Memorandum

To: Department Chairs, Third-Year Review Candidates, Division Directors

From: Lyle Roelofs

Re: Guidelines and Timing of Third-Year Review

The attached guidelines should be followed as the Third-Year Review files are assembled. The Associate Dean of the Faculty will be sending each of you a letter indicating which courses will be used in the preparation of SET responses for inclusion in the dossiers. Candidates and Department Chairs are urged to read the appropriate section of the Faculty Handbook prior to preparation of the dossier.

Please be reminded of the January 1, 2005 deadline for completion of the Ph.D. and the February 7th deadline for submission of the files to the Dean of the Faculty office. Chairs should submit the original and nine copies to the Division Director by Monday, January 31, 2005.

attachment
GENERAL INFORMATION CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF THIRD-YEAR REVIEW DOSSIERS
(Fall 2004)

Department Chairs should prepare nine copies of the dossier, plus the original, in a format for loose-leaf binding (three-hole punched paper). Copies should be double-sided.

Dossiers must be paginated throughout and follow the checklist sequence. Last-minute additions can be designated with a page number and letter; e.g., 19a, 19b, etc.

Department Chairs should not deviate from standard request letters for soliciting comments from peers or outside evaluators without the Division Director’s prior approval (see model letters at the end of this document). It is the responsibility of each Department Chair to provide review copies of any published or unpublished materials not readily available to our outside evaluators.

Documentation of material that does not readily fit into a guideline category should be included in an appendix. If in doubt about inclusion, check with the Division Director.

Dossiers should not contain
- letters solicited in ways other than according to the terms of this guideline
- solicited or unsolicited letters from students
- letters of annual consultation
- SET forms other than those specified by the guidelines
- course outlines or syllabi (but they may be made available for reading in the Dean’s Office)
- published and accepted materials or grant proposals

The Chair, Candidate, and Division Director should meet to review the third-year review procedures and guidelines during the fall term (by mid-October) prior to the preparation of the dossier.[1]

Materials for inclusion in the dossier that are provided by the candidate must be given to the department chair by the second week of January. Later additions, e.g., grants received or articles accepted for publication, may be given to the division director throughout the decision period. The Department Chair should submit the assembled dossier to the appropriate representative of the P&T Committee, who will review it for completeness and compliance with the guidelines. Approved dossiers will then be transferred to the candidate’s Division Director.

In February, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure will meet with each candidate individually. At approximately the same time, another meeting of the candidate and the Division Director should be held to assess the completeness of the dossier before sending it to the Dean of the Faculty.

In the final stages of preparation of each dossier for third-year review, the Candidate’s Division Director and the Promotion and Tenure Committee member from the Candidate’s division share the responsibility of seeing that the dossier is prepared according to guidelines. The Promotion and Tenure Committee has a responsibility to bring to the DAC’s attention material deemed prejudicial or improper.

While the Candidate may not read the complete dossier, she/he should be informed of the names of persons from whom outside letters of evaluation were solicited at the time the dossier is reviewed with the Division Director.
A candidate should feel free to discuss her/his dossier directly with the Division Director or to contact any member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee concerning his/her candidacy if there is a perceived procedural problem.

When possible, late-arriving evidence regarding scholarship will be considered. Once the decisions have been made, however, no additional evidence will be considered.

Departments should not indicate to the candidate the nature of their third-year review recommendations to the DAC. Candidates will be informed of the DAC decision in writing with a follow-up discussion to be scheduled with the Dean of the Faculty and the Division Director.
GUIDELINES FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

The following procedures for the Third-Year Review have been approved by the Dean’s Advisory Council in consultation with the Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

I. THE DOSSIER

The Third-Year Review dossier (original plus nine copies) should include the following:

A. Table of contents (a blank form is attached—Appendix A) (*)

B. A full *vita* of the candidate, including a list of scholarly achievements and activities (e.g., dissertation, publications, presentations, exhibitions) and a complete list of service activities. (**) 

C. A statement by the candidate summarizing his/her views on his/her teaching, scholarship, and service.[2] The teaching section should include the candidate’s philosophy and goals of teaching. The section on research should contain a reasonably detailed description of the candidate’s short- and long-term research goals and methodology. This section should specify the planned activities and expected accomplishments of the one-semester Junior Faculty Leave for which the successful candidate will be eligible.[3] Finally, there should be a section summarizing the candidate’s service contributions to the department, university, and/or profession. (**)

D. Extra-departmental Evaluations of Candidates Holding Joint or Affiliated Appointments

In addition to the procedures described elsewhere in these guidelines, the following procedures will apply for candidates who formally hold joint or affiliated appointments in both a department and an interdisciplinary program.[4]

1. The dossier should include letters evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service from the appropriate program director[4] and from up to four (but not exceeding the number of tenured faculty in the candidate’s home department) other tenured members of the faculty. These additional faculty members, beyond the program director, will be associated with the appropriate program but be from outside the candidate’s home department, and they will be selected with the mutual agreement of the candidate and the director. Normally the extra-departmental faculty will be identified during the spring semester of the year prior to the review. For these extra-departmental evaluations, the evaluators should have access to the candidate’s *curriculum vitae* and personal statement, all student evaluations of teaching in the dossier, the packet of materials sent to the outside evaluators, letters from outside evaluators of scholarship, and internal letters describing Core teaching and service. The Chair of the candidate’s home department will attend this meeting in order to hear the program’s views of the candidate. No formal vote will be taken by the program faculty.
Following the meeting, individual letters evaluating the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service should be written by the program director and those program faculty chosen as evaluators. These letters should be prepared independently, and, rather than being merely a review of the discussion, each letter should convey the author's personal assessment of the candidate's professional record. These extra-departmental letters will be included in the dossier that is reviewed by tenured members of the candidate's home department and the program director.

2. If appropriate, under Section F below, the Chair of the home department and the program director should discuss possible choices of external evaluators of scholarship.

3. The program director, or one of the extra-departmental faculty evaluators designated by the program director if the program director is a member of the candidate’s home department, will attend the meeting(s) at which the candidate’s home department discusses the dossier. The program director will have a full voice in the meeting and will present the program’s views of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service. However, the program director will not be present for the home department’s summary discussion and vote.

4. Following the meeting of the home department, the program director, or the extra-departmental faculty member who attended the department’s discussions of the candidate, should write a letter summarizing the views of the extra-departmental evaluators. This letter may also address issues raised in the department meeting and will be added to the dossier when the rest of the dossier is complete.

E. A summary statement of the Chair recording the views of the tenured members of the department based on teaching, scholarly promise, and service. This statement should address the department’s evaluation of performance in each area. For purposes of later communication with the candidate, it is helpful if this summary characterizes performance in each of the areas satisfactory or better, acceptable but in need of improvement, or unacceptable. This summary should be based on a meeting of all tenured members of the department at which the vote of the department is taken about performance in each area and about the candidacy overall. This meeting should normally occur in January, by which time all tenured faculty should have read the collected material on teaching, scholarship, and service. The chair’s written summary of the meeting should record the members present and absent and each member’s votes. It should be made available to the tenured members of the department who are contributing letters to the dossier. (*)

Following that meeting, each tenured member including the Chair, will write a letter for the dossier containing her/his decision and the basis for it. Tenured members’ letters should comment on the quality of the teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with the language in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, Section D. Tenured faculty whose attendance at the meeting is impossible may also contribute letters to the dossier. (*)

F. Letters from the chair and other members of the candidate’s thesis committee evaluating the candidate’s scholarly promise; where appropriate for adequate appraisal, a letter or letters can be solicited from one or two other scholars. For review of those faculty who have received the Ph.D. more than five years prior to the review year, or when members of the candidate’s thesis committee would not
be the most appropriate reviewers, letters from the thesis committee need not be requested. In such circumstances, the candidate may select external reviewers (normally two), with one or two additional reviewers selected by the department. (Please see Appendix B for the form letter that is to be used to solicit the letters from the external evaluators. Alternative models may be used if approved by the Division Director.) If any of the candidate’s work was sent to the outside evaluators, the dossier should contain a list identifying those materials. (*)

G. Letters from CORE component chairs and, at the request of the candidate or in the case where a candidate was hired with a contractual obligation to teach in a program or second department, from other directors of University programs in which the instructor participates commenting on quality of teaching in those programs (in accordance with Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, Section D, Part 1). See Appendix C for model letter of invitation. (*)

H. At the request of the candidate, letters from tenured members of team-taught courses within all-university programs may be included. See Appendix D for model letter of invitation. (*)

I. SET form data

1. The Dean’s Office is to supply a list of all courses (including First-Year Seminars, CORE [with the exception of first-time taught CORE courses] and UNST courses) in the three on-campus teaching semesters immediately preceding candidacy. SET data for a minimum of six courses are required. If six courses have not been taught in the three semesters immediately preceding candidacy, data from the four semesters immediately preceding candidacy will be supplied. (***)

2. List of all courses taught at Colgate: title, course number, enrollment, level (introductory, upper-level, seminar, special service). Please indicate semester and year and include courses being taught during the semester that the review is taking place. When appropriate, the chair should provide a brief description of the candidate’s duties in courses where classes or labs taught by the candidate comprise some form of shared or team teaching (e.g. a lab instructor teaches some lab(s); a research seminar involves other faculty participants, etc.). (*)

3. SET information should be presented in order of the courses taught with the most recent courses presented last. (*)

4. With the exception of first-time CORE courses, typed copies of all student responses should be included. SET responses should be numbered sequentially for each course. All nine copies of the dossier will contain this information. (*)

5. In the instance of team-taught courses, Department Chairs should include in the dossier only those SET comments that pertain to the candidate. (*)
6. In no case should the name of any faculty or staff member other than the candidate appear in SET comments. (*)

J. Study Group Data

1. For candidates who have led Off-Campus Study Groups, student evaluations may be included at the candidate’s request in addition to the on-campus SET data identified in Section H. (***)

2. When study group student evaluations are included in the dossier, the Study Group leader may supply comments on these evaluations and/or submit his/her final report. (**)

K. The chair should provide a statement with the necessary documentation addressing institutional need as discussed in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter III, Section E. Parts 5 and 6). Prior to writing this statement, the chair will meet with the Division Director to review considerations of institutional need. This should include: (*)

1. the need for the number of positions in the department based upon recent enrollment trends, including the following:

   (a) enrollments in the candidate’s courses under review; and

   (b) three years of enrollments in all department courses. The dossier should contain the raw data supplied by the Registrar (listings of all courses taught by the dept for each term with final enrollments for each course). The dossier should also include department summary statistics (based on the Registrar’s data) for each of the three years with the current year listed first. The department summary should be in a table of the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100 Level</th>
<th>200 Level</th>
<th>300 level</th>
<th>400 level</th>
<th>Total Department</th>
<th>Non-Departmental Courses (CORE, UNST, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
<td>Total enrollments (# of Sections)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. the need for the position based upon the specialization it represents within the department’s curriculum and potential for contribution to all-university programs;

3. justification of the position in relation to departmental faculty rank structure, both at present and as projected in the next five years, taking into account anticipated retirements;
4. explanation of how the candidate has met the pedagogical, curricular and professional expectations established at the time of hire;

5. A copy of the job announcement that resulted in the candidate's hire.

This statement should be made available for review by all tenured members of the department.

L. For candidates formally holding joint or affiliated appointments the program director should provide a statement with the necessary documentation addressing institutional need as discussed in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter III, Section E, Parts 5 and 6). This should include:

1. the need for positions in the program based upon recent enrollment trends, including the following:
   (a) enrollments in the candidate’s courses under review; and
   (b) three years of enrollment in all program courses;
   These figures, which should be final enrollment figures (i.e., after course withdrawals), should be obtained from the Registrar.

2. the need for the position based upon the specialization it represents within the programs’ curriculum.

3. explanation of how the candidate has met the pedagogical, curricular and professional expectations established at the time of hire;

   [A copy of the job announcement that resulted in the candidate’s hire is included in K.5.]

   This statement should be made available for review by all of the extra-departmental evaluators.

II. PROCEDURES AND REVIEW

All third-year review candidates shall be informed of the results of the DAC discussion of both merit and institutional need. Depending on the nature of the results of the DAC deliberations, the Dean may determine that an annual update may be necessary during the fourth and fifth years for some faculty members (see Faculty Handbook, Chapter III, Section E, Parts 5-6).

A. After assessing a department’s response to I.K. (and, for faculty holding joint or affiliated appointments, the program’s response to I.L.), the DAC will come to one of three possible conclusions:

1. position should be continued;

2. the need for the position is uncertain and should undergo annual review; or

3. the position is no longer needed and will be discontinued on __________ .

B. The decision to terminate a faculty member in a tenure-stream position will be made on the basis of one or more of the following considerations:

1. Inadequate teaching with insufficient evidence of potential for improvement.
2. Non-completion of the Ph.D. or insufficient evidence of significant scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D. (Successful candidates must have completed the Ph.D. by January 1 of the third year as documented by a letter from the Ph.D. granting institution.)

3. Failure to satisfy or to show promise of satisfying reasonable expectations for service as expressed in Chapter III, Section D, Part 3 of the *Faculty Handbook* concerning service to the university community.

4. Evidence that the candidate has not met the pedagogical or curricular or professional expectations established at the time of hire.

5. Institutional needs and priorities which would mandate a termination or redefinition of the position.
APPENDIX A

MODEL DOSSIER

No.

A. Table of Contents

B. Vita

C. Candidate’s Statement

D. Extra-Departmental Evaluations (only for candidates holding joint or affiliated appointments)
   1. Letters from Selected Tenured Members of the Program
   2. Program Director’s Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

E. Departmental Evaluation
   1. Chair’s Summary Statement
   2. Letters from Tenured Department Members

F. Scholarship
   1. List of External Evaluators
   2. Outside Letters Evaluating Scholarship
   3. Model Letter of Request
   4. List of the Candidate’s Work Sent to External Evaluators

G. Letters from Directors of University Programs Evaluating Teaching
   1. Letters from Directors Evaluating Teaching
   2. Model Letter of Request

H. Letters from Members of Team-Taught Courses
   1. Letters from Members of Team-Taught Courses
   2. Model Letter of Request
I. SET Form Data

J. Off-Campus Study Group Data
   1. Study Group Student Evaluations
   2. Study Group Leader’s Comments and/or Final Report

K. Chair’s Statement Addressing Institutional Need and Supporting Data

L. Program Director’s Statement Addressing Institutional Need (only for candidates holding joint or affiliated appointments)
APPENDIX B

Letter to be used in solicitation of external scholars to evaluate scholarship. Do not depart from the wording of the sample letter unless permitted by the Division Director.

MODEL LETTER

Dear _____,

During the spring of 2005, _____ will undergo a third-year review by Colgate University. This review, which is made by the individual’s department and submitted to the Dean’s Advisory Council, is based on the quality of the individual’s teaching, scholarly promise in addition to the Ph.D. dissertation, and service to Colgate. On the basis of this review, successful candidates continue toward tenure, a decision made in their sixth year.

May I please ask you for your considered judgment of _____’s scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D.? Should you respond affirmatively, we request that you give us your evaluation of _____’s scholarly promise based on an evaluation of the items listed in the curriculum vitae. If any of the material is not readily available, please let me know and I shall be happy to send you copies of what you need.

We want to learn what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s current and proposed scholarship, your opinion of its quality, originality and significance. We also wish to receive your estimate of the candidate’s potential for continued scholarly work.

In your response, please indicate whether you know the candidate personally, and if so, in what capacity. It would be most helpful if you could forward your evaluation to me by _____. Although the candidate will be informed that you are evaluating his/her scholarship, the contents of your letter will be held in the strictest confidence.

Thank you for rendering this important service. If you have questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to write or telephone me.

Sincerely,

enclosure: candidate’s curriculum vitae
[list of materials sent to outside evaluators]

P.S. If you do not feel that you can provide an evaluation of _____________’s work, we would be pleased to have you suggest the name of a person who is in a position to do so. In any case, please let me know as soon as possible if you are unable to undertake this evaluation.
APPENDIX B1

Letter for External Evaluators for Candidates Holding Joint or Affiliated Appointments

Letter to be used in solicitation of external scholars to evaluate scholarship. Do not depart from the wording of the sample letter unless permitted by the Division Directors.

MODEL LETTER

Dear _____,

During the spring of 2005, _____ will undergo a third-year review by Colgate University. This review, which is made by the individual’s department and program and submitted to the Dean’s Advisory Council, is based on the quality of the individual’s teaching, scholarly promise in addition to the Ph.D. dissertation, and service to Colgate. On the basis of this review, successful candidates continue toward tenure, a decision made in their sixth year.

May I please ask you for your considered judgment of _____’s scholarly promise beyond the Ph.D.? Should you respond affirmatively, we request that you give us your evaluation of _____’s scholarly promise based on an evaluation of the items listed in the curriculum vitae. If any of the material is not readily available, please let me know and I shall be happy to send you copies of what you need.

We want to learn what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s current and proposed scholarship, your opinion of its quality, originality and significance. We also wish to receive your estimate of the candidate’s potential for continued scholarly work.

In your response, please indicate whether you know the candidate personally, and if so, in what capacity. It would be most helpful if you could forward your evaluation to me by _____.

Although the candidate will be informed that you are evaluating his/her scholarship, the contents of your letter will be held in the strictest confidence.

Thank you for rendering this important service. If you have questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to write or telephone me.

Sincerely,

Signed by Department Chair and Program Director

enclosure: candidate’s curriculum vitae
[ list of materials sent to outside evaluators]

P.S. If you do not feel that you can provide an evaluation of _____________’s work, we would be pleased to have you suggest the name of a person who is in a position to do so. In any case, please let me know as soon as possible if you are unable to undertake this evaluation.
APPENDIX C

Letter of solicitation to CORE Component chairs and other Program Directors to evaluate teaching.

MODEL LETTER

Dear ______________________,

During the spring of 2005, _____ will undergo a Third-Year Review.

I ask you to review the section in the Faculty Handbook on teaching (Chapter III, Section D, Part 1) and to offer your considered judgment of __________________________'s work in your program.

If the teaching has been within the CORE, please comment on the candidate's contributions to his/her students, to the staff or your component/course, and to the program as a whole. It would be most helpful if you would review the appropriate SETs and discuss them within the context of the component/course as a whole.*

If the teaching has been within an Interdisciplinary Program, please comment on the quality of the candidate's contribution to both students and staff of the Program.

Could you please forward your evaluation to me by _____________________?

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

__________

*Please keep in mind that SETs from first-time participation in CORE courses are not included within the dossier and should not be incorporated directly in your evaluation. Moreover, references to other faculty may not be included. (Please contact the Department Chair or the Dean of the Faculty's Office to ascertain which CORE SETs will be included within the dossier.)
APPENDIX D

Letter of solicitation to Colgate colleagues in team-taught courses within all-university programs.

MODEL LETTER

Dear ______________________,

During the spring of 2005, _____ will undergo a Third-Year Review.

Under the guidelines outlined in the Faculty Handbook regarding the evaluation of teaching, the DAC seeks the input from members of team-taught courses. We would greatly appreciate your assessment of the quality of _________________’s teaching.

Your letter will be most helpful if it considers both the strengths and weaknesses of _________________’s teaching. In your response, please consider the extent to which the teaching is challenging, demanding and effective.

Could you please forward your evaluation to me by ________________________?

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

__________

*Please keep in mind that SETs from first-time participation in CORE courses are not included within the dossier and should not be incorporated directly in your evaluation. Moreover, references to other faculty may not be included. (Please contact the Department Chair or the Dean of the Faculty’s Office to ascertain which CORE SETs will be included within the dossier.)

[1] For candidates holding joint or affiliated appointments, the second Chair or Program Director and Division Director should also attend this meeting with the candidate. The same principle applies to other dossier preparation meetings with the candidate.

[2] These categories are defined in Chapter III, Section D in the current Faculty Handbook.

[3] Successful passage of third-year review will entitle a candidate to a two-course Junior Faculty Leave. This leave may be taken in a single semester, or it may be taken as a one-course load reduction in each of two semesters. It must be completed before the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed for tenure, and will be taken at a time mutually acceptable to the candidate and her/his department.

[4] This section of the guidelines also applies to candidates who hold appointments in two academic departments. For candidates with appointments in two departments the chair of the second department will take on the duties that this section assigns to the program director.

[5] When the program director is not eligible for this role according to the Faculty Handbook statement in Chapter III, Section E. Part 8, the Division Director for the program will designate an appropriate person to prepare the file.