

Faculty Meeting
April 24, 2015

MOTION

The Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CAPT) proposes the following changes (remove in **red** and insert in **blue**) to the "Procedures for Granting Tenure" (Part I, Article VIII, Section E, Number 5, i.) and "Procedures for Granting Promotion" (Part I, Article VIII, Section F, Number 2, a, xiii.)

Current language: "Procedures for Granting Tenure" (Part I, Article VIII, Section E, Number 5, i.)

i. Candidates for tenure **(successful or unsuccessful)** shall have access to all written materials in the tenure file immediately after the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs has made **his/her** recommendation known to the candidate. These materials may not be **photocopied**.

Proposed language:

- i. Candidates **not recommended** for tenure shall have access to all written materials in the tenure file immediately after the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs has made **the** recommendation known to the candidate. These materials may not be **reproduced digitally or otherwise**.
- ii. **Candidates recommended for tenure shall have access to written materials in the tenure file immediately after the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs has made the recommendation known to the candidate, with the exception of letters of evaluation written by individual department colleagues, colleagues internal to the college, or colleagues external to the college, which shall remain confidential. These materials may not be reproduced digitally or otherwise.**

RATIONALE: CAPT seeks more context to help in the deliberation of tenure and promotion cases. In CAPT's experience too many letters written by colleagues are not forthcoming to help explain a candidate's file. Often, the letters overtly ignore areas that need explanation or context given the evidence in the candidate's file. The current open process does not promote (or make it easy) for evaluators to provide the necessary nuance and context for fear of retribution or out of avoiding difficult interactions in the future. The result of biased letters puts CAPT, and the candidate, at a disadvantage since CAPT must do its due diligence to unravel the incongruent evidence in the file, often without the expertise to understand the gap between the evidence and CAPT's interpretation. The needed context and nuance that CAPT seeks is usually provided by a degree of confidentiality in solicited letters for promotion and tenure cases.

The proposed language is a compromise that provides access to all material for unsuccessful tenure candidates to gather the information necessary to build a case for review and appeal. It also provides a level of confidentiality that is customary when writing letters of evaluation. A recent Northeast Deans' poll of 17 of our peer and aspirant institutions (Bard, Bates, Bowdoin, Colgate, Connecticut, Dickinson, Franklin & Marshall, Hamilton, Holy Cross, Lafayette, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, Trinity, Union, Vassar, Wheaton, Williams) only four institutions allowed access to internal letters and only one to external letters in the tenure process.

AND

Current language: "Procedures for Granting Promotion" (Part I, Article VIII, Section F, Number 2, a, xiii.)

xiii. Candidates for promotion (**successful or unsuccessful**) shall have access to **all** written materials in the promotion file immediately after the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs has made **his/her** recommendation known to the candidate, with the exception of **external letters of evaluation**, which shall remain confidential. These materials may not be **photocopied**.

Proposed language:

xiii. Candidates (**recommended or not recommended**) for promotion shall have access to written materials in the promotion file immediately after the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs has made **the** recommendation known to the candidate, with the exception of **letters of evaluation written by individual department colleagues, colleagues internal to the college, and colleagues external to the college**, which shall remain confidential. These materials may not be **reproduced digitally or otherwise**.

RATIONALE: Same as the first paragraph in rationale above. However, while the ramifications of a negative promotion decision are consequential, the stakes are somewhat lower (the candidate that is not recommended will not have to leave the college and can stand for promotion again). Thus, in keeping with the rationale above all solicited letters shall be confidential.