisfied with graduates who lack skills in oral and written communication, critical-thinking ability, and being effective team members. Moreover, after almost two decades of downsizing, and the perception that no one's job is safe even though the organization is doing well, the public

is angry at the sense of entitlement of academics who retain tenure, whether or not they are productive. This is the source of much of the external pressure for post-tenure review.

Higher education must respond to external criticism that demands change in the system, and to internal awareness of challenges arising from virtual universities and corporate classrooms. Whether that change is improving student learning, relating methodology to course objectives, curriculum renewal, or broader interventions such as outcomes assessment, service-learning, or integrating technology, chairs often feel helpless in the face of necessary innovation.

Developing faculty who will be responsive to these kinds of changes seems a formidable task to chairs. Despite the colossal need for leadership at the departmental level, and the position that the American Association for Higher Education and the Pew Roundtables have taken that the department is the place where change should begin, chairs often state that there is nothing they can do to initiate change in the department. Not only do they not know how to be change agents, they do not believe that they have the power to bring about change. Fewer than one-third of 4,500 chairs in self-report data I have collected reported any degree of success in motivating difficult colleagues or poor teachers who are tenured. Chairs also report problems in getting faculty to accept a "fair share" of the work of the department, and in dealing with conflict in the department. There is a feeling of powerlessness in the face of such difficulties, primarily because faculty are tenured and thus presumably resistive to change. On campus after campus, chairs have repeated to me a series of myths they believe as justification for being unable to modify the status quo.

A myth, particularly one in which there is a strong belief, is a fixed perception of a situation that in turn dictates what an individual can control and what cannot be changed. The "rules of the game" develop from such an attribution or label; for example, whether chairs will try to deal with difficult colleagues, or ignore the situation because they believe there is nothing they can do that will make a difference. Thus, chairs build high walls around themselves and around circumstances that not only control their behavior but justify how they choose to behave. Whenever individuals describe a situation as having no solution, or see it only as a dichotomy having just two opposed alternatives, it is probable that they are engaging in premature closure. In other words, they have stopped trying to generate options to the problem, and often put themselves in no-win situations.

From my observations, here are the six most frequent fixed beliefs, or myths, that are dysfunctional for the chairs who hold them, accompanied each time by my rebuttal.

- 1. "I am elected by my colleagues to serve at their pleasure for only three or four years, then I will be a faculty member again. Therefore, there is nothing I can do to deal with the problems."**

The belief in an inability to do anything as chair because a person is simply a peer among equals conveys an aura of humility and democracy in action; yet it can effectively

leave a department without a leader. Particularly when a chair is elected by peers for a limited term, choosing to be a team leader is a valuable choice of leadership style. As team leader, a chair can take an active role in seeking meaningful input and full participation from everyone in the department so that faculty members can plan and organize themselves to function most effectively. Being a team leader requires setting shared goals with the department and individual goals with individual faculty members so that everyone can focus on how they can achieve departmental goals while realizing their own. Goal setting with individuals and providing feedback on performance in a supportive climate are the strongest forces a chair can use for motivating faculty. When chairs are passive because they feel there is nothing they can do, departments, and often faculty, stagnate.

**2. "It is my turn in the barrel. I don't particularly want to be chair, but we all have to take a turn."**

Given academic norms that administration of any sort is a necessary evil, such statements by an incoming department chair do not usually raise concern among faculty; on the contrary, faculty often worry that people who want to be chair may be seeking power. However, when someone doesn't want to be chair, neither the department nor its faculty will benefit by having a person in that role simply because it is his or her "turn." What is most likely is that such an individual will behave in a passive-resistive fashion and accomplish nothing for the department. Whenever he or she is chided for not taking some responsibility, the response can always be, "But I didn't ask to be chair."

**3. "I am simply a peer among equals. I am not a manager."**

This is a good example of generating only two options. "I am either a peer or a manager. There is nothing in between." As chair, an individual is no longer just a peer among equals. Chairs have responsibilities that are different from those of faculty members. Although all chairs have to perform some management functions, they don't have to become managers; they can become leaders.

**4. "I have neither carrot nor stick. It is not possible either to reward or punish faculty members."**

It is simplistic to think that rewards include only economic benefits, and that punishment means only the firing of a faculty member. There are many more meaningful ways to reward people; and punishment has so many negative side effects, it is rarely an alternative of choice in motivating others. When chairs are respected colleagues, they have the ability to reinforce faculty for the latter's work. Being taken seriously by a colleague who appreciates the quality of what an individual is doing is both rewarding and motivating. Moreover, chairs usually have major input into personnel decision making, scheduling of courses, release time, and allocation of resources. Therefore, despite the fact that it is not realistic, the perception that chairs have "neither carrot nor stick" certainly contributes to their feelings of powerlessness.

**5. "I am neither fish nor fowl. Being neither faculty member nor administrator, my role is not clear."**

Granted that role conflict is stressful, a chair must be the conduit between faculty and administration, representing the needs of each to the other. This requires that a chair be an articulate spokesperson for department members to administration. It is also necessary for a chair to be a public relations person for faculty members so that their accomplishments, their impact on the discipline at the state or national level, and their outreach to the community can be appreciated by the rest of the university.

In addition, however, because they represent administration to faculty, chairs must at times advance points of view that represent what is deemed to be good for the college or university over what is perceived as good for individual faculty members. For example, faculty often strongly resist a chair's request that they teach an 8 a.m. class, a late evening course, or a course that meets three times a week. In each of these cases, faculty may feel that the chair has lost the ability to identify with colleagues and is behaving like an administrator. Chairs must handle such conflict in their roles with tact, fairness, and good humor.

**6. "I have no power. Therefore, I can do nothing."**

Many chairs feel they have no power, though this perception is not usually accurate. In the context of the work of the chair, power is the ability to influence faculty to achieve their own goals as they accomplish the work of the department. Chairs have enough power to motivate faculty to increase student learning by teaching effectively, to increase scholarly productivity, and to increase service or outreach activities. All they need is to know how to go about it.

The kinds of power that chairs have to motivate faculty include position power, personal power, and expert power. Position power, often referred to as legitimate power, is related to the authority individuals have simply because of their positions. The extent to which chairs control rewards and punishments varies markedly from one institution to another, but when their input on administrative matters is weighted heavily by a college or university, their position power is increased. Thus, chairs have strong position power when their judgment is given serious consideration in personnel decision making.

Position power is by and large a given. Personal power, however, varies considerably and can be increased in legitimate ways. If chairs treat everyone with respect, if they are perceived as working for and fighting for the well-being of their faculty members when the cause is just, if chairs create a supportive climate in the department, and if they give people recognition and visibility for their achievements, their personal power becomes greater.

A third kind of power is expert power, which is based on knowledge and control of resources. Chairs usually know better than faculty how to get things accomplished in a

college or university, particularly how to do things that are not described in faculty handbooks and other formal documents.

### **Overcoming Mythology**

Chairs do have considerable power, then, but when they believe these six myths their effectiveness is undoubtedly reduced. However, institutions also have great responsibility for enhancing competent leadership by taking the chair role more seriously. Although the 80,000 chairs in colleges and universities constitute a knowledgeable body of leadership and influence, too often they are overlooked as the valuable resource they can be. There is little evidence that sufficient care is given to selection, training, professional development, and support of chairs.

Furthermore, if chairs are to be good team leaders and effective agents of change, they need to learn how to initiate those difficult conversations in which the collective wisdom of their colleagues is gathered so that commitment is developed to confront challenges that face their departments. Chairs need to learn the skills for leading change. Chairs must learn how to confront and manage negative behaviors of faculty and staff. They need to learn more about motivating department members. Chairs must master skills in creating a supportive communication climate, managing constructive feedback, resolving conflict, and be engaged in their own ongoing leadership development. In addition, some of the mind-deadening paperwork — the primary complaint of chairs — must be handled by computer or delegated to a technical assistant or a competent secretary so that chairs have time to be leaders.

--Ann F. Lucas is a professor of organization development at Fairleigh Dickinson University. She can be reached at [annlucas@aol.com](mailto:annlucas@aol.com).) Lucas is the author of *Strengthening Departmental Leadership: A Team Building Guide for Chairs in Colleges and Universities* (Jossey-Bass, 1994). Her most recent book, *Leading Academic Change: Essential Roles for Chairs*, will be published by Jossey-Bass in January 2000.

### **Department Chairs**

By Artin Arslanian

(Bennett and Figuli, eds., *Enhancing Departmental Leadership*, pp. 5-7; in *Skidmore College Chairperson/Program Director Handbook*, <http://cms.skidmore.edu/dof/upload/Handbook-9-8-08.pdf>)

It was by a haphazard process of selection that I became chair of a medium-sized department (10 FTE's). I came to the position unexpectedly and quite unprepared. This was true for many of the new chairs on campus. Most of us had not read about departmental leadership, and our requests to the administration of the college for an orientation seminar went unanswered. Although some of us solicited advice from experienced chairs on campus, it is safe to say that we embarked on our tasks with little experience but full of good intentions. We were resolved to nurture departmental collegiality, encourage excellence in teaching and scholarship, and improve the departmental image on and off campus. We soon learned that these lofty goals were not easily accomplished. We tried our best – with mixed results.

I jotted down a few pointers for the new chair when I recently moved to another college. These are distilled from my experience and the thoughts of other chairs. I share

these knowing full well that differences in institutional size, mission, and philosophy may invalidate some of them.

- Always work within the philosophic and pedagogic tradition, and budgetary guidelines of your college... There should be a good fit between your plans and the institutional goals and realities. Ideas and methods considered brilliant in one institution might be damned in another with a different mission, tradition, structure, and clientele.
- Learn to say no early. Resources of all kinds are limited and are invariably outpaced by demand. Do not concentrate most of the resources on a few: all members should receive their fair share. However, make public the criteria informing the distribution of departmental funds and use them consistently; otherwise you'll be (rightly) accused of favoritism or shiftiness.
- Fight the urge to do something as soon as a colleague complains against another or in case of a crisis. First, hear out all parties involved and try to ascertain the facts. Do not become an intermediary or messenger between the feuding parties – this will further complicate the problem. Call the grieving individuals to your office, discuss their concerns and ask them to work out a solution, reminding them that we are condemned to live together as a family in these days of almost nonexistent career mobility.
- When chairing departmental meetings, state the issues and let all present have their say first. Do not begin by arguing your case or solutions as it will create the semblance of an adversarial relationship with those who disagree with you – they may not even bother to express their opinions. Try to maintain an atmosphere conducive to discussion by all members of the department at the price of not having sufficient opportunity to elaborate your position fully. If there is a minority view, give its proponents a second or third opportunity to make their case, but avoid taking formal votes that tend to create winners and losers. Summarize the majority view in such a way as to make some concessions to the concerns of the minority and announce it as the reflection of the department's thinking.
- Do not discuss the shortcomings and weaknesses of the department's members with others if you want to enhance your credibility and the image of the department. Always talk about their contribution, accomplishments, and strength, especially in the case of those who are rumored to have criticized you in public.
- Avoid creating an inquisitorial atmosphere when evaluating for tenure, promotion, salary raises, or merit pay. Required, frequent, and systematic evaluations are the key to a potentially difficult and sometimes explosive situation. Frequent discussions with individual faculty members about teaching, publications, professional growth, and involvement in the life of the college community create a relaxed environment for open discussion. But make sure to give equal time to the faculty members for the evaluation of your performance as

chair and discussion of departmental goals, problems, and priorities. If done frequently and systematically, this procedure will greatly ease the tense atmosphere that permeates yearly evaluations.

- Read the papers and publications of the members of your department, discuss their works with them, and honor their accomplishments in the department and in the wider college community.
- Make sure that candidates visiting the campus are treated professionally. Provide them with pertinent information about departmental needs, educational philosophy, salary, and benefits, but refrain (and restrain others) from gossiping about the members of the department, the faculty at large, or the administration. Indiscretions of this sort have a way of haunting the department, and sometimes the college, whether that candidate is offered a job or not.
- If a colleague takes a problem to the dean's office before resorting to all the departmental procedures, do not invest additional time on the matter. Just inform the dean that the faculty member has failed to exhaust the departmental grievance procedures. A wise dean will refer the case back to the department, lest a precedent be set that will soon flood his office with requests from faculty.
- Do not check your mail after hours or on weekends. If there are problems, there is very little that you can do about them when everyone is away from the campus. Most probably the only thing you will accomplish is to ruin your evening or weekend!

I am sure that others can easily supplement this list from their experience. Let me close with a confession: I failed to follow some of these guidelines – and often paid the price!

\*\*\*

### **ACE Website**

The American Council on Education (ACE) website has many helpful articles and resources for chairs as well: <http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/>.

### **Scheduling Courses**

The Registrar will send you scheduling instructions and reminders at several key moments during the year. Here is an overview of what to expect:

#### **September:**

In September you will receive a draft of the Spring Semester Schedule and will be asked to submit changes by September 19th.

New course proposals for Spring semester are due to the Registrar by September 26th. Be sure to remind your faculty. (Forms may be found on the Registrar's website.)

**October and November:**

Discuss scheduling needs and request preferred schedules from faculty for the following academic year. Ask faculty if they want to have a waitlist for any of their courses, and, if so, how many students to allow on the waitlist. You will also need to determine how many seats should be reserved for first-year students in various courses. Finally, be sure to ask your faculty for special requirements in classroom assignments.

Communication with your faculty is vital: you may want to devote part or all of a department/program meeting to scheduling matters.

You will be asked to proof the Schedule of Courses for Spring Semester by October 21-23. (The registrar will send instructions with the proofs.)

The Registration Handbook and Schedule of Courses for Spring Semester will be available at the end of October.

Spring Semester Advising Week takes place the first week of November. In fact, as soon as the Registration Handbook appears, faculty may want to start scheduling appointments with their advisees. Please remind faculty to make themselves more available during this advising period.

**Late November:**

Start building the course prospectus. You will receive course scheduling worksheets and the department/program printouts of the schedule of courses from the Registrar for the Fall and Spring semesters of the next academic year. The printouts are actually course rollovers from the current year, like semester to like semester.

Examine your department/program's preliminary schedule of course offerings for the next academic year. As you fill out the schedule, use the Course Scheduling Worksheets as guides. These worksheets will help you distribute the courses throughout the week; please use all class periods (1-12).

Checklist for scheduling:

- Add/delete course sections
- Update course numbers and titles
- Update meeting days & times, instructor's name
- Update course notes and edit text that you want to have published in the body of the handbook
- Update prerequisites
- Review maximum enrollments, and change where needed.

Important reminders:

- Courses should be evenly distributed throughout the academic day and week. Use all class periods, including periods 1 and 12, before offering two courses in the same class period.

- Be sure to include First-Year Seminars and Bidisciplinary Courses to be offered during the next academic year.
- Remember to use periods 5, 6, 6A, 8 and 9 for the First-year Seminars in the Fall semester.
- Do not schedule any 100-level courses into periods 5, 6, 6A, 8 and 9 in the Fall semester.
- Remember that period 7A is 3:00-4:25 pm **WF only** (not any 2 days MWF).
- *Wait List*: course instructors should indicate in the waitlist column if they would like to use the waitlist functionality and if so, the number of seats to be used on the waitlist.
- Please submit your changes and updates on the preliminary course scheduling sheets to Lorraine Heatherly, the Assistant Registrar, before the holiday break.

If you have any questions, or need assistance, please call Lorraine (3652) or stop by her office in Gulick.

**First week of courses, Spring semester:**

Round two of scheduling—You will receive the Prospectus from the Registrar for the next academic year, reflecting any changes that were made in round one. Please meet with faculty to review the schedules, add updates, and make corrections. The Registrar may have denied some class period preferences because of an uneven distribution of offerings throughout the week. In that case, additional class periods scheduled for a TBA will appear on your prospectus and your packet will have a note explaining the situation. Academic Affairs has urged that all twelve class periods be used and that FSEM be scheduled in periods 5, 6, 6A, 8 and 9. Again, please do not schedule 100-level courses in the periods reserved for the FSEM.

**January 27:** New course & new FSEM proposals due to the Registrar.

**End of January:**

Return prospectus changes to Lorraine Heatherly.

**Early February:**

Chairs and Program Directors will receive the revised department/program schedules. Again, please go over any changes in the schedule with affected faculty and make any needed changes or corrections.

**Mid-February:**

Return revised prospectus (department/program schedule of courses) to Lorraine. The Registrar will then proof the schedule, and send it to press by the end of February.

**Early March: estimated publication date for the Prospectus**

**First weeks of March:**

You will receive the fall schedule from the Registrar. Please alert the Registrar of any changes within three days of receiving the schedule.

**Third week of March: the fall schedule will be sent to press.**

**End of March: estimated publication date for the Fall Registration Handbook**

**Last week of March: Advising Week**

Fall Semester Advising Week takes place the last week of March. As in the fall, as soon as the Registration Handbook appears, faculty may want to start scheduling appointments with their advisees. Please remind faculty to make themselves more available during this advising period.

**First week of April: Registration for Fall**

## **Procedures for Review of Requests for the Renewal and Authorization of Faculty Appointment lines**

How does the chair begin the process of hiring a new faculty member? First of all, there is a procedure in place for the review and allocation of positions within the faculty. Under this procedure all vacant positions, other than those vacated by negative personnel decisions, comprise a single "position pool." All requests for allocation of positions will be met from this pool. Departments and programs should not assume a continuing claim to a position vacated by other than a candidate's failure to pass Review I or Review II. The details of this procedure are as follows:

### a. Vacant lines

Vacant lines logically occur in the following situations:

- (1) **Tenable and ongoing** positions may be vacated by negative personnel decisions.
- (2) **Tenable and ongoing** positions may be vacated by disability (including death) or voluntary resignation (including retirement).
- (3) **Ongoing** "turnover" positions may be vacated when an incumbent reaches the end of his or her terminal contract.

### b. Position pool

A position vacated through a negative personnel action (e.g., failure to pass Review I or II) is automatically retained by a department/program.

All other vacant positions post to a central pool out of which all requests for positions (both renewals and new) are subsequently met. This pool may be contracted or expanded, as it becomes necessary to reduce or increase the size of the faculty, by subtracting or addition positions. Positions may be scheduled into this pool prognostically, as when a retirement is scheduled, an individual's contract in a turnover position is known to be terminating, or the Dean of Faculty is able to secure in budget the funds required for a new position. The Committee on the Faculty and the Dean of Faculty will seek to identify each year those positions currently vacant or expected to become vacated and those expected to be vacated in the immediately subsequent year.

This policy applies to tenurable and ongoing lines. The Dean of Faculty will continue to meet requests for leave replacements and supplemental faculty on a year-to-year basis, as required to meet curricular demands and as budgeted resources permit.

### c. Procedure

Departments and programs are expected to petition for allocation of all tenurable, ongoing, and temporary lines out of this central position pool, other than lines vacated by negative personnel action. All petitions will a priori have equal standing in this

consideration, including: petitions to renew lines vacated through disability, retirement, and resignations; petitions to fill ongoing "turnover" lines vacated through the natural termination of an incumbent's period of appointment; petitions to establish 1-3 temporary lines into which to hire supplemental faculty; and petitions to establish incrementally new positions within a department or program.

The Committee on Academic Affairs and the Committee on the Faculty reviews these petitions each year, acting in an advisory capacity to the Dean of Faculty. The deadline for receipt of applications and a schedule for subsequent reviews and notifications will be fixed and announced early in the academic year. The Committee on Academic Affairs will advise on the academic and programmatic need and merit of the proposal, and the Committee on the Faculty will advise on the distribution of faculty effort, the structure of staffing patterns relative to enrollment, general budgetary concerns, matters of equity and affirmative action, and conformance in matters of procedure and substance with faculty bylaws and written procedures.

- (1) Ordinarily, the following sequence will apply:

Year 1 Department/program

- a. Anticipates that a vacancy will occur through retirement or resignation (i.e., a line will be vacant in the subsequent year, Year 2, or in Year 3), or
- b. Learns of an unanticipated resignation or disability (it finds that a line is vacant in the current year, Year 1), or
- c. Requests a new line, incremental to the petitioning department/program.

The request is reviewed by the Committees and the Dean of Faculty along with all other department or program requests for the year. If the request is approved, a search is authorized for Year 2. The Dean of Faculty may on occasion approve a search contingent upon final approval, or appoint an individual temporarily in a line until such time that a full position review can be conducted.

Year 2 Search is conducted.

Year 3 Appointment begins.

- (2) Lines vacated by negative personnel decisions need not be reviewed and reauthorized.

- (3) In general, searches will be authorized only for lines already fully budgeted and scheduled to be available in the first year of appointment.

d. Requests to convert ongoing lines to tenurable status

Under these guidelines, ongoing lines vacated by natural "turnover" at the end of an incumbent's term of appointment revert to the position pool. Proposals to convert to tenurable status should ordinarily be made at this point. However, this procedure does not supersede any existing contractual commitments to review lines occupied by current members of the faculty as specified in their letters of appointment (i.e., such commitments will be honored).

(Adopted by Committees on the Faculty and Academic Affairs 10/92)

## **Faculty Hiring**

All faculty hiring will be conducted in full accord with the Faculty Recruiting and Hiring Handbook.

When hiring for a position has been authorized in writing by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Faculty and Provost will authorize the department/program chair to begin the hiring process.

The department/program chair will convene the department/program for the purpose of selecting an appropriate hiring committee consisting of members of the department/program and a member of another department/program. Student majors or other students are also to be represented on the committee. The chair may be a member of that committee and may or may not be the committee's chair. All activities of the committee will be undertaken in full consultation with the department/program chair. Faculty and student members of the hiring committee are to be selected with the knowledge and approval of the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The search committee will be provided a consultant by the faculty Committee on Diversity, Equity and Social Justice.

The hiring committee will prepare an appropriate text for an advertisement for the position, which, when approved by the department/program chair, will be forwarded for approval to the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The text must include area of expertise, minimum qualifications required, a closing date or date on which review of applications will begin, and the Colleges' commitment to diversity designation which is typically the last line in the ad. Department/programs are urged to include phrases encouraging minority and women candidates to apply.

The chair of the search committee will meet with the Dean of Faculty and the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice, or their designate, to review the search plan, including availability data, the objectives of the Colleges' diversity plan, the language of the job description and advertisement, the placement of ads, and strategies

for identification and recruitment into the applicant pool of qualified women and minority individuals. After approval from the Dean of Faculty and Provost the advertisement may be run and the active solicitation and review of candidates begin.

All applicants will be asked to submit anonymously a self-identification form to the Office of the Provost, acting for the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice. This will allow the Committee and the Dean of Faculty to assess the character of the applicant pool.

When the deadline for applications or date for initiation of review has arrived, the hiring committee will count and review the candidates known to the committee. The committee will report the number of applicants, the number of minority applicants, and the number of women applicants to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, along with its prioritized list of candidates whom they wish to invite to campus for interview. In some cases, this list may be based on candidates already seen at national or regional conventions. At the point at which the search committee submits its prioritized list of candidates to the Dean for authorization to conduct on-campus visits, the Dean may ask the committee to forward additionally the dossiers of all or a number of qualified minority and/or female candidates. Upon review, the Dean may request that additional candidates be brought to campus.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost is satisfied with the number and demographic character of the candidate pool, campus visits of a given number will be authorized. No on-campus interviews are to be scheduled before such undertaking. If the Dean, in consultation with the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Social Justice, determines that the pool is not commensurate with the availability data, the Dean may require that the application process be reopened and steps taken to increase the number of qualified female and minority applicants. The search may not continue until the Dean and Committee are satisfied that every reasonable effort has been made to identify qualified minority individuals and women and to recruit them into the pool of active candidates. The Dean of Faculty and Provost may consider the number and strength of the candidates, the expense of bringing the most desirable candidates, and the current status of the recruiting budget. The provisions of this paragraph are the very heart of a diversity program. It is important that committees keep detailed rosters of candidates, with careful attention to race and gender.

Interviews. Under normal circumstances, candidates for faculty positions will meet with the hiring committee members, faculty of the department/program and appropriate members of other department/programs, and with the Dean of Faculty and Provost or the dean's designate. Candidates will normally make at least one presentation in lecture or seminar format. Details of visits may be varied by the hiring committee in accord with program or useful scheduling of events.

Selection of candidate. When the interview process is completed to the *satisfaction of the hiring committee, that committee through the department/program chair will* make a written recommendation to the Dean of Faculty and Provost that a

candidate be hired. Candidates should not be informed that they have been so recommended until approval for hiring has come from the Dean of Faculty and Provost. Formal offers of employment and salary come from the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

Reporting at the conclusion of the search. At the conclusion of its search, the department/program will submit to the Dean and to the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Social Justice a report containing a numeric analysis of the final applicant pool and candidates at each successive stage, a narrative description and assessment of its efforts to identify and recruit minorities, and copies of job descriptions and advertisements. This report must then be submitted in support of subsequent position requests and authorizations to search.

Expenses incurred. The Dean of Faculty and Provost is responsible for all search expenses, including the cost of advertisements; interviewing at professional meetings; candidate travel, food, and lodging; and campus hospitality. Prior authorization is required for expenditures in the first three categories. With respect to expenses through the course of the candidate's visit (lunches, dinners, small receptions), it is expected that department/programs will show prudence and moderation. This will ordinarily mean using the Faculty Dining Room for lunches and restricting dinner parties to a number that can reasonably interact with the candidate, at a cost not to exceed \$40 per individual. Faculty who are authorized to travel to professional meetings to screen and interview potential candidates are expected to meet the general guidelines for faculty travel to professional meetings, unless authorized otherwise by the provost.

## **Strategic Hiring Initiative**

In exceptional cases, candidates may be offered appointment to the faculty without a national search. Appointments may be full-time or part-time, in tenurable or non-tenurable status. In order to qualify as “exceptional,” the candidate must meet at least one of the criteria listed in group A and one or more of the criteria in group B.

### Group A Criteria:

- Candidate belongs to a historically-underrepresented group, and would increase faculty diversity.
- Candidate is the same-sex or opposite-sex partner/spouse of a current faculty member or a recruited faculty candidate for whom the employment of the partner/spouse would be a significant factor in the recruitment or retention decision.

### Group B Criteria:

- The candidate would be a suitable replacement for an anticipated retirement in a department/program.
- The hiring of the candidate into a tenure-track line would reduce or eliminate the need for temporary leave replacement searches and hiring.

- The candidate could provide additional courses to interdisciplinary programs that are currently understaffed.
- The candidate could direct off-campus programs or make it possible for others in the department/program to direct such programs.

## **Process**

- (1) The process begins when the candidate comes to the attention of the department/program or the Provost.
- (2) The Provost and the department/program meet and both must agree that the candidate is of comparable quality to successful candidates in comparable national searches.
- (3) The department/program then submits a written request to the Provost describing the candidate's proposed status (full-time or part-time, tenurable or non-tenurable) and their expectation for teaching and scholarship along with the candidate's c.v.
- (4) The Provost forwards the written request and candidate's c.v. to CoFac and CoAA for advice and counsel.
- (5) The Provost consults with the President and the Vice President for Finance to ensure sufficient funds are available.
- (6) The Provost notifies the department/program and negotiates an offer with the candidate.

## **Hiring of Foreign Nationals**

A foreign national is a person who is not a citizen of the United States or does not have permanent residency status under U.S. law. Federal immigration law regulates the hiring of foreign nationals by U. S. employers, requiring employers to hire only U.S. citizens, permanent resident aliens, and non-resident aliens lawfully authorized to work in the United States.

Since employers must not discriminate on the basis of national origin, the process of hiring foreign nationals has become very complex. U.S. Immigration law prohibits employers from making payments to non-resident alien workers without work authorization. These regulations are in effect even if the worker is only on campus for a brief lecture or appearance. The Colleges would be held liable and may be subject to a fine for hiring any foreign national who does not have the proper visa status and employment verification.

The Colleges will act as the immigration sponsor for foreign nationals who will have academic appointments. The Office of Human Resources will assist prospective employees with those immigration proceedings required to secure employment authorization through the most common type of work authorization programs - the H-1b Temporary Worker visa, the TN (North America Free Trade Agreement) for nationals from Canada and Mexico, or the Colleges' J-1 Exchange Visitor Program - provided that Human Resources is fully informed of the prospective appointee's immigration status in a timely manner and that no extraordinary impediments to employment exist. The Colleges will assume financial obligation in assisting employees with the above stated immigration-related matters including legal assistance for the employee only. Filing fees

and other related charges associated with acquiring status for the spouse and/or dependents will be the employee's responsibility.

For those faculty members in tenured or tenure track positions who wish to obtain legal permanent resident (green card) status, the Colleges will sponsor the faculty member through the labor certification process **with permission from the Provost and Dean of Faculty**. Costs associated with the permanent resident application process (legal and filing fees) will be covered by the Colleges up to a pre-determined limit set by the Office of Human Resources and the Provost's Office. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to assume any additional costs above the pre-determined limit and for any costs associated with spousal legal permanent resident applications. The Colleges will **not** apply for labor certification for temporary, non-tenurable faculty including visiting faculty and adjunct faculty.

## **New Hire Support**

When a new instructor or professor is hired, the following items are addressed early in the summer by the Department/Program Chair and the Faculty Secretary, Human Resources, or the Provost's Office with the Learning Commons Staff:

**\*\*Department/Program Chairperson and Faculty Secretary (early summer):**

Phones (x3410 Dan Strally)  
Office (x3306; confirm with Pat Cool)  
Mail (secretary)  
Keys (Work Order required from Chair to Buildings and Grounds)  
New course proposals (require department/program chair's signature)  
Classroom assignment  
Syllabi guidelines, including final exam policy

**\*\*Human Resources**

Paycheck processing  
Benefits  
Parking permit application  
Faculty identification card

**\*\*Provost's Office**

Appointment letter  
Faculty Handbook  
Moving expenses reimbursement  
Faculty Orientation to teaching and technology at HWS (mid-August)  
Web biography and HWS e-mail/FACADM listserv  
Computer needs

## **Faculty Mentoring**

Each new faculty member will be given a copy of the Faculty Handbook which contains the bylaws describing the standards and procedures for contract renewal and all reviews and promotions and a copy of his/her departmental/program review Standards and Criteria (SAC). Before the eighth week of the faculty member's first semester, the Dean of Faculty and Provost will arrange a meeting with the faculty member and his/her department or program chair to discuss the appointment letter and the departmental/program SAC. Within one month after the end of classes in the faculty member's first year on campus, the department/program chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss teaching during the first year, examine all course evaluations and identify areas of strength and weakness. (Faculty Bylaws, I. A. 1. b)

It is the responsibility of department and program chairs to generate and sustain an environment where mentoring and support for all faculty can take place. The Colleges Faculty Enrichment Program, led by the Associate Dean of Faculty, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), Chair of CoFac, and the Chair of the sub-committee on Faculty Research and Honors, was begun in Fall 2007. It is now located physically in the Learning Commons where the Presentation Room hosts wine and cheese gatherings around topics of faculty interest, including pedagogical research, publishing across disciplines, and student assessment of learning. In addition, faculty are invited to take advantage of individual consultations with Dr. Susan Pliner and the opportunity to conduct a mid-semester course evaluation (Small Group Instructional Diagnosis).

Faculty Reading Groups, Faculty Institutes, Passion Into Practice gatherings, in-class workshops by CTL Staff, and calls for teaching and learning grant proposals comprise some of the many opportunities for faculty support at CTL.

Within the Faculty Enrichment Program, faculty development and advisement are meant to transcend traditional notions of the junior-senior faculty relationship. The idea of mutual mentoring is encouraged, wherein tenured and non-tenured professors, new faculty and senior colleagues, generate opportunities to learn from one another to grow as scholars and teachers. The program aims to increase the frequency of both scholarly and pedagogical exchanges.

## **Course Evaluations**

As noted in the Faculty Handbook, all members of the faculty are required to conduct course evaluations in all courses taught each semester, employing the form (or one of several) and procedure in general use within their department or program and the college-wide form, available from their department or program secretary. Course evaluations are ordinarily distributed to students and collected from them by an individual other than the instructor on the last day of class. Students are not asked to identify themselves by name. Course evaluations must not be available for instructor review until after grades are submitted.

Faculty members are expected to review their evaluations regularly, and department/program chairs are encouraged to assume responsibility for counseling junior members of their department or program in the use and assessment of course evaluation. The Bylaws now mandate that the department/program chair meet with faculty members who have just finished their first year of teaching at HWS to discuss teaching during the first year, examine all course evaluations and identify areas of strength and weakness. (I.A.1.b.) All faculty, however, may benefit from discussing course evaluations with their chair or another colleague. Although student evaluations are by no means the only measure of teaching effectiveness, they do provide an opportunity for reflection on course content and teaching methods.

A department or program's secretary or chair is responsible for maintaining securely a file of each faculty member's departmental or program course evaluations, including a record of access to each file. Evaluations for general curriculum courses (First Year Seminars and Bidisciplinary courses) are forwarded to the Provost's Office and maintained there. Evaluations for off-campus programs and courses are forwarded to the Director of Off-Campus Programs. Course evaluations will be kept on file for five years for Full Professors. Evaluations for Associate Professors and Assistant Professors will be kept until the faculty member is promoted to the rank of Full, then disposed of after five years. Evaluations for faculty members who have retired or have left the Colleges will be kept on file for two years after the termination.

## Budgets and Expenditure Guidelines

For advice on how to prepare your department or program's budget, please see Kelly Switzer in the Provost's Office (3304).

The Committee of the Faculty has recommended to the Dean of Faculty the following policies and guidelines with respect to the expenditure of departmental or program funds. These are intended to encourage equitable utilization of funds across department/programs and equitable access within department/programs to support for all faculty, and to aid chairs in establishing accountability within their department/programs for faculty's use of resources. It is assumed that all expenditures are always within the total limit set by budget, regardless of whether or not they are "legit."

- a. Bookstore charges. Departments and programs should meet to establish written expenditure limits and guidelines for individual charges for supplies and instructional materials, including charges at The College Store. Ordinarily, such charges should be very modest, with department/program chairs approving purchases beyond that cumulative limit only if assured that budgeted funds are available. Department/programs sharing a building and/or secretary may wish to pool the purchase of basic supplies (e.g., by contributing a certain per capita amount). Faculty are reminded of the bookstore's and publishers' desk and examination policies. Chairs may wish to ask faculty to keep available annotated receipts for bookstore charges against departmental or program accounts.
- b. Entertainment and hospitality. Ordinarily, it is expected that entertainment and hospitality is either authorized by the department chair or program director by prior approval, or is subject to similar written departmental or program policies.
- c. Mileage. Ordinarily, mileage for the use of a personal car will be reimbursed only as authorized by department chair or program director, by prior approval only, for speakers, guests, and student fieldtrips sponsored by the department/program.
- d. Photocopying. When faculty find it necessary to use department/program copiers for personal business, it is expected that they will reimburse the department/program for that copying. Otherwise, department/program funds may be used for course-related and professional materials only, and students are expected to bear the expense of copying their own course materials (e.g., assignments and other written work) themselves. Department/programs whose photocopying expense has or threatens to exceed budgeted allocations may need to establish written guidelines for their faculty.
- e. Federal Express and express mail. Express mail service is less expensive than Federal Express and should be the preferred choice when it is necessary to use an express service. However, express service of any type should be considered the exception rather than the rule.

- f. Search and review expenses. Expenditures incurred in support of searches and personnel reviews are borne by the Provost's Office under policies set specifically for such expenses. Chairs and directors should consult with the Provosts' Office at the beginning of the academic year about upcoming searches and reviews, and so that they can anticipate the approximate budget requirement for such activities which the Provost's Office must meet. Please refer to Section C.3 (Departmental Hiring) for further information on expenditure guidelines for search expenses.

## **Student employees**

Departments and programs are urged, whenever possible, to employ work/study eligible students. Both the Colleges and the students benefit -- the Colleges because the federal work/study funds match only actual hours worked by eligible students, the students because their financial aid includes an expected complement of work/study employment. Work/study-eligible students may present a letter of eligibility from the Colleges Financial Aid Office, or department/program chairs may call the Financial Aid Office to ascertain a student's eligibility.

The wage rate for all students employed in the academic year is based on a 3-tier system. Exceptions to the student wage rate require the approval of the Provost and Dean of Faculty, and are approved in exceptional circumstances.

For 2009-10:

Tier 1 - \$7.25 per hour

Tier 2 - \$7.40 per hour

Tier 3 - \$7.65 per hour

Contact Human Resources for a description of the pay scale and work categories.

## **Travel Expense Guidelines**

### Support for Professional Travel

Subject to the availability of funds, the Colleges reimburse each tenured or tenure track faculty member appointed at least half-time for a portion of the cost of attending professional meetings each academic year. The amount of reimbursement depends upon a faculty member's level of participation in that meeting. The maximum annual grant for an individual faculty member is \$1,200. Faculty appointed on a full-time, temporary basis are eligible for a maximum grant of \$700 each year. All receipts must be submitted for reimbursement.

### Levels of participation and reimbursement:

Level 1. Presentation of a paper before a state, regional, national, or international meeting of a widely recognized national or international professional organization. The Colleges will pay 100% of the above costs, up to a total of \$1,200.

Level 2. Discussant, respondent, commentator, panel chairperson, etc., in a professional society meeting, or service in a significant office of a widely recognized state, regional, or divisional professional organization. The Colleges will reimburse 80% of above costs up to a total of \$400.

Level 3. Attendance. The Colleges will reimburse 80% of above costs up to a total of \$300.

The Colleges will reimburse the following as described below:

- Least expensive practical fare.\*
- Room for up to four nights (\$110/night maximum).
- Meals and miscellaneous expenses for up to four days (\$50/day maximum).
- Registration fees.

\*This is interpreted as the appropriate super-saver fare. Those for whom the supersaver requirement (i.e. a Saturday night stay) is unduly convenient or expensive should request an exception from the Provost.

Note: These policies are subject to the availability of funds and may be changed accordingly. The Dean of Faculty and Provost will notify faculty of such changes in a timely way. A Faculty Travel Report and all receipts must be submitted to the Provost's Office after each trip. These forms are available in the Provost's Office, faculty secretaries, or on-line under the Provost web page. Expenses should be separated by category (food, hotel, travel, parking, etc.) with each category totaled.

We recognize that these funds may not be adequate for international travel. Faculty presenting a paper or undertaking a significant leadership role in a professional society meeting may apply to the Provost and Dean of Faculty for supplemental funding.

#### Support for Other Travel

The Colleges typically pay transportation and reasonable living costs for faculty members who are asked to travel as official representatives of the Colleges, or in connection with recruitment. Faculty traveling to professional meetings to screen and interview candidates are expected to meet the general guidelines for faculty travel to professional meetings, unless an exception is approved by the Dean of Faculty and Provost. Arrangements must be made in advance with the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

Use of a personal car for Colleges' business, when authorized, is reimbursed at a standard mileage rate set annually by the Vice President for Finance.

## **Campus Vehicle Pool**

The Colleges' vehicle pool consists of several vans and cars which can be rented for educational and departmental trips as well as athletic trips. A reservation must be in writing and received at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled trip. All drivers of College-owned vehicles must furnish evidence of a current, valid driver's license and pass a general Colleges' driving test. Reservations are accepted on a first-come, first-served basis through the Office of Conferences and Events:

[http://www.hws.edu/offices/conferences/van\\_form.aspx](http://www.hws.edu/offices/conferences/van_form.aspx). Please plan ahead when reserving vehicles.

### **Charges:**

- If the total round trip mileage is LESS than 100 miles: the rates for vehicle use are \$15/half day (4 hours or less) or \$30/full day (over 4 hours)
- If the total round trip mileage is MORE than 100 miles: a rate of \$.30 per mile will be charged. This will be in lieu of the half day or full day charge.
- Cleaning Charge: If a vehicle is returned with dirty interior, a \$15 cleaning charge will be charged to the department or organization.
- Fueling Charge: All vehicles are to be returned full of gasoline. Failure to comply will result in a \$50 charge to your department.
- Your department will be charged for any damage to the vehicles, up to a \$1,000 deductible. Vehicles are checked between all trips and any damage found will be noted. It is your responsibility to check the vehicle before leaving campus and to inform the Conferences and Events Department of any damage not listed before you use the vehicle.

## **Facilities for Special Events and Guests**

### a. Houghton House

This house is an instructional facility and office area for the Art Department, and an official College entertainment center. The first floor dining room and kitchen, northeast porch, and large drawing room may be reserved for official College purposes, as arranged by the Facilities Coordinator, ext 3652.

### b. DeLancey House Faculty Social Space

The public areas of DeLancey House consist of a dining room, seminar room (when not scheduled for class use), downstairs parlors and kitchen, and an upstairs lounge. Use of any portion of this space may be reserved for departmental or other official Colleges functions by faculty through the Facilities Coordinator at ext. 3652.

Guest rooms for official campus visitors may also be reserved on a first-come/first-served basis through the Facilities Coordinator.

c. The Henry W. Hanley Biological Field Station and Preserve

The Hanley Biological Field Station and Preserve of Hobart and William Smith Colleges is a private area available for instruction, research, and nature study. Members of the college community are welcome to use it for activities including hiking, nature study, ski touring and similar recreation. No rocks, plants, or animal specimens may be collected for any reason without special permission. If you are interested in visiting the Hanley Preserve, please contact the Department of Biology for information on its location, use, and restrictions.

d. The William Scandling

Hobart and William Smith Colleges' Research Vessel, *The William Scandling*, is available for use by qualified Colleges staff, and to outside institutions, organizations, and investigators via application. Use of the vessel may range from participation in our pre-planned cruise program, involving students in the basics of oceanographic technique, to extended research voyages designed to meet the needs of the most sophisticated specialist. For additional information, availability, and cost, contact the vessel captain at 781-3758.

### **Conflict of Interest Policies**

One of the great strengths of any small, residential college is the relationships among its members. Invested in the common goals of educating our students and creating a community of scholars, and connected through face-to-face communication, we are able to achieve a great deal despite our small size and resources. The closeness and intensity of these relationships does pose some challenges, however, and it is for that reason that the Faculty Handbook spells out particular expectations in cases of familial relationships:

A familial relationship to another member of the Colleges' community (trustees, faculty, administration, staff, and students) is not a barrier to employment by the Colleges. Spouses, partners, and other relatives of Colleges' community members are considered for appointment, promotion, retention, tenure, and all other rights on the same basis as those who are not related to others in the Colleges' community. However, such community members will neither initiate nor participate in any decision involving direct benefit (initial appointment, retention, promotion, salary, leave, tenure, etc.) to members of their immediate families. (Faculty Bylaws I. A. 1. b)

Specifically, that means that spouses, partners and relatives should not participate in reviews or performance evaluations or exercise supervisory authority in these cases; they should not approve procurements, stipends, grants, or any other form of financial

compensation; and they should not participate in decisions involving resources such as offices or equipment. Normally, this is achieved by simply recusing yourself from all deliberations on the matter, in addition to the decision itself. If you find yourself or a colleague in such a situation, please be in touch with the Provost to work out how best to comply with the Handbook in this case.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges will not contract the services of, purchase goods or services from, or reimburse in favor of a company or individual to the benefit of an individual faculty member, except by competitive bid and on a formal contractual basis.

# **Policies and Procedures for Faculty Review**

## **Guidelines for Initial Contract Renewal**

### General considerations

Criteria used in the evaluation and decision-making process are to be made clear at the time the candidate is hired. These standards and criteria include the College-wide principles articulated in the bylaws for teaching, scholarship, and community service and the particular standards and criteria articulated in the departmental and/or program SAC document.

Decisions on contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be based on appropriate evidence carefully gathered in a manner consistent with maintaining the high intellectual and professional aspirations of the faculty and a sense of common purpose. Confidentiality shall be maintained at every stage of the process and concerning all matters of substance involved in the review by all members of the faculty who have the responsibility of reviewing a candidate. Confidentiality must be maintained even after a review has been completed, except when the review is being appealed under the provisions of the bylaws. In that case, individuals involved in the contract renewal or review must respond to any questions of the Grievance Panel. The maintaining of confidentiality is a professional obligation to the members of the community and breaking it endangers the integrity of the whole community.

Specific procedures for evaluation should be governed by the overriding principle of providing a system for making informed, fair decisions which will at the same time protect colleagues from excessive scrutiny, abusive or arbitrary treatment, or disruption of their teaching, while assisting their intellectual and professional growth.

### 1. Contract renewal

#### a. Standards and criteria

The contract renewal evaluation allows the department/program and the candidate to take early stock of their relationship, with an eye to the future. If the original hiring process went well, there is no reason to expect that the candidate will be found wanting. On the other hand, it is far better for the candidate, the department/program, and the Colleges that a negative decision, if indicated, be made now rather than later.

Effective teaching is the primary consideration. At this stage, the candidate should be aware of his or her strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and actively seeking ways to ameliorate any difficulties encountered in the first year. Evidence to be

considered will include student course evaluations and materials submitted by the candidate. Scholarly promise, as indicated by the candidate's curriculum vitae, is a secondary consideration. There are no requirements for community service at this point.

#### b. Procedures

The department/program chair will meet with the candidate by the third week of the fall semester in the candidate's second year to discuss the contract renewal process. Deliberations on renewal will be completed by mid-November.

All members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'ongoing part-time' for at least one year participate in contract renewal deliberations. No spouses or partners of candidates are eligible to serve. Departmental/program faculty on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The department/program chair will assemble the materials to be considered in the contract renewal deliberations, including student course evaluations. The candidate will submit to the chair any materials he or she believes will be helpful to these deliberations. At the minimum, the candidate will submit a curriculum vitae and course syllabi, and any other materials the department/program chair, the faculty involved, or the Provost and Dean of Faculty request. The chair will draft a brief summary of the materials and convene a meeting of participating faculty to determine their recommendation for or against renewal.

Based on this meeting, the chair will write a letter to the Dean of Faculty and Provost with the departmental/program recommendation for or against renewal. Recommendations need not be elaborately documented, but they should at least outline the procedures followed, and the department/program must be prepared to explain a negative finding. Negative recommendations are sent to COTAP to be reviewed for procedural adequacy before administrative action. The Dean of Faculty and Provost makes the final decision concerning renewal, but normally follows the recommendation of the department/program. The Dean of Faculty and Provost will send to the candidate a letter of contract renewal or a letter stating that the contract is not renewed, with a copy sent to the department/program chair. A candidate will be provided reasons for non-renewal, in writing, if he or she so requests.

In case of a decision not to renew the contract, the candidate has the right to request a reconsideration of this decision. The unsuccessful candidate is also entitled to file a grievance, as outlined in the Faculty Bylaws, if he or she believes the decision was made with inadequate or improper consideration, or that it involved discrimination or a violation of academic freedom. Unsuccessful candidates who elect to grieve must understand that such proceedings may extend the case beyond December 15, the AAUP-recommended deadline for notification of non-reappointment in a faculty member's second year, and that, unless a proceeding has resulted in a reversal of the non-renewal

decision, the candidate's employment contract ends with the academic year in which the decision was made.

## **Guidelines for Review I**

### General considerations

Criteria used in the evaluation and decision-making process are to be made clear at the time the candidate is hired. These standards and criteria include the College-wide principles articulated in the bylaws for teaching, scholarship, and community service and the particular standards and criteria articulated in the departmental and/or program SAC document.

Decisions on contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be based on appropriate evidence carefully gathered in a manner consistent with maintaining the high intellectual and professional aspirations of the faculty and a sense of common purpose. Confidentiality shall be maintained at every stage of the process and concerning all matters of substance involved in the review by all members of the faculty who have the responsibility of reviewing a candidate. Confidentiality must be maintained even after a review has been completed, except when the review is being appealed under the provisions of the bylaws. In that case, individuals involved in the contract renewal or review must respond to any questions of the Grievance Panel. The maintaining of confidentiality is a professional obligation to the members of the community and breaking it endangers the integrity of the whole community.

Specific procedures for evaluation should be governed by the overriding principle of providing a system for making informed, fair decisions which will at the same time protect colleagues from excessive scrutiny, abusive or arbitrary treatment, or disruption of their teaching, while assisting their intellectual and professional growth.

### Review I. For a Four-Year Reappointment

- a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges: See Faculty Bylaws, A, article 1, section e, 2.a.
- b. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures for Review I

Review I is conducted by a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review I Committee. Review I normally occurs in the third year of full-time teaching, and is designed both to provide feedback to the faculty member in order to help her/him succeed at the Colleges, and to give that faculty member's colleagues an opportunity to make a judgment on his/her suitability for retention. The review will take into account a wide body of evidence, described below.

#### 1. Roles and responsibilities in Review I

(a) Review I Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with the Review I Committee of the department/program into which the candidate was hired. This body assembles the candidate's file and prepares the report which is both diagnostic and evaluative and which makes a recommendation for or against a four-year reappointment. Review I Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a sub-committee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'on-going part-time' for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review I Committee, but are not required to do so. Department/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review I Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This nondepartmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review I Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the Committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review I Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review I Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way and approved by COTAP.

Each Review I Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from COTAP.) The role of this sub-committee will be to summarize student input on the candidate's teaching in a short report to the Review I Committee. The students will present their findings to the Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review I Committee report. The students' signed report will become part of the candidate's file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a

department/program and COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

(b) Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate's department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate's strengths and weakness, especially in teaching and scholarly work, their role in Review I is to submit letters which, like the report, are both evaluative and diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague's own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. The chair will ensure that at least two colleagues each visit at least one class session taught by the candidate before they write their letters. Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review I Committee report.

If the faculty member undergoing Review I works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate's file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

(c) The Candidate

The candidate's responsibility is to provide to the Review I Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate's own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

- (1) teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
- (2) scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the completion of the dissertation or equivalent, plans for future work, and the candidate's own location in the discipline;
- (3) community service: a report on candidate's college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics,

other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed to date, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate's work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other schools. The candidate will also be asked to provide the names of Hobart & William Smith colleagues who should be contacted for comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and/or community service. Finally, the candidate will be asked to provide responses to the reports of the Review I Committee and COTAP.

(d) COTAP

COTAP's role in Review I is to examine the candidate's file, read the Review I Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges' standards, as well as to the standards expressed in the departmental/program SAC document. Any member of COTAP who is a member of the candidate's department/program will recuse himself/herself from COTAP's deliberations and discussions of the case. The COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate's Review I Committee.

(e) The Dean of Faculty and Provost

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate's file is complete and ready to be read by the members of COTAP.

The Dean of Faculty and Provost reads the candidate's file, including the Review I Committee and COTAP reports, and makes a final determination on the outcome of Review I, following any meetings with the Review I Committee or COTAP she/he deems necessary.

## 2. Specific Procedures for Review I

(a) Assembling the Candidate's File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review I Committee between December 15 and January 15 of the academic year in which Review I is occurring. The completed file is due in the Provost's Office by the third Monday of February.

The Review I Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate, using a letter developed by COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate. All comments from students must be signed. The report will include

the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the letter(s) sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each course either by the student sub-committee or by faculty members of the Review I Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department-or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review I Committee report.

The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate's teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review I Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to the standards for Review I. In addition, the Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators by COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review I in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

#### (b) Writing the Review I Committee Report

The Review I Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarly potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file's evidence concerning the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the committee's discussions. It will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the SAC document given to the candidate at the time of her/his hire. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review I and is signed by all members of the Review I Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review I Committee report, along with any statement of dissenting opinion, is given to the candidate. The candidate will submit to the chair of the Review I Committee, a letter addressed to COTAP, stating that she/he has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. This letter is required before the file is

submitted to COTAP.

(c) The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review I:

- (1) Table of contents.
- (2) Copy of Colleges-wide standards and criteria for Review I and a copy of the departmental/program SAC document sections on Review I.
- (3) Candidate's curriculum vitae.
- (4) Candidate's letters of appointment and reappointment.
- (5) Written statement by candidate concerning teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; scholarly work, achievements, and aims; and record of community service.
- (6) Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses (supplied by Registrar's office).
- (7) Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review I (such as sample exams, assignments, quizzes, etc.) supplied by the candidate.
- (8) Student course evaluations for all courses, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
- (9) Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter seeking comments on the candidate.
- (10) Scholarship: this includes any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, and other forms of professional engagement supplied by the candidate.
- (11) Miscellaneous materials related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate's work, records of participation in professional organizations and professional affairs.
- (12) Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
- (13) Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges.
- (14) Report of the student sub-committee.
- (15) Review I Committee report. Also, a letter of any dissenting opinions.
- (16) Late-arriving materials.
- (17) Signed letter from the candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review Committee report (and, if present, letter of dissenting opinions), along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.
- (18) Signed letters from members of COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
- (19) COTAP report.
- (20) Signed letter from the candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the COTAP report, along with

candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

(d) Review of the file by COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review I Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to COTAP when it is complete.

COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review I Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in the Review I Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. The COTAP report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the Review I Committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter sent to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to COTAP and the Chair of the Review I Committee, that she/he has read COTAP's report. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. The deadline for receipt of this confirmation letter will be set by COTAP, generally allowing seven days. Once the candidate has sent this letter, COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss the case.

(e) Final decision regarding Review I

The Dean of Faculty and Provost will make a final determination, following any meetings with the Review I Committee or COTAP she/he deems necessary. The Dean of Faculty and Provost will convey the outcome of the Review I in a letter to the candidate, with a copy sent to the chair of the Review I Committee. Following a negative Review I decision, the candidate may request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of the negative decision. Following a positive Review I decision, the letter from the Dean of Faculty and Provost will outline the diagnostic recommendations that emerged from the review. These recommendations will address actions that both the candidate and the department/program should take to continue the candidate's development as a member of the faculty, with an eye toward preparing the candidate for Review II. Within four months of a positive decision, the Dean of Faculty and Provost will meet with the candidate to discuss these recommendations.

## **Guidelines for Review II**

### General considerations

Criteria used in the evaluation and decision-making process are to be made

clear at the time the candidate is hired. These standards and criteria include the College-wide principles articulated in the bylaws for teaching, scholarship, and community service and the particular standards and criteria articulated in the departmental and/or program SAC document.

Decisions on contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be based on appropriate evidence carefully gathered in a manner consistent with maintaining the high intellectual and professional aspirations of the faculty and a sense of common purpose. Confidentiality shall be maintained at every stage of the process and concerning all matters of substance involved in the review by all members of the faculty who have the responsibility of reviewing a candidate. Confidentiality must be maintained even after a review has been completed, except when the review is being appealed under the provisions of the bylaws. In that case, individuals involved in the contract renewal or review must respond to any questions of the Grievance Panel. The maintaining of confidentiality is a professional obligation to the members of the community and breaking it endangers the integrity of the whole community.

Specific procedures for evaluation should be governed by the overriding principle of providing a system for making informed, fair decisions which will at the same time protect colleagues from excessive scrutiny, abusive or arbitrary treatment, or disruption of their teaching, while assisting their intellectual and professional growth.

3. Review II. For Promotion to Associate Professor, and the Awarding of Tenure
  - a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges: See Faculty Bylaws, A, article 1, section e, 3.a.
  - b. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures for Review II

#### General Considerations

Review II is conducted by a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review II Committee. Review II normally occurs in the sixth year of full-time teaching at this institution; or in the third year of a senior appointment; or at a time agreed upon appointment to tenurable status when credit is given for prior service. Its aim is to allow the faculty member's colleagues an opportunity to formulate a recommendation on whether the candidate should be awarded tenure, as well as to provide information to the candidate that will allow her/him to continue developing as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. The review will take into account a wide body of evidence, described below.

#### 1. Roles and responsibilities in Review II

##### (a) Review II Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with the Review II Committee of the

department/program into which the candidate was hired. This body assembles the candidate's file and prepares the report which makes a recommendation for or against the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Review II Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a sub-committee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as 'on-going part-time' for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review II Committee, but are not required to do so. Departmental/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review II Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This nondepartmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review II Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the review committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review II Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review II Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way.

Each Review II Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from COTAP.) The role of this subcommittee will be to summarize student input on the candidate's teaching in a short report to the Review II Committee. The students will present their findings to the Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review II Committee report. The students' signed report will become part of the candidate's file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a department/program and COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting

faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

(b) Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate's department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate's strengths and weakness, especially in teaching and scholarly or artistic work, their role in Review II is to submit letters which, like the report, are both evaluative and diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague's own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. The chair will ensure that at least two colleagues each visit at least one class session taught by the candidate before they write their letters. Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review II Committee report.

If the faculty member undergoing Review II works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate's file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

(c) The Candidate

The candidate's responsibility is to provide to the Review II Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate's own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

- (1) teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
- (2) scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the candidate's last review, plans for future work, and own location in the discipline;
- (3) community service: a report on candidate's college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics, other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed to date, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered. The candidate and Review II Committee chair jointly decide which work will be sent out for outside review. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate's work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other

schools. The candidate will be asked to provide the names of potential outside reviewers of his/her scholarship and the names of people who should be contacted for comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and/or community service. Finally, the candidate will be asked to provide responses to the reports of the Review II Committee and COTAP.

(d) COTAP

COTAP's role in Review II is to examine the candidate's file, read the Review II Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges' standards, as well as to the standards expressed in the departmental/program SAC document. Any member of COTAP who is a member of the candidate's department/ program will recuse himself/herself from COTAP's deliberations and discussions of the case. The COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate's Review II Committee.

(e) The Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate's file is complete and ready to be read by the members of COTAP.

Having received the reports of COTAP and the Review II Committee, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes a recommendation to the President. The President attends the meetings at which COTAP meets with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss each Review II case. Having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the President makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, to inform him/her of the outcome of Review II.

## 2. Specific Procedures for Review II

(a) Assembling the Candidate's File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review II Committee between May 1 and July 1. The completed file is due in the Provost's Office by the third Monday of October.

### 1. Outside Review of Scholarship

The candidate and the Review II Committee chair jointly decide which work the candidate will send out for outside review. The candidate is obliged to submit a representative sample (at least) of her/his scholarship for review by scholars in the discipline. Typically this will include both published and unpublished work. Work

published in refereed publications should be considered by the Review II Committee as evidence of quality and originality, but at least some of it should still be sent out for review to allow an outside scholar the chance to see the range of a candidate's work. The Review II Committee report should describe the refereeing practice in each case.

Work will be sent to three to five outside reviewers, who are deemed able to speak from an informed position explicitly to the candidate's accomplishments in and further potential for scholarly work. The candidate will submit a list of possible reviewers, specifying her/his relationship to each individual, and the Review II Committee will independently draw up a list of possible reviewers. The Committee's list will be shown to the candidate, and the latter will specify her/his relationship to each individual, and can insist on the removal of one or more names on grounds that the individual is likely to be prejudiced against the candidate. In no circumstances should any reviewer be a former colleague, collaborator, or close friend of the candidate. Neither should a reviewer have a significant formal or informal connection to the Colleges. The Review II report will explain how and why it chose the outside reviewers it did. Typically it is best to have a mix of outside reviewers: people of different levels (although all will usually be tenured), from different types of institutions, including people who work in a candidate's specific subfield as well as those who simply work in the candidate's discipline. At least two of the outside reviewers should not be personally acquainted with the candidate. If it is not practical to engage at least two such reviewers, the Review II Committee report will explain why. A curriculum vitae will be obtained from each reviewer. Interdisciplinary work should be sent to appropriate reviewers. The Review II Committee will treat the outside letters as constituting significant, but not all-determining, input on the candidate's scholarship.

Since this is one of the few times a candidate is likely to hear a group of academic colleagues assessing her/his work, the Review II Committee report should accurately reflect the letters' assessment of strengths and weaknesses of that work. Representative quotations from the letters should be included in the Review II Committee report. At the Committee's discretion, an appendix can be included with more extensive quotations so as to provide the candidate with more specific comments, suggestions, praises, or criticisms that the Committee deems will be beneficial for the candidate, provided the quotations do not give away the reviewer's identity.

## 2. Assessing student perceptions of the candidate

The Review II Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate since the candidate's last review, using a letter developed by COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate. All comments from students must be signed. The report will include the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the letter(s) sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each

course taught since the last review either by the student sub-committee or by faculty members of the Review II Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department-or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review II Committee report. The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate's teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

### 3. Soliciting comments from colleagues

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review II Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges and individuals from outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to the standards for Review II. In addition, the Review II Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators by COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review II in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

#### (b) Writing the Review II Committee Report

The Review II Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarly accomplishments and potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file's evidence concerning the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the Committee's discussions. The report will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the SAC document that was given to the candidate at the time of her/his hire. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review II and be awarded tenure. This report will be signed by all members of the Review II Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review II Committee report, along with any statement of dissenting opinion, is given to the candidate. In the case of non-unanimous reports, the candidate does not receive a list of who voted which way. The candidate will submit to the chair of the Committee, a letter addressed to COTAP, stating that she/he has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. This letter is required before the file is

submitted to COTAP.

(c) The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review II:

- (1) Table of contents.
- (2) Copy of Colleges-wide standards for Review II and relevant SAC document.
- (3) Candidate's letters of appointment and reappointment.
- (4) Candidate's curriculum vitae.
- (5) Candidate's Review I reports (Review I Committee and COTAP) and letter from the Dean of Faculty and Provost following Review I (unless the candidate did not undergo Review I at the Colleges).
- (6) Written statement by candidate concerning her/his scholarly work, achievements, and aims; teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; and record of community service.
- (7) Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses, since Review I (supplied by Registrar's office).
- (8) Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review II.
- (9) Student course evaluations for all courses taught since Review I, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
- (10) Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter, seeking comments on the candidate. Responses must be signed.
- (11) Scholarship: this includes any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, and other forms of professional engagement which the candidate wishes to be considered. Candidate should include all such work produced since Review I.
- (12) Miscellaneous material related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate's work, records of participation in professional organizations and professional affairs.
- (13) Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
- (14) Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges.
- (15) Signed letters from people outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked. A copy of the letter sent out will also be included.
- (16) Letters from outside reviewers of scholarship. Letters must be signed or received by COTAP-approved electronic means. Also included will be a curriculum vitae from each outside reviewer, a list of the materials sent out to reviewers, and a copy of the letter sent with these materials.
- (17) Report of the student sub-committee.
- (18) Review II Committee report. Also, a letter of any dissenting opinions, together with reasons.
- (19) Late-arriving materials.

- (20) Signed letter from candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review II Committee report (and, if present, statement written by any dissenters), along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.
- (21) Signed letters from members of COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
- (22) COTAP report.
- (23) Signed letter from candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the COTAP report, along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

(d) Review of the file by COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review II Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to COTAP when it is complete.

COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review II Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in the Review II Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. This report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the departmental/program review committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to COTAP and the chair of the Review II Committee, that she/he read COTAP's report. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. The deadline for receipt of this confirmation letter will be set by COTAP, generally allowing seven days. Once the candidate has sent this letter, COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President to discuss the case.

(e) Final decision regarding Review II

Following the meeting of COTAP with the President and the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes his/her own recommendation to the President. Prior to making this recommendation, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may meet with the Review II Committee or COTAP if she/he thinks it necessary. The President, having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, may meet with COTAP or the Review II Committee prior to making his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, with copies to the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the Review II Committee chair, to inform the candidate of the outcome of Review II. Following a negative decision, the candidate may

request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of that decision.

## **Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor (Review III)**

### General considerations

Criteria used in the evaluation and decision-making process are to be made clear at the time the candidate is hired. These standards and criteria include the College-wide principles articulated in the bylaws for teaching, scholarship, and community service and the particular standards and criteria articulated in the departmental and/or program SAC document.

Decisions on contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be based on appropriate evidence carefully gathered in a manner consistent with maintaining the high intellectual and professional aspirations of the faculty and a sense of common purpose. Confidentiality shall be maintained at every stage of the process and concerning all matters of substance involved in the review by all members of the faculty who have the responsibility of reviewing a candidate. Confidentiality must be maintained even after a review has been completed, except when the review is being appealed under the provisions of the bylaws. In that case, individuals involved in the contract renewal or review must respond to any questions of the Grievance Panel. The maintaining of confidentiality is a professional obligation to the members of the community and breaking it endangers the integrity of the whole community.

Specific procedures for evaluation should be governed by the overriding principle of providing a system for making informed, fair decisions which will at the same time protect colleagues from excessive scrutiny, abusive or arbitrary treatment, or disruption of their teaching, while assisting their intellectual and professional growth.

### 4. Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges: See Bylaws A, article 1, section e, 4.a

#### 1. Roles and responsibilities in Review III

##### (a) Review III Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review III Committee. This body assembles the candidate's file and prepares the report which is primarily evaluative, making a recommendation for or against promotion to Full Professor but also providing information to the candidate that will assist her/him in continuing to develop as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. Review III Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a subcommittee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and

recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as ‘on-going part-time’ for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review III Committee, but are not required to do so. Departmental/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review III Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This non-departmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review III Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the review committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review III Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review III Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way.

Each Review III Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from COTAP.) The role of this subcommittee will be to summarize student input on the candidate’s teaching in a short report to the Review III Committee. The students will present their findings to the Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review III Committee report. The students’ signed report will become part of the candidate’s file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a department/program and COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

(b) Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate's department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate's strengths and weakness, especially in teaching and scholarly work, their role in Review III is to submit letters which, like the report, are primarily evaluative but also diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague's own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. The chair will ensure that at least two colleagues each visit at least one class session taught by the candidate before they write their letters. Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review III Committee report.

If the faculty member undergoing Review III works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate's file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

#### (c) The Candidate

The candidate's responsibility is to provide to the Review III Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate's own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

- (1) teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
- (2) scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the candidate's last review, plans for future work, and own location in the discipline;
- (3) community service: a report on candidate's college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics, other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed since Review II, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered.

The candidate and the Review III Committee chair jointly decide which work will be sent out for outside review. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate's work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other schools. The candidate will be asked to provide the names of potential outside reviewers of his/her scholarship and the names of people who should be contacted for comments on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and/or community

service.

(d) COTAP

COTAP's role in Review III is to examine the candidate's file, read the Review III Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges' standards, as well as to the standards expressed in the departmental/program SAC document. Any member of COTAP who is a member of the candidate's department/program will recuse himself/herself from COTAP's deliberations and discussions of the case. The COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate's Review III Committee.

(e) The Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate's file is complete and ready to be read by the members of COTAP.

Having received the reports of COTAP and the Review III Committee, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes a recommendation to the President. The President attends the meetings at which COTAP meets with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss each Review III case. Having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the President makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, to inform him/her of the outcome of Review III.

## 2. Specific Procedures

(a) Assembling the Candidate's File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review III Committee between September 1 and October 1. The completed file is due in the Provost's Office by the fourth Monday of January.

### 1. Outside Review of Scholarship

The candidate and the Review III Committee chair jointly decide which work the candidate will send out for outside review. The candidate is obliged to submit a representative sample (at least) of her/his scholarship for review by scholars in the discipline. Typically this will include both published and unpublished work. Work published in refereed publications should be considered by the Review III Committee as evidence of quality and originality, but at least some of it should still be sent out for

review to allow an outside scholar the chance to see the range of a candidate's work. The Review III Committee report should describe the refereeing practice in each case.

Work will be sent to three to five outside reviewers, who are deemed able to speak from an informed position explicitly to the candidate's accomplishments in and further potential for scholarly work. The candidate will submit a list of possible reviewers, specifying her/his relationship to each individual, and the Review III Committee will independently draw up a list of possible reviewers. The Committee's list will be shown to the candidate, and the latter will specify her/his relationship to each individual, and can insist on the removal of one or more names on grounds that the individual is likely to be prejudiced against the candidate. In no circumstances should any reviewer be a former colleague, collaborator, or close friend of the candidate. Neither should a reviewer have a significant formal or informal connection to the Colleges. The Review III Committee report will explain how and why it chose the outside reviewers it did. Typically it is best to have a mix of outside reviewers: people of different levels (although all will usually be tenured), from different types of institutions, including people who work in a candidate's specific subfield as well as those who simply work in the candidate's discipline. At least two of the outside reviewers should not be personally acquainted with the candidate. If it is not practical to engage at least two such reviewers, the Review III Committee report will explain why. A curriculum vitae will be obtained from each reviewer. Interdisciplinary work should be sent to appropriate reviewers. The Review III Committee will treat the outside letters as constituting significant, but not all-determining, input on the candidate's scholarship.

Since this is one of the few times a candidate is likely to hear a group of academic colleagues assessing her/his work, the Review III Committee report should accurately reflect the letters' assessment of strengths and weaknesses of that work. Representative quotations from the letters should be included in the Review III Committee report. At the Committee's discretion, an appendix can be included with more extensive quotations so as to provide the candidate with more specific comments, suggestions, praises, or criticisms that the Committee deems will be beneficial for the candidate, provided the quotations do not give away the reviewer's identity.

## 2. Assessing student perceptions of the candidate

The Review III Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate since the candidate's last review, using a letter developed by COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate. All comments from students must be signed. The report will include the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the materials sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each course taught since the last review either by the student sub-committee or by faculty members of the Review III Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the

file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department-or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review III Committee report.

The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate's teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

### 3. Soliciting comments from colleagues

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review III Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges and individuals from outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to the standards for Review III. In addition, the Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators by COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review III in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

#### (b) Writing the Review III Committee Report

The Review III Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate's teaching, scholarly accomplishments and potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file's evidence concerning the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the committee's discussions. The report will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the relevant SAC document. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review III and be promoted to Full Professor and is signed by all members of the Review III Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review III Committee report, along with any statement of dissenting opinion, is given to the candidate. In the case of non-unanimous reports, the candidate does not receive a list of who voted which way. The candidate will submit to the chair of the Committee, a letter addressed to COTAP, stating that she/he has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. This letter is required before the file is submitted to COTAP.

(c) The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review III:

- (1) Table of contents.
- (2) Copy of Colleges-wide standards for Review III and relevant SAC document.
- (3) Candidate's curriculum vitae.
- (4) Candidate's Review II reports (Review II Committee and COTAP) plus any previous Review III reports.
- (5) Written statement by candidate concerning her/his scholarly work, achievements, and aims; teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; and record of community service.
- (6) Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses, since Review II (supplied by Registrar's office).
- (7) Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review III.
- (8) Student course evaluations for all courses taught since Review II, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
- (9) Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter, seeking comments on the candidate. Responses must be signed.
- (10) Scholarship: this includes any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, and other forms of professional engagement which the candidate wishes to be considered. Candidate should include all such work produced since Review II.
- (11) Miscellaneous material related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate's work, records of participation in professional organizations and professional affairs.
- (12) Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
- (13) Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges, commenting on the teaching, scholarship, and community service of the candidate.
- (14) Signed letters from people outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked. A copy of the letter sent out will also be included.
- (15) Letters from outside reviewers of scholarly work. Letters must be signed or received by COTAP-approved electronic means. Also included will be a curriculum vitae from each outside reviewer, a list of the materials sent out to reviewers, and a copy of the letter sent with these materials.
- (16) Report of the student sub-committee.
- (17) Review III Committee report. Also, a letter of any dissenting opinions, together with reasons.
- (18) Late-arriving materials.
- (19) Signed letter from candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review III

Committee report (and, if present, statement written by any dissenters), along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

- (20) Signed letters from members of COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
- (21) COTAP report.
- (22) Signed letter from Candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the COTAP report, along with candidate's comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.

(d) Review of the file by COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost's Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost's staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review III Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to COTAP when it is complete.

COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review III Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in Review III Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. This report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the Review III Committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to COTAP and the chair of the Review III Committee, that she/he has read COTAP's statement. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. The deadline for receipt of this confirmation letter will be set by COTAP, generally allowing seven days for a response. Once the candidate has sent this letter, COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President to discuss the case.

(e) Final decision regarding Review III

Following the meeting of COTAP with the President and the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes his/her own recommendation to the President. Prior to making this recommendation, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may meet with the Review III Committee or COTAP if she/he thinks it necessary. The President, having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, may meet with COTAP or the Review III Committee prior to making his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, with copies to the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the Review III Committee chair, to inform the candidate of the outcome of Review III. Following a negative decision, the candidate may request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of that decision.

## Sabbatical and Untenured Leaves

### a. Sabbatical Leaves (Chair's responsibilities in **bold**)

Full-time faculty in tenured or tenurable positions only at the rank of Assistant Professor and above who hold the Ph.D. or other appropriate terminal degree are eligible for sabbatical leaves as follows:

- (1) For every 7.5 course equivalents taught as part of a normal teaching load of 5 courses per year, a faculty member accrues one course equivalent of sabbatical leave at full pay. These may be "expended" as either mini-sabbaticals (15 courses taught earns 2 courses sabbatical release) or full sabbaticals (30 courses taught earns 4 courses of sabbatical release). While time on leave of absence is not normally counted in determining eligibility for sabbatical leave, exceptions can be authorized by the President.
- (2) Faculty who are eligible for a full sabbatical may choose to schedule the semesters in which they are on sabbatical in various ways. They may take a full academic year (5 courses) off at 80% pay. They may choose to teach one course in their sabbatical year and receive 100% pay. They may also choose to schedule their sabbatical as a combination of two-course semesters off at full pay. Or, they may choose to use chair's leave, additional eligibility from additional semesters teaching, or support from research grants or fellowships to augment their sabbatical time. The following examples illustrate these several strategies:

Example 1: Professor H is eligible for a full sabbatical in Year B. He does not teach at all and receives 80% of his pay.

Example 2: Professor W is eligible for a full sabbatical in Year B. He teaches one course in the fall semester and no courses in the spring. He receives 100% pay for the academic year.

Example 3: Professor S is eligible for a full sabbatical in Year B. She chooses to take that sabbatical as a combination of 2 two-course semesters at full pay. She deliberates amongst the following choices: (a) teaching three courses in the Fall of Year B, taking the Spring of Year B and Fall of Year C off, and teaching 3 courses in the Spring of Year C; or (b) rearranging the semesters such that in Year B she takes off 2 two-course semesters and in Year C teaches the three course semester from Year B and the three-course semester from Year C; and (c) organizing her sabbatical as any combination of two mini-sabbaticals.

Each of these examples has implications for the institution and one's departments and interdisciplinary programs. **Thus, departments and individuals must plan sabbaticals well in advance. For this reason, all sabbatical requests must be accompanied by a two-year sabbatical plan for your department or program.**

Half-time faculty in ongoing positions who have taught 7.5 courses in consecutive years are eligible for one course sabbatical leave.

Faculty members are not eligible for full sabbatical or semi-sabbatical leave in their last three years before retirement. However, individual exceptions may be made on the recommendation of the President.

**A request for sabbatical leave must be submitted in writing to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with prior approval of the department or program chair. This letter must be accompanied by a letter from the appropriate chair acknowledging the request and describing the department's replacement plans. The request should include a statement of the faculty member's plans, in conformity with the purpose of sabbatical leave as set forth above. The request should be made by mid-October in the academic year preceding the leave. If possible, the department concerned should rearrange course offerings to eliminate the need for a replacement.** On return from sabbatical leave, a faculty member will submit to the President and Dean of Faculty and Provost, within 60 days, a short written report of his or her activities and accomplishments while on leave.

A faculty member on sabbatical leave may not accept a teaching appointment in the United States or Canada when on a one-semester leave, and may not accept a teaching appointment for more than a semester if on a full year's sabbatical leave.

b. Untenured Leaves

Untenured faculty in tenure-track positions are eligible for a research leave of two courses at full pay normally in their fourth year of appointment, contingent upon completion of the Ph.D. or other appropriate terminal degree and a successful Review I. Availability of untenured leaves for faculty hired with prior credit for teaching at another institution must be negotiated with the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The intent of the untenured leave program is to provide untenured faculty the opportunity to pursue a scholarly research or writing project prior to review for tenure. **Departments are expected to plan for them, and generally to operate without replacement for the one semester that the faculty member is absent.**

A letter of intent from interested faculty must be sent to the Dean of Faculty and Provost in mid-October prior to the academic year during which the leave will occur. **This letter must be accompanied by a letter from the appropriate department chair acknowledging the request and describing the department's plans for meeting its**

**curricular obligations.** A brief description of the faculty member's proposed project is due in the office of the Dean of Faculty and Provost no later than February 15th. Upon completion of the leave, a faculty member will submit to the President and Dean of Faculty and Provost, within 60 days, a short written report of his or her activities and accomplishments while on leave.

## **Faculty Secretaries**

Faculty secretaries provide secretarial and clerical support to faculty members in all aspects of their profession, including reception, answering telephones and relaying messages, typing, copying and filing.

Their responsibilities include:

- Prepare and duplicate class material from rough drafts (handwritten, typed, or edited on disk), such as exams, syllabi, handouts, tables, notes, articles and manuscripts.
- Place material on reserve in the library, perform statistical typing, hand out make-up exams, collect exams and term papers.
- Answer telephone and assist by providing appropriate information and making referrals as necessary; greet and screen visitors; relay messages.
- Assist students, faculty and other offices upon request.
- Format, type and photocopy correspondence from drafts; compose routine correspondence; correct spelling and grammatical errors as needed.
- Type, photocopy and mail as required, confidential tenure and promotion reports, grievance reports, manuscripts, grant proposals, special projects, and confidential letters of recommendation for students applying to graduate schools.
- Coordinate off-campus speakers and visiting job applicants – handle travel arrangements, accommodations, luncheons, dinners; expedite payment vouchers for honoraria and travel expenses.
- Order and maintain adequate office supplies; research price quotes from outside vendors; prepare purchase requisitions, check invoice against supplies received/ordered, verify amounts, charge to specific account and expedite to business office for payment. Monitor and track all departmental expenditures.
- Maintain departmental correspondence and other filing systems unique to the departments, including faculty schedules, departmental searches, departmental student-related records.
- Type, copy, distribute, count, file and maintain records of all course evaluations in confidential files.
- Deliver and pick up materials from Post Office, Bookstore, Library, Central Services and other campus offices.
- Provide general instruction on use of word processor and photocopier to faculty as required.
- Open, screen, process and forward mail for faculty on leave.
- Order textbooks and desk copies for faculty.

- Prepare monthly photocopier billings, read machine, balance accounts, and charge to appropriate departments.
- Process and keep records of building maintenance and repairs.
- Provide direction to student employees by assigning tasks and maintain a record of hour worked.
- Other duties as assigned or as required.

## **Chair's Relief Policy** (as of AY 2005-2006)

During the period that a chair is serving his/her department or program, Hobart and William Smith Colleges provides support for departmental and program chair duties as follows:

1. Category A: For chairs of departments with 5 allocated tenure track/tenured faculty or greater, the chair receives one (1) course reduction per academic year, concurrently taken in that year of service. It is expected that the individual serve a full three-year term. Ordinarily, the course subject to reduction is not replaced.
2. Category B: For programs and departments with 3 or 4 allocated tenure-track/tenured lines, the chair receives, at the end of each academic year of service, a research stipend of \$2,000, to be liquidated by the end of the subsequent academic year or stipends may be banked to be used on sabbatical. It is expected that the individual will serve a full three-year term.
3. Category C: For programs and departments with 1 to 2 allocated tenure-track/tenured lines, the chair receives, at the end of each academic year of service, a research stipend of \$1,500, to be liquidated by the end of the subsequent academic year or stipends may be banked to be used on sabbatical. It is expected that the individual will serve a full three-year term.
4. The Committee on the Faculty will reevaluate the research stipend amount every three (3) years and adjust its value to prevent de-valuation from inflation.
5. Should the chair of a program or department with one (1) to four (4) tenure-track/tenured lines conclude that the subsequent year's workload should provide some exception to this policy, the Provost's office, in consultation with CoFac, is authorized to review the claim and may substitute a research stipend, course release, and/or an adjunct replacement as appropriate.
6. Chairs serving under the current chair's leave system (in which the faculty member will have served three consecutive years) will be permitted to take a chair's leave at the end of the three years of service or be provided with alternative compensation in the form of a research stipend based on the categories above.

7. A change in the number of tenure-track/tenured faculty lines in a department or program will result in a change in the category of chair's relief.
8. The Chair's Relief Policy will be formally reviewed after five (5) years. This will allow the liquidation of current obligations and see the new policy through at least one cycle. At that point we may have a better sense of consistent variations in the chair's workload. However, CoFac will monitor how work load issues develop as it studies faculty work load and department reporting and may make adjustments before the five year review.

## **Important Dates and Deadlines**

### **2009-10**

August 21, 24 & 25	New Faculty Orientation
August 31	First Day of Classes
September 1	Notice to Provost of pending retirement
September 2	Convocation
September 4	Last day to drop/add courses
September 7	Faculty Meeting
September 9	Research assistant applications due to Provost's Office
September 12	Incomplete grade changes for 09S due to Registrar
September 18	Last day for Chairs to meet with second-year Faculty concerning Contract Renewal
September 28	Changes to Spring Semester Schedule due to Registrar
September 26	New course proposals for 10S due to Registrar
October 5	Faculty Meeting
October 10	Second round of changes to Spring Semester Schedule due to Registrar
October 10-13	Fall Recess
October 14	Department and program staffing requests due to Provost's Office
October 15-17	Board of Trustees Meetings
October 16	Last day for meetings of new Faculty with Provost and Chair

October 19	Review II cases due to Provost's Office
October 23-25	Family Weekend
November 2-9	Advising Weeks
November 2	Faculty Meeting
November 9-18	Spring 2010 Registration
November 15	Contract Renewal Recommendations due to Provost's Office
November 18	Fall Honors Projects due
November 25 – 29	Thanksgiving Recess
December 1-5	Fall honors oral exams
December 7	Faculty Meeting
December 11	Last Day of Classes
December 15-18	Final exams
December 19	Residences close at noon
December 20 – January 17	Break
December 21	Final grades are due to the Registrar by 12 midnight
January 20	Formal request for sabbatical leave due to Provost's Office
January 20	First day of classes
January 21	Faculty research grant applications due to Provost's Office
January 22	Departmental position request due to Provost's Office
January 27	Last day to drop/add classes New course proposals and FY Seminars for 2010-11 due to Registrar

January 29	Research assistant applications due to Provost's Office
January 28-30	Board of Trustees Meetings
January 25	Review III cases due to Provost's Office
February 5	Preliminary Schedule of Courses for AY2010-11 due to Registrar
February 1	Faculty Meeting
February 12	Revised Schedule of Courses for AY2010-11 due to Registrar
February 15	Review I cases due to Provost's Office
February 23	HWS DAY
February 26	Final changes to Schedule of Courses for AY2010-11 due to Registrar
February 27	Incomplete grade changes for 09F due to Registrar
March 1	Faculty Meeting
March 13-21	Spring Break
March 12	Reserved first-year seats due to Registrar
March 29 – April 2	Advising Weeks
April 5	Faculty Meeting
April 5-12	Fall 2010 Registration
April 14	Spring Honors Projects due
April 16	Faculty Prize Nominations due to Provost's Office
April 17	Charter Day
April 22-24	Board of Trustees Meetings
April 30	Moving Up Day

April 27 – May 1	Spring honors oral exams
May 4	Last Day of Classes
May 8-11	Final Exams
May 11	Senior grades due to Registrar by 5 PM
May 14	Faculty Meeting @ 9:00 AM
May 16	Commencement
May 17	All underclass grades are due by 5 PM
June 3	Last day for Chairs to meet with first-year Faculty to review teaching
June 3-6	Reunion

---

All Faculty Meetings will be held in the Faculty Dining Room. The meetings will begin at 4:00 PM except for the last meeting of the year which begins at 9:00 AM.

## Program Review Schedule

During the Middle States accreditation review in 2004, the Colleges were required to implement a regular and recurring cycle of program and department reviews. Over the past three years, previous CoAAs and CoFACs, working with the Assessment Committee, generated guidelines and procedures for the reviews. As part of those procedures, the Provost has asked that the schedule of reviews be reviewed annually by CoAA and CoFac.

The schedule below was generated by the following principles: 1) we identified volunteers to begin the schedule in 2009; 2) we ordered departments by the proximity to the last review of the department or program; and 3) we sought to achieve a diversity of disciplines and program size in any given year.

<u>2008-09 or spring/fall 2009</u> Geoscience Religious Studies Spanish & Hispanic Studies Writing & Rhetoric	<u>2011-2012</u> Art Education French & Francophone Studies Physics Psychology Russian Area Studies
<u>2009-2010</u> Anthropology & Sociology Asian Languages & Cultures English History Political Science Classics	<u>2012-2013</u> Africana Studies Biology Mathematics & Computer Science Theatre Women's Studies
<u>2010-2011</u> American Studies Dance Economics Environmental Studies Music Philosophy	<u>2013-2014</u> Chemistry German Area Studies Media & Society Public Policy

Appeals Process: It is expected that programs and departments will have to go forward with a review during a semester or year when one member of the department or program is on leave, sabbatical, or teaching abroad. If the scheduled review poses undue hardship, however, Chairs should appeal directly to the Provost and Dean of Faculty.

## **Faculty Office/Phone**

2009-10

Theodore Allen	108 Eaton Hall	3623
Lauren Alleyne	123D Demarest	3752
Aimen Almaloul (FTLA/Arabic)	310 Trinity Hall	4514
Jeffrey Anderson	212 Stern Hall	3438
Etin Anwar	208 Demarest	3712
Marina Aptekman	202 Smith Hall	4540
Nan Arens	111 Lansing Hall	3930
Eugenio Arima	318 Stern Hall	3445
Michael Armstrong	312 Smith Hall	3908
A.E. Ted Aub III	104 Katherine Elliott Arts Bldg	3486
Eugen Baer	Smith Hall	3300
Abou Bamba	Henry House	3631
Cerri Banks	Smith Hall	3467
Eric Barnes	306 Demarest	3182
Jaime Barrera	306 Lansing Hall	3595
Biman Basu	112 Demarest	3367
Betty Bayer	210 Demarest	3460
David Belding	307 Lansing Hall	3618
Bonnie Bennett	211 Houghton House	3477
Sheila K. Bennett	208 Stern Hall	3145
Joseph Berta	209 Williams Hall	3405
Neeta Bhasin	205 Smith Hall	3138
Lisa Black	32 Coxe Hall	3042
Lara C.W. Blanchard	208 Houghton House	3893
Bodenlos, Jamie	217 Gulick	3481
Michael J. Bogin	202 Houghton House	3484
Walter Bowyer	108 Rosenberg Science Building	3608
Stina Bridgeman	312 Lansing Hall	3614
Scott Brophy	303 Demarest	3377
Meghan Brown	118 Eaton Hall	3464
Eric Bulson	123D Demarest	3380
Larry Campbell	B27 Eaton Hall	3593
James Capreedy	313 Smith Hall	3798
Sigrid Carle	205 Rosenberg Science Building	3589
Rob Carson	106 Demarest	3358
Anthony Cerulli	203 Demarest Hall	3879
Christine Chin	103A Elliott Arts Bldg.	3705
Cecelia Choi	307 Smith Hall	4458
Elena Ciletti	207 Houghton House	3485
Patrick M. Collins	Coxe Hall	3634

Sean Conrey	213 Smith Hall	4456
Melanie Conroy-Goldman	111 Demarest	3374
Brian Cooper	312 Stern Hall	3427
Marc Corliss	300 Lansing Hall	3607
Robert Cowles	203 Williams Hall	3404
David W. Craig	111 Rosenberg Science Building	3611
Anna Creadick	113 Demarest	3871
Carol Critchlow	301.5 Lansing Hall	3617
Luciana Cursino	210 Rosenberg	4528
Tara Curtin	110 Lansing Hall	3928
Susan Cushman	226 Eaton Hall	3599
Nicholas D'Angelo	201 Williams Hall	3402
Kanate Dahouda	304 Smith Hall	3799
Donna Davenport	Coxe Hall	3760
Christine deDenus	205 Lansing Hall	3612
Jodi Dean	116 Stern Hall	3425
Marisa DeSantis	307 Smith Hall	4458
Iva E. Deutchman	114 Stern Hall	3429
Mark Deutschlander	213 Eaton Hall	3921
Richard Dillon	211 Stern Hall	3447
Michael Dobkowski	206 Demarest	3369
Thomas Drennen	314 Stern Hall	3419
David Droney	206 Rosenberg Science Building	3597
Kevin Dunn	115 Stern Hall	3436
Portia Dyrenforth	219 Gulick	3415
David Eck	313 Lansing Hall	3398
Laurence Erussard	109 Demarest	3363
Marie-France Etienne	301 Smith Hall	3792
May Farnsworth	306 Smith Hall	3785
Maureen Flynn	205 Henry House	3582
Christopher Fobes	206 Williams Hall	3407
Cheryl Forbes	214 Smith Hall	3804
Jonathan Forde	303 Lansing Hall	3814
Jeffrey Frame	101A Lansing Hall	3615
Laura Free	109 Henry House	3554
Lester Friedman	111 Stern Hall	3580
Alan I. Frishman	316 Stern Hall	3417
Greg Frost-Arnold	Harris House	4509
Karen Frost-Arnold	308 Demarest Hall	4525
Stephen Frug	Henry House	3581
Catherine Gallouet	310 Smith Hall	3795
David J. Galloway	202 Smith Hall	3790
Bernard Gee	205 Gulick Hall	3448
Ronald Gerrard	200 Gulick	3448
Geoffrey Gilbert	315 Stern Hall	3414
Thomas J. Glover	302 Eaton Hall	3602
Jeffrey Greenspon	202 Gulick	3463
Robert Gross	33 Coxe Hall	3876
Christopher E. Gunn	319 Stern Hall	3416
John Halfman	112 Lansing Hall	3918

Warren Hamilton	316 Stern Hall	3149
Jack D. Harris	215 Stern Hall	3439
William Harris	Henry House	3577
Susan Henking	205 Demarest	3889
Mary Hess	123B Demarest	3085
Leah Himmelhoch	311 Smith Hall	3907
James-Henry Holland	108 Stern Hall	3642
Grant I. Holly	107 Demarest	3365
Clifton Hood	100 Henry House	3576
Chi-Chiang Huang	207 Stern Hall	3553
Khuram Hussain	103A Merritt	3953
Michelle Ikle	201 Winn Seeley Gymnasium	3575
Jonathan Iuzzini	211 Gulick	3461
Marilyn Jimenez	120 Stern Hall	3791
Cedric Johnson	119 Stern Hall	3434
Mark Jones	110 Houghton House	3490
George Joseph	216 Smith Hall	3794
Matthew Kadane	103 Henry House	3583
Shalahudin Kafrawi	202 Demarest	3833
Paul E. Kehle	101 Merritt	3037
Mary Kelly	105 Merritt	3084
David Kendrick	106A Lansing Hall	3929
Kristy Kenyon	207 Rosenberg Science Building	3598
Feisal Khan	316A Stern Hall	3149
Erika L.C. King	304 Lansing Hall	3355
Rodmon King	307 Demarest	3169
Julie Newman Kingery	215 Gulick	3641
Beth Kinne	310 Stern Hall	3913
Eric Klaus	302 Smith Hall	3635
Kyoko Klaus	121 Stern Hall	3584
John Krummel	209 Demarest Hall	3139
Pasad Kulatunga	126A Eaton Hall	3636
Neil Laird	107 Lansing Hall	3603
Pam Lambert	Center for Teaching/Learning (Library)	3832
Steven Lee	305 Demarest	3379
Juan Liebana	309 Smith Hall	3633
Lightweis-Goff, Jennie	205 Demarest	3911
Derek Linton	102 Henry House	3382
DeWayne Lucas	112 Stern Hall	3902
Elisabeth Lyon	105 Demarest	3357
Darrin Magee	307 Stern Hall	3364
Brenda Maiiale	218 Stern Hall	3443
James MaKinster	100A Merritt	3141
Kirin Makker	302 Houghton House	3474
Richard Mason	219 Stern Hall	3440
Gary Matassarini	29A Coxe Hall	3352
Stanley Mathews	201 Houghton House	3476
Patricia Mathews	106 Houghton House	3048
Helen McCabe	103C Merritt	3142
James McCorkle	308 Smith Hall	3632

Patrick McGuire	310 Stern Hall	3423
Judith R. McKinney	311 Stern Hall	3432
Scott G. McKinney	313 Stern Hall	3424
D. Brooks McKinney	108 Lansing Hall	3819
Susanne E. McNally	201 Henry House	3585
Jo Beth Mertens	317 Stern Hall	3457
Justin Miller	110 Rosenberg Science Building	3884
Nicola Minott-Ahl	108 Demarest	3362
Kevin Mitchell	305 Lansing Hall	3619
Evelyn Monsay	203 Gulick Hall	4515
Renee Monson	220 Stern Hall	3426
T. Dunbar Moodie	209 Stern Hall	3446
Patricia Mowery	221 Eaton Hall	3184
Cristina Muller	307 Smith Hall	3127
Patricia Myers	202 Williams Hall	3401
Elizabeth Newell	107 Rosenberg Science Building	3590
Ilene M. Nicholas	210 Stern Hall	3442
Barbara Nikolovska	219 Stern Hall	3440
Carol Oberbrunner	302 Demarest	3381
Scotty Orr	309 Lansing Hall	3616
David Ost	113 Stern Hall	3428
Edgar Paiewonsky-Conde	207 Smith Hall	3632
Karl Parker	111 Demarest	3137
Paul Passavant	118 Stern Hall	3431
Eric Patterson	104 Demarest	3356
Erin Pelkey	109 Rosenberg Science Building	3708
Steven Penn	126B Eaton Hall	3759
H. Wesley Perkins	214 Stern Hall	3437
Mihaela Petrescu	002 Smith Hall	4457
Stacey Philbrick Yadav	109 Stern Hall	3430
Thelma Pinto	308 Smith Hall	3187
Michele Polak	205A Smith Hall	3181
Elizabeth Ramey	320 Stern Hall	4525
Alison Redick	204 Demarest	3373
Craig Rimmerman	308 Stern Hall	3435
Colby Ristow	106 Henry House	3136
Michelle Rizzella	204 Gulick	3465
Linda Robertson	BLAC Demarest	3805
Devparna Roy	221 Stern Hall	3173
Sarah Russo	210 Demarest	3359
Nicholas Ruth	102A Katherine Elliott Arts Bldg	3493
James Ryan	210 Eaton Hall	3601
Mary Salibrici	29A Coxe Hall	3462
Richard Salter	207 Demarest	3370
Shafer, Leah	111 Stern Hall	3951
Lilian Sherman	100B Merritt	3628
Daniel J. Singal	200 Henry House	3581
Melissa Smith	108 Winn Seeley Gymnasium	3188
Robin Sowards	123A Demarest	3338
James L. Spates	216 Stern Hall	3441

Donald Spector	106 Eaton Hall	3594
Christopher Spiese	208 Lansing Hall	3613
Charles Temple	202 Merritt	3444
Michael Tinkler	211 Houghton House	3489
Thierry Torea	304 A Smith Hall	4541
Jorge Torres-Lumsden	309 Smith Hall	3043
Caroline Travalia	208 Smith Hall	3072
Alan van Giessen	205D Lansing Hall	3757
John B. Vaughn	302 Lansing Hall	3906
Kathryn L. Vaughn	203 Houghton House	3483
William T. Waller, Jr.	320 Stern Hall	3433
David Weiss	110 Demarest	3644
Dylan Weller	112 Stern Hall	3430
Kristen Welsh	201 Smith Hall	3864
Cadence Whittier	Trinity Hall	3949
Cynthia J. Williams	200 Winn Seeley Gymnasium	3495
Kimberly Williams	203 Merritt Hall	4417
Robert Wolfe	303 Houghton House	3958
Uta Wolfe	217 Gulick	3459
Yi-Tung Wu	202 Stern Hall	4512
Vikash Yadav	110 Stern Hall	3176
Phillia Yi	105A Katherine Elliott Arts Bldg	3494
Tenzin Yignyen	322 Stern Hall	3707
Lisa Yoshikawa	206 Henry House	3578
Jinghao Zhou	222 Stern Hall	3926
William Zuk	205C Lansing Hall	3604

## **Appendices**

### **Web Links**

- Provost's Office – <http://www.hws.edu/offices/provost/>
- Registrar's Office – <http://www.hws.edu/offices/registrar/>
- Library – <http://library.hws.edu/>

*Department and Program Review Procedures*

*Faculty Recruiting and Hiring Handbook*

*Sexual Misconduct Policy*

*Things We Wish We Had Known Sooner!—Information, Tips and Hints for New Faculty at Hobart and William Smith Colleges (9th ed.)*