Section d. Standards for Tenure and Reappointment

**General Considerations**

Hobart and William Smith Colleges seek to appoint and retain faculty members who will be talented and committed teachers, who will demonstrate quality in their professional work and who will provide valuable service to the Colleges and the community. Therefore, the Colleges’ aim is to assist the growth of individual faculty members by encouraging programs of personal and professional development; by rigorously evaluating their teaching, scholarship, and community service; by providing detailed and constructive feedback on their development as educators, scholars, and members of the community; and by making informed and serious judgments regarding contractual renewal and tenure within a reasonably open process of consultation, discussion, and shared information.

An individual's qualifications must be judged as a whole and each person's contributions will be greater in some areas than in others. The weighing of a faculty member’s several contributions to the Colleges’ community cannot be accomplished entirely by formula, but certain guidelines should systematically be invoked. Because Hobart and William Smith Colleges are devoted chiefly to undergraduate education, demonstrable excellence in teaching is of paramount importance. Significant scholarly achievement is a second, but still essential, criterion. Meaningful and consistent service to the Colleges and the community is seen as a third measure and is an essential part of the normal and expected duties of faculty members.

Because Hobart and William Smith Colleges are devoted chiefly to undergraduate education, demonstrable high quality in teaching is of paramount importance. Superior professional development is seen as a second criterion. Although a faculty member's teaching and professional development are the primary and secondary measures of evaluation respectively, meaningful and consistent service to the Colleges and the community are seen as an essential part of the normal and expected duties of faculty members.

**Teaching**

Teaching is a complex task which helps students to gain knowledge, understanding, and skill in academic subjects or disciplines. It enables students to use ideas for themselves in open-minded and analytic ways, empowering them to function fully as individuals and citizens. The evaluation of teaching requires consideration of several qualities reflected in the faculty member's performance: commitment to teaching, effectiveness as a teacher, and mastery of an area of knowledge.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges consider a genuine professional commitment to teaching to be of the highest importance. Enthusiasm for teaching may be as well demonstrated by a quiet and deliberative manner as by more dramatic approaches. It transcends the boundaries of the classroom, finding form in a wide range of activities: personal advising and informal conversations, the encouragement of independent creative or scholarly work, the structure and organization of courses, innovative curriculum development, field work, and the assessment of and response to student performance.
Faculty members should be effective teachers. Though difficult to measure, effectiveness should include an ability to present students with the subject matter in a way which generates intellectual enthusiasm, conveys central insights of the discipline, develops critical habits of thinking, and encourages original scholarly or creative work. An excellent teacher adheres to high intellectual standards, and responds to the work of students with fair and constructive methods of evaluation. Evidence that a faculty member fosters independent thinking and research and serves as a mentor may include, but is not limited to, the supervision of honors projects, independent studies, summer research projects, course equivalents and internships.

Ordinarily, effective teaching cannot be considered wholly apart from professional development. It is related to an individual's mastery of a field of knowledge, to his or her original research or creative work, and to participation in professional organizations. There may, however, be exceptional teachers who do not engage in what is customarily known as scholarly activity. Still, such teachers are expected by the Colleges to be aware of new developments in their field, to renew themselves intellectually, and to reflect this continual development in their teaching.

Faculty members should reflect in their teaching both depth and breadth, including the best and most rigorous work in their disciplines, an attention to the broader outlines of the field, and commitment to the general curriculum. At these Colleges, teaching involves not only one's students but one's colleagues, and requires mutual respect and consideration. Its evaluation takes into account both what the teacher intends, what the teacher does, and what effects such activity has upon students and colleagues.

**Professional Development**

Professional development is reflected in scholarship, in other professional activities, and in general demonstrations of intellectual vitality. Hobart and William Smith Colleges expect that this faculty will achieve high levels of professional development in all its forms. It is important not only in the advancement of human knowledge, but also in the improvement of teaching, as a means of refreshing and revitalizing the Colleges' community, and as an indicator of the Colleges' understanding of their larger social responsibilities.

Scholarship denotes original research in a field or discipline, or its equivalent expression in the creative arts. It seeks to advance the frontiers of knowledge, or to provide new insights into old problems, new interpretations, or continuing questions.

Generally, scholarship takes the form of publication in scholarly journals, monographs or book-length studies, presentations of papers at scholarly conferences, or public performances and exhibition of creative work. Such demonstrations reflect a vital connection to one's peers in the field and make such work available to the criticism and insights of those best able to judge it.

However, the form of scholarly work varies with both the discipline and the reference group for which it is intended. For example, it can include works which interpret one's field to a general rather than a professional audience, unpublished manuscripts, participation in the proceedings of learned societies, lectures to knowledgeable public groups, and participation in colloquia or panel discussions at one's own or other institutions.

The Colleges recognize that professional development occurs both within and between traditional academic disciplines: Wherever such work is offered for evaluation it will be referred to its appropriate reference group for comment. What is of greatest importance in assessing professional development is the strength and quality of the individual's intellectual engagement.
with others and the confidence the institution can gain in its faculty through the various demonstrations of such engagement.

Community Service

Considerable flexibility is needed in evaluating a faculty member's service to the Colleges' community because of the great variety of activities which are included in this category. Many of a faculty member's contributions to the life of the community are intricately linked to teaching and professional development. Others are part of the normal and expected duties of the faculty: serving on committees, participating in campus decision making and faculty governance. Still others include activity outside the Colleges' community, work which draws on and improves the instructor's competence as well as which benefits the Colleges.

Such service cannot be considered as a substitute for achievement in teaching and professional development, but it does constitute an important contribution to the Colleges. Moreover, when a faculty member has been asked to carry an abnormal load of such duties, that circumstance will be considered when evaluating the individual's professional development as part of an overall review.

A faculty member exists both in relation to students and among colleagues. Members of a department and of a faculty contribute to the scholarly and intellectual growth of other colleagues -- reading papers, exchanging views on issues of common concern, discussing scholarly books and articles, assisting with problems and questions regarding teaching, developing courses and working in the honors program, etc. Colleagueship may be subtle and not always easy to evaluate, but it is important in developing and maintaining mutual respect, openness and intellectual commitment, and represents an essential element of the criterion of community services.

Section e. Standards, criteria, and procedures for contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion

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.

2. Review I. For a Four-Year Reappointment
a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges

_Review I is designed to give a faculty member's departmental colleagues an opportunity to make a broad judgment of his or her suitability for retention. Without demanding full-scale accomplishment at this early stage, it assesses ability as a teacher, including academic competence; intellectual vitality, though not necessarily accomplished scholarship; and likelihood of departmental and community service at a superior level. This review will take into account student response to systematic inquiry, assessment by colleagues, and evaluation of written material submitted by the faculty member._

b. Roles, responsibilities, and procedures for Review I

**General considerations**

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 non-
departmental/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 [the Committee develops] 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 [the Committee] 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 dissenter[s], 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.
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 I 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. 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.