

Model Personnel Policies

Skidmore College

updated July 2025

- I. Preamble
- II. Aspects of Professional Practice
 - A. Teaching
 - 1. Student evaluations of teaching
 - 2. Peer observations
 - 3. Self-reflection
 - B. Professional Engagement/Scholarship
 - C. Service
 - 1. To the College
 - 2. To the department or program
 - 3. To students
 - 4. To the professional community and the field
- III. Mentoring
- IV. Evaluation, Reappointment, and Promotion
 - A. Annual review letters in the first six years
 - B. Third-year review
 - 1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty
 - 2. Tenure-track faculty
 - C. Promotion to associate
 - 1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty
 - 2. Tenure-track faculty
 - A. Process
 - B. Selection of external and internal referees and handling of referee letters for tenure and promotion
 - D. Promotion to full
 - 1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty
 - 2. Tenure-track faculty
 - E. Periodic review without change in rank
 - 1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty
 - A. Assistant Tier
 - B. Associate and Full Tier
 - 2. Tenure-track faculty
- V. Resources
- VI. Glossary of terms

I. Preamble

Skidmore's Model Personnel Policies outline the process by which a department or program mentors, evaluates, reappoints, and promotes its faculty. These policies are intended not only to offer guidance for chairs, program directors, personnel committees, and others performing these evaluations, but also to provide clarity for faculty members within the department or program around their own performance expectations. These guidelines are intended to provide a detailed model of how College-wide policies enumerated elsewhere—namely, in the Faculty Handbook and in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)—may be put into practice in an individual department. None of the policies outlined below are intended to supersede or contradict these other documents.

II. Aspects of Professional Practice

A. Teaching

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, "To receive contract renewal, tenure, or promotion, a member of the teaching faculty must provide evidence of sustained success in teaching at a level of accomplishment satisfying the applicable standards" (VIII.A.1). One framework for structuring this evidence is using three separate perspectives: student, peer, and self.

1. Student evaluations of teaching

The primary function of the College's student evaluations of teaching (SETs) should be to support developmental feedback for faculty. This data should not be used as the sole evidence for teaching effectiveness. As outlined in the Faculty Handbook (III.G.1.e) and CBA, faculty have the right to receive fair and honest student ratings; any faculty member who feels this right has been violated may pursue the matter through any of several channels: conversations with the C/PD, consultation with Committee on Academic Freedom & Rights (CAFR), or a formal grievance through union representation, as appropriate to the case and faculty stream.

The department or program should use student evaluations of teaching to identify persistent themes. These trends should be interpreted within the context of other sources of information, such as syllabi, annual summaries of activities, and peer observations.

All faculty are required to collect feedback from students within the last two weeks of the semester via College SET forms. Faculty should dedicate class time during the assessment period to allow students to complete these forms, and are not present in the room while students are actively completing the ratings.

A summary of those responses will be provided to the faculty member electronically well in advance of the start of a new semester. Faculty members should retain a copy of these records for use in future self-evaluation and promotional moments.

2. Peer observations

Peer classroom or lab observations are valuable opportunities to share teaching methods and experience among all faculty members, regardless of seniority. Faculty should receive peer feedback from a wide range of peers to allow for a breadth of perspectives and to foster a shared community of practice. In its most successful form, peer observation creates opportunities for mutual mentorship across ranks and positions. Faculty are encouraged to seek out developmental feedback from colleagues both in their department and across the College who might be able to support growth and development in specific areas of their pedagogy.

There are two types of peer observations: evaluative and developmental. “Evaluative observations” are those where a written record is maintained by the department or program, the Dean’s office, and the faculty member. While these evaluative observations are also important for a faculty member’s development, they serve as evidence of teaching effectiveness in summative evaluation moments.

A “developmental observation” is an informal opportunity to identify and discuss areas for growth and is not intended to be used for evaluative purposes. Records of developmental observations should be kept between the faculty observer and the faculty member being observed. They should not appear in reappointment or promotion dossiers unless the faculty member being observed elects to include them.

At the beginning of the semester in which a faculty member will be observed, that faculty will, in consultation with the C/PD, identify the observer(s) for the semester. The faculty member being observed and the observer will work together to identify at, at minimum, a single suitable course meeting that runs a minimum of 55 minutes.

Process

Both evaluative and developmental observations should follow the following procedure:

1. A pre-observation discussion between the faculty member being observed and the observer should cover learning objectives, class dynamics, and any other relevant topics for the class sessions that will be observed.
2. The observer should complete the Class Observation Rubric (found in the CBA and linked here), including comments and questions.
3. A post-observation meeting should take place in a timely fashion to discuss the observed class. During this meeting, the observer and faculty member will discuss the completed rubric and other feedback (written or verbal).

4. The faculty member being observed may submit a written response to the observer to be appended to the Class Observation Rubric.
5. The written feedback from an evaluative observation will become part of the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Written feedback from a developmental observation may also become part of the faculty member's dossier, at their discretion.

3. Self-reflection

Evidence of high quality teaching includes a practice of self-reflection and professional growth. Opportunities include the annual report; teaching statements in reappointment and promotion dossiers; and the curation of syllabi, assignment handouts, sample lesson plans, student feedback, and other materials selected for dossiers to offer evidence of teaching effectiveness.

During moments of summative evaluation, faculty may include a statement regarding their self-reflection on their teaching. This statement is more comprehensive than the annual report and may reflect on how the faculty member's teaching strategies have evolved over time and the extent to which these strategies have been effective.

Faculty will engage in formal self-evaluation annually through the required annual report. This report will be made available to faculty by April 15th of each year, and should be completed by May 31st.

B. Professional Engagement/Scholarship

"Professional engagement" is an umbrella term that describes a wide variety of ways that a faculty member might engage with their academic field. Different faculty ranks and streams are required to demonstrate professional engagement in a variety of ways, as defined in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.A.2) and CBA.

The department or program is encouraged to develop a set of specific guidelines around the types and relative weight of professional engagement outputs to share with faculty at the beginning of their appointments at Skidmore.

Professional engagement is assessed as part of the regular cycle of personnel review as appropriate for each rank of faculty. Engagement outcomes should be reported and archived as part of the Annual Summary of Activities and, when appropriate, uploaded as part of the dossier for promotional reviews (see section IV, "Evaluation, Reappointment, and Promotion").

During moments of promotional review, candidates are encouraged to provide a statement that contextualizes the full body of professional engagement activities and how they are related to the appropriate professional engagement standards. Such a

statement may also document a faculty member's individual contributions to collaborative efforts.

C. Service

While all tenured, tenure-track, and renewable faculty members are expected to take part in the administrative work of the College, such work is not necessarily consistent across one's career. Similarly, within a department or program, the weight of service may vary between faculty members based on rank and stream. Part-time or terminal faculty may engage in service at their choosing, but are not required to do so. No individual faculty member should find themselves overburdened with service, and the C/PD and the department should work together to align an individual's service work with their interests and abilities.

1. To the College

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to stand for election to College-level committees in accordance with the policies established by the Skidmore Faculty Handbook (P2.II.F). Renewable non-tenure track faculty may stand for election to those committees for which they are eligible. The College may also establish ad-hoc working groups and appoint additional committees necessary to the function of the College. All full-time renewable, tenure-track, and tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on these committees.

Non-tenure track faculty may also engage in service to the NTT faculty union; such service will count as service to the College.

2. To the department or program

The department or program will meet regularly to discuss its ongoing work. All full-time faculty members are expected to attend these meetings; part-time faculty shall be invited but are not required to attend. All faculty members have the right to speak at these meetings, and all full-time faculty have the right to vote. The C/PD may elect to hold meetings exclusively for tenure-line faculty when appropriate. Appropriate uses might include, but are not limited to, discussing standards for tenure and promotion, tenure and promotion cases, managerial policies within the department, or changes to research output expectations that apply only to tenure-track faculty.

The department or program may establish subcommittees, including but not limited to those dedicated to supervising the curriculum, assessment, intradepartmental programs, search committees, events, and/or awards. All full-time faculty members may serve on these committees. The department or program may elect to make such committee service mandatory. As with Collegiate service, the expectation for leadership and depth of service increases with seniority.

3. To students

Part-time and visiting faculty may not serve as student advisors. Full-time renewable, tenure-track, and tenured faculty are expected to serve as student advisors following

their first full year of service. The C/PD and department/program should provide training and support for faculty in this role, and should ensure that the work of advising majors is shared equitably across faculty. Faculty on medical or disability leave (which may include part of parental leave) will have their advisees reassigned. Faculty on sabbatical, pre-tenure leave, or research leave will have their advisees reassigned unless the faculty member explicitly elects otherwise.

Any additional service to students should be documented in the annual report and at summative moments of evaluation.

4. To the professional community and the field

Service to one's professional community and/or field should be documented in the annual report and at summative moments of evaluation.

III. Mentoring

Mentoring is a shared responsibility between the College and the members of the department or program to support each faculty member and should not be explicitly linked to the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the department to provide developmental feedback (in the form of developmental observations, annual letters, and meetings), to make developmental resources available, and to create a culture that encourages development and growth. It is the responsibility of the College to provide opportunities and resources to support development in teaching, professional engagement and service. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to pursue opportunities for mentorship in line with their goals for growth. It is the responsibility of the C/PD to make themselves available for consultation with their department members; this may take the form of regular informal conversations (weekly office hours, regular engagement with faculty in department common spaces, department meetings), more infrequent formal contact (scheduled meetings or check-ins), or some blend of the two.

C/PDs and mentors are also encouraged to work with faculty to develop individual plans for growth that outline the necessary benchmarks for growth over a candidate's professional trajectory. Departments may choose to use the Individual Faculty Development Plan (IDFP) provided by the ADOF/VPAA's Office. In developing these plans, mentors and mentees should consult with the CBA and Faculty Handbook to identify the criteria for their rank and stream, taking into account the relative emphasis on areas of teaching, professional engagement, and service appropriate to that faculty.

The department should be mindful that mentoring programs are particularly essential for part-time and terminal appointment faculty. Since these faculty are not working towards summative evaluation moments at the College, they necessarily receive fewer opportunities for formal feedback and support. Nonetheless, these faculty are working toward a wide range of professional and pedagogical goals and mentoring programs can provide invaluable support toward those ends.

Materials that come out of mentoring practices (including developmental observations, workshops, and conversations around teaching, professional engagement, or service) should not appear in reappointment or promotion dossiers, unless the faculty member being evaluated elects to include them.

IV. Evaluation, Promotion, and Continuing Appointment

Summative evaluations occur at reappointment, promotion, and tenure (where applicable). Eligible department or program members (tenure-track faculty in their third year or service or beyond and renewable non-tenure track faculty at the Associate or Full rank) share responsibility for the work of evaluation within the department.

The C/PD or designee is responsible for sharing all details of the evaluation process with faculty members in the first semester of their appointment and for ensuring that that process remains consistent with the expectations communicated.

A. Annual review letters for faculty in the first six years

The C/PD is responsible for writing letters of evaluation (often referred to as “annual letters”) for faculty in the department. Faculty in their first six years of appointment receive these letters every year. These letters should provide faculty with specific reflections on their strengths and opportunities for growth, tailored to rank, position, and category of employment.

These letters are intended to provide developmental feedback. The letters are not shared with Appointments and Tenure Committee (ATC), Promotions Committee (PC), or department or program members eligible to write at summative evaluation moments, unless the faculty member receiving the letter elects to do so. However, all faculty (both those writing and those receiving these letters) should be conscious that any recorded performance evaluation will be included as a part of that faculty member’s personnel file. Therefore, it is essential that these letters accurately reflect the performance of a faculty member and their progress towards any future moments of summative evaluation.

The C/PD should be conscious of the department/program’s and College’s standards for performance and should provide faculty members with consistent feedback that helps progress them towards those goals. The C/PD is encouraged to consult the faculty member’s earlier annual letters written by previous C/PDs to provide consistent and/or clarifying feedback.

The annual summary of activities will be submitted no later than the May 31st deadline. Before June 30th, the C/PD or designee will share a draft of their annual letter with the relevant faculty member. This communication allows the faculty member to correct any inaccuracies or provide a written response if so desired. The C/PD is also encouraged to share their letters with another department/program member to ensure the accuracy and consistency of feedback; candidates for this second reader may include previous C/PDs,

a faculty member's mentor or hiring committee chair, or department/program Personnel Committee members.

No later than June 30th, the C/PD will share these letters with the Associate Dean of the Faculty (for review) by emailing them to the Academic Affairs Coordinator.

B. Third-year review

The purpose of the third-year review is to assess the faculty member's accomplishments to decide whether or not to reappoint the candidate. If reappointment is successful, the third-year review informs the next review (whether it be for tenure, promotion, or reappointment). This is primarily a summative review, in which developmental feedback may be offered to help the candidate make informed decisions moving toward their next evaluation. A candidate's third-year review dossier provides the basis for recommendations for continued growth that can be consulted by the candidate and the current C/PD during the next summative evaluation moment (tenure, promotion, or reappointment).

1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty

Renewable non-tenure track faculty at the assistant rank are formally reviewed for reappointment every three years. For those faculty in this stream who intend to stand for promotion in year 6, their first review serves as an important opportunity to assess their progress toward that evaluation. Regardless of promotional function, these evaluations assess a faculty member's teaching, professional engagement, and service, as outlined in the collective bargaining agreement.

Process

1. In the fall semester of the relevant year, renewable non-tenure track faculty will be provided with a course site on theSpring. There, they will upload each year's Annual Summary of Activities, as well as materials to support their accomplishments in teaching (e.g., student evaluation of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching, written feedback from class observations, and all course syllabi), professional engagement, and service (as listed in the CBA) on or before October 10th.
2. On or before September 30th, the faculty member should consult with their C/PD to arrange an evaluative observation by the C/PD or a mutually-agreed upon designee, to occur no later than December 2nd.
3. Prior to the end of the fall semester, eligible members of the department will share with the C/PD their assessment of the candidate as it relates to the criteria for reappointment, either through individual letters or a collective department meeting without the candidate present.
4. On or before January 10th, the C/PD will submit the department or program's recommendation to the ADOF. This takes the form of a consensus letter that summarizes: (1) the department's or program's overall recommendation whether to reappoint or promote the unit member; and (2) the evidence supporting the recommendation. The letter will also explain any internal personnel procedures that guided the review process.

2. Tenure-track faculty

During their 3rd year of service, tenure-track faculty will be reviewed for contract renewal.

Process

1. In the fall semester of the relevant year, faculty will be provided with a course site on theSpring. The faculty member will make available on their site a set of materials to support their review on or before October 10th. These materials will include:
 - a. Materials to inform evaluation of teaching including faculty member's teaching evaluations, written feedback from class observations, and all course syllabi. Faculty members are encouraged to develop a teaching statement that describes their strategies for supporting student learning and growth. Appropriate sections of the Annual Summary of Activities are also helpful for evaluation of teaching.
 - b. Materials to inform evaluation of professional engagement include the sections of the Annual Summary of Activities documenting types of professional engagement as appropriate to faculty category of employment. For professional engagement that results in a scholarly product (book, article, grant proposal, creative piece), copies of these products should be uploaded to theSpring or made available as appropriate to the disciplinary norms. Faculty members are encouraged to include a statement which articulates the position of the scholarly work in the larger discipline(s), their individual contribution to collaborative projects, and how their contributions are related to the department's expectations for scholarship.
 - c. Materials to inform evaluation of service contributions include the section of the Annual Summary of Activities documenting service to the students, College, and professional discipline. Faculty members are also encouraged to develop a service statement that describes their service commitments.
 - d. An updated CV making it clear which items have been accomplished since arriving at Skidmore.
2. Prior to November 1st, eligible members of the department will review the materials developed by the candidate and have a meeting to share their assessment of the candidate as it relates to the criteria for reappointment. At this meeting, a deadline will be agreed upon for circulating a draft of the consensus letter.
3. On or before December 1st, the C/PD will share the finalized consensus letter with eligible members of the department. Members who agree with the recommendation will co-sign the consensus letter; members who disagree may choose to write an individual letter of assessment to be submitted along with the department's consensus letter.
4. On or before the date specified on the ATC calendar, the C/PD will submit the department or program's recommendation to the ADOF. This takes the form of a

consensus letter that summarizes: (1) the department's or program's overall recommendation whether to reappoint or promote the unit member; and (2) the evidence supporting the recommendation. The letter will also explain any internal personnel procedures that guided the review process.

5. After a candidate is successfully reappointed, the C/PD or designee will begin consultation with the candidate to choose external referees who will be asked to write letters on behalf of the candidate for tenure. This process requires mentoring and support from the C/PD or designee to assist the candidate in choosing letter writers who are best situated to impartially evaluate the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work.

C. Promotion to Associate

1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty

The promotional process for renewable non-tenure track faculty is identical to the third-year review process, outlined above and in the CBA. Faculty who are not recommended for promotion may be recommended for reappointment at their current rank.

2. Tenure-track faculty

The purpose of the tenure review is to evaluate a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service against the standards of the department, the College, and the field to determine if they should be granted tenure. While tenure most often accompanies the promotion to associate professor, tenure and promotion may be decoupled in the case of candidates with previous full-time teaching experiences at other colleges and universities.

A full-time tenure-track member of the faculty who is at the rank of assistant professor or above becomes a candidate for tenure in the fall term of the faculty member's sixth year of service. Parental, medical, or other leaves during which the tenure clock was suspended do not count toward the period of service, unless the candidate wishes for them to. Faculty members with previous full-time teaching experience at other colleges and universities may count up to two years of prior service towards their tenure review. Faculty members who come to the institution with tenure at another institution may come up for tenure as soon as their second year.

A. Process

1. In consultation with C/PD or designee, the candidate prepares a portfolio of materials curated to demonstrate evidence of the candidate's teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service to the College; this portfolio will be uploaded to theSpring. Candidates should consult the [Guidelines for Assembling Materials for Tenure](#) for directions in compiling their portfolio and [Procedures for Creation and Maintenance of Electronic Portfolios](#) for managing their site on theSpring. The candidate will make this file available for review by Department/Program members at least six weeks before faculty and department/program letters are due to ATC. Candidates should consult the ATC Calendar (circulated each August) for specific dates.

2. The C/PD or designee will solicit letters from both the candidates' external reviewers and solicited internal reviewers (see "Selection of External Referees and Handling of External Letters for Tenure," below), and make those letters available to the faculty eligible to participate in the candidate's review prior to the department/program meeting described below.
3. With sufficient time to allow for meeting the ATC deadline for submission of letters, the C/PD or designee will convene a department or program meeting of all eligible faculty. The faculty will consider whether the candidate has met the criteria, obligations, and responsibilities for tenure as detailed in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.A). The candidate will not be present at the meeting. During the meeting, faculty will thoroughly discuss the evidence presented in the file as it relates to the evaluative criteria set forth in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.A). The purpose of the meeting is for information sharing and interrogation of the file to help eligible faculty make informed recommendations for or against tenure. The details of the meeting are to be held confidential by all parties involved.
4. Eligible faculty submit individual letters according to the evaluative criteria for tenure as set forth in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.A) to the C/PD or designee at least ten days (weekends included) before the letters are due to ATC. These letters form the basis of the department/program consensus letter sent to ATC, and each letter should clearly state whether the individual recommends for or against tenure and the reasons for that recommendation, supported by evidence from the candidate's dossier.
5. The department/program letter (also colloquially known as "the Chair's letter," or the "C/PD or designee's letter") describes the process used to arrive at the recommendation for or against tenure, makes a case for the continued need for the candidate's line, and makes a clear recommendation for or against tenure using supporting evidence from faculty letters, evaluative teaching observation records, and the candidate's dossier. The C/PD or designee may express their own view in a separate letter, or an addendum to the department/program consensus letter, if their recommendation differs from the majority (or tied) view of the department/program. In cases where there is not a unanimous decision, the department/program letter should document the disagreements.
6. The C/PD or designee will share a draft of the department/program letter, minus any addendum reflecting their individual opinion, with eligible faculty. Opportunities for feedback are provided with clear timelines, after which the letter is revised (if necessary) and resubmitted to eligible faculty. The C/PD or designee then submits a final version of the letter to the Dean of the Faculty's (DOF's) office along with letters from individual eligible faculty and internal letters.
7. Once the letters are submitted to ATC, the C/PD or designee will share the department/program's recommendation, without details or explanation, with the candidate.
8. If the C/PD is untenured and eligible for tenure the year they are in the C/PD role, or if the C/PD has a conflict of interest, the ADOF (with responsibilities for TT personnel) will appoint a tenured designee to lead the tenure review process and

act in the role of the C/PD.

B. Selection of external and internal referees and handling of referee letters for tenure and promotion

While all cases have a unique context, it is suggested that the list of external referees include specialists in the candidate's area(s) of study. Reviewers should not stand to benefit in any direct or indirect way from the candidate's advancement in rank and, ideally, have achieved the rank or standing that the candidate wishes to obtain (although in some narrower fields, this may not be possible). It is desirable to have at least one reviewer from a liberal arts college (though again, this may not be possible).

Process

1. During the spring semester prior to tenure review, the candidate will identify 3–4 external letter writers. Under special circumstances, a candidate may suggest and request up to 5 external letters. (Special circumstances might include a candidate whose work is in multiple subfields or a letter from a collaborator.)
2. The C/PD or designee is responsible for reaching out to external letter writers to ascertain their willingness to write on behalf of a candidate well before the ATC deadline for submission of names of letter writers. The C/PD or designee will furnish external letter writers with the instruction letter on the Dean of Faculty/Vice-President of Academic Affairs (DOF/VPAA) website, as well as the department/program's tenure expectations for scholarly and creative work. Once external letter writers are successfully identified and have agreed to write, the C/PD or designee will notify the DOF/VPAA Office of the external letter writers' names and contact information by the due date in the ATC calendar. The C/PD or designee will keep the candidate apprised of the status of invitations and of the external letter writers' final dispositions.
3. The C/PD or designee is responsible for sending external letter writers the link to the candidate's electronic scholarship dossier well in advance of the letter due date. If the reviewer requests a hard copy, the candidate will coordinate their administrative assistant to send the materials through mail.
4. In consultation with the C/PD or designee, the candidate may choose 2–3 internal letter writers from outside their department/program who can address the candidates' service and/or significant contributions to the College community. The candidate adds the internal letter writers as viewers on theSpring. The C/PD or designee solicits the letters from the internal referees for departmental review. The candidate should receive a copy of the template letter to the internal reviewers (which outlines criteria and instructions) prior to selecting them.
5. The C/PD or designee will solicit a copy of the letters from both the external reviewers and the internal letter writers for department/program review with a receipt date one month prior to the ATC deadline for the department/program letter. All faculty eligible to write letters on the candidate's tenure case should have access to the letters as soon as possible after receipt. This deadline will allow for department/program review before the department/program meeting at which the candidacy is discussed.

6. The C/PD or designee collects all of the letters (departmental/program, internal, and external) and submits them to the DOF/VPAA Office by emailing them to Academic Affairs Coordinator who then forwards them to ATC by the deadline indicated in the ATC calendar.

D. Promotion to Full

1. Renewable non-tenure track faculty

The promotional process for renewable non-tenure track faculty is identical to the third-year review process, outlined above and in the CBA. Faculty who are not recommended for promotion may be recommended for reappointment at their current rank.

2. Tenure-track faculty

Consideration for promotion to the rank of Full Professor is not based on years of service but a typical period after promotion to Associate is at least five years. Faculty may stand for promotion at their own discretion, and such consideration may be initiated by the C/PD or designee, DOF/VPAA, or ADOF with responsibility for TT personnel in consultation with one another. The C/PD or designee shall present the department/program's recommendation to the PC. The ADOF may initiate promotion consideration in the case of the promotion of a C/PD or designee, and will find an appropriate designee to act as Chair of the promotion review.

Process

1. In consultation with C/PD or designee, the candidate prepares a dossier of materials curated to demonstrate evidence of the candidate's teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and service to the College; this dossier will be uploaded to theSpring. The candidate will make this file available for review by Department/Program members by the date indicated on the Promotions Committee (PC) calendar.

In addition to the documents specified in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.F.1.b), faculty may consider including:

- a. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness particularly when it is illustrative of claims in the teaching statement. These may include but are not limited to syllabi; assignments; exams; audio, visual, and digital resources; examples of student work; reports from peer evaluation of teaching.
- b. For those courses that are included in the file, any efforts to summarize or contextualize teaching evaluations with regards to individual courses or between courses or over time. These could include a summary of quantitative ratings, summaries or themes from the qualitative departmental forms or anything else that the candidate believes will provide insights into the evaluations.
- c. Other materials that the faculty member chooses to submit as evidence of teaching, scholarship or professional engagement, and service to the

Department, College, Skidmore community, or the academic profession.

- d. Materials that provide evidence and context regarding activities during faculty appointments prior to the Skidmore appointment, if the faculty member has not completed five years of service at Skidmore.
2. The C/PD or designee will solicit external letters and internal letters in accordance with the procedures as outlined in the section on tenure. All letters regarding scholarship and community service that the candidate wishes to present to the PC shall also be made available to the department/program by a date that will allow for review before the department/program meeting in which the candidacy is discussed.
3. Well before the PC deadline for submission of department/program letters, the C/PD or designee shall convene a department/program meeting with all eligible faculty to discuss and review the candidate's file and to decide whether or not to recommend the candidate for promotion. The candidate shall not be present at the meeting. During the meeting, faculty will thoroughly discuss the evidence presented in the file as it relates to the evaluative criteria set forth in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.F.1.b). The purpose of the meeting is for information sharing and interrogation of the file to help eligible faculty make informed recommendations for or against promotion. The details of the meeting are to be held confidential by all parties involved.
4. Eligible faculty submit individual letters according to the evaluative criteria for promotion as set forth in the Faculty Handbook (VIII.F.1.b) to the C/PD or designee at least ten days (weekends included) before the letters are due to PC. These letters form the basis of the department/program consensus letter sent to PC, and each letter should clearly state whether the individual recommends for or against promotion and the reasons for that recommendation, supported by evidence from the candidate's dossier.
5. The department/program letter (also colloquially known as "the Chair's letter," or the "C/PD or designee's letter") describes the process used to arrive at the recommendation for or against promotion and makes a clear recommendation for or against promotion using supporting evidence from faculty letters, evaluative teaching observation records, and the candidate's dossier. The C/PD or designee may express their own view in a separate letter, or an addendum to the department/program consensus letter, if their recommendation differs from the majority (or tied) view of the department/program. In cases where there is not a unanimous decision, the department/program letter should document the disagreements.
6. Letters from individual members of the Department and any outside evaluators to be included in the promotion file should be submitted to the DOF/VPAA Office by the date required by the PC.

E. Periodic review without change in rank

1. Non-tenure track faculty

- A. Assistant Tier:** The process for reappointment for renewable non-tenure track faculty at the assistant tier is identical to the third-year review process, outlined above and in the collective bargaining agreement. The candidate may elect to stand for reappointment without seeking promotion. If a candidate is not recommended for reappointment, they will be issued a 1-year terminal appointment for the following year.
- B. Associate and Full Tier:** The process for reappointment for renewable non-tenure track faculty at the associate tier not standing for promotion and at the full tier shall be as detailed below, and is outlined in the CBA. If a candidate is not recommended for reappointment, they will be issued a 1-year terminal appointment for the following year.

Process

1. In the fall semester of the relevant year, renewable non-tenure track faculty will be provided with a course site on theSpring. There, they will upload the Annual Summary of Activities for each year since their last formal evaluation and an updated CV on or before September 15th.
2. On or before October 1st, the C/PD or designee will review the updated portfolio and share with the candidate their recommendation for reappointment. The C/PD or designee is encouraged to consult with eligible department members as part of this review.
3. If the C/PD does not recommend a candidate for reappointment, a full review following the procedure outlined in the "Third-Year Review" section (see above) will take place. The candidate and the C/PD or designee will set a mutually-agreed upon timeline, to be completed by the end of the fall semester.
4. By the end of the fall semester, the C/PD or designee will submit the department's recommendation to the ADOF. This takes the form of a consensus letter that summarizes: (1) the department's or program's overall recommendation whether to reappoint or promote the unit member; and (2) the evidence supporting the recommendation. The letter will also explain any internal personnel procedures that guided the review process.

2. Tenure-track faculty

Reviews for tenured faculty not applying for promotion are an opportunity for intentional conversation about a faculty member's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in order to help them identify their strengths and areas for development. Periodic reviews are also an opportunity to help the faculty member plan for the next 3–6 years of their career and identify ways that the department and College can help support their goals and development.

Tenured members of the department at the rank of Associate Professor shall be evaluated every three years on a schedule determined by the Chair and coordinated with the individual's and the department's sabbatical cycle. Tenured members of the department at the rank of Professor shall normally be evaluated every six years on a schedule determined by the Chair and coordinated with the individual's and the department's sabbatical cycle.

Process

1. The C/PD or designee will review the faculty member's Annual Summary of Activities, teaching evaluations, syllabi, and an updated CV from the candidate. The faculty member will be offered an opportunity to provide additional material that they would like considered.
2. After reviewing the materials, the C/PD or designee will have a conversation with the faculty member to discuss the chair's feedback and strategize about goals for the next 3–6 years.
3. The C/PD or designee will write a summary of this discussion that is shared with the faculty member for factual review and then submitted to the DOF's Office.

V. Resources

The following resources provide additional guidance on many of the policies and procedures referenced above:

[Individual Faculty Development Plan](#)

[Procedures for Creation and Maintenance of Electronic Faculty Academic Portfolios](#)

[Guidelines on Assembling Materials for Tenure](#)

[Guidance for Writing the teaching statement for promotion to full](#)

[NTT Faculty Union Information - Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)

[Skidmore Faculty Handbook](#)

VI. GLOSSARY

Annual report, Annual Summary of Activities, or Watermark – the required annual self-report of a faculty member's professional activities over the previous academic year, to be completed by May 31st each year.

Annual review letter or annual letter – the letter written by the C/PD evaluating a faculty member's performance over the previous academic year or year(s); frequency of these letters varies by rank and stream.

Consensus letter or chair's letter – the letter written by the C/PD on behalf of the department, summarizing the department's consensus on a candidate's suitability for reappointment and/or promotion.

Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) – the contract negotiated between all non-tenure track faculty, represented by SEIU Local 200United, and Skidmore College. Policies set out in the CBA are legally binding and not subject to change.

Dossier, ePortfolio, or portfolio – the materials assembled by a faculty member standing for reappointment and/or promotion to be shared with the C/PD and/or the department for evaluation. Materials to be included are dependent on rank and stream, and are detailed in the Faculty Handbook and CBA.

Junior faculty – faculty at the terminal or assistant rank.

Rank or tier – the level of seniority of an individual faculty member. The following ranks are associated with the following titles and positions:

Terminal: Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Artist in Residence, Visiting Writer in Residence

Assistant: Assistant Lecturer (PT only), Assistant Teaching Professor, Assistant Professor, Artist in Residence, Writer in Residence

Associate: Associate Lecturer (PT only), Associate Teaching Professor, Associate Professor, Senior Artist in Residence, Senior Writer in Residence

Full: Lecturer (PT only), Teaching Professor, Professor, Distinguished Artist in Residence, Distinguished Writer in Residence

Senior faculty – faculty at the associate or full rank.

Stream or track – the promotional pathway of an individual faculty member, whether tenure or non-tenure.

Student Evaluations or SETs – the end-of-semester evaluation tool administered to enrolled students by the College. Data from these evaluations are shared with faculty and C/PDs, and may be included or required at reappointment or promotion.

Mentoring resource — Summary Timelines
Appointment type – Non-Tenure Track

Year in rank	Required for reappointment	Required for promotion	Recommended
Year 1			
Year 2			
Year 3			
Year 4			
Year 5			
Year 6			

Resources:

Mentoring resource — Summary Timelines

Appointment type – Tenure Track

Year in rank	Required for promotion	Recommended
Year 1		
Year 2		
Year 3		
Year 4		
Year 5		
Year 6		