Departmental/Program Procedures

The *Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure* requires units to establish the procedures it considers effective in evaluating the teaching of its members (see section IV.A.3), as well as to develop procedures to be followed in the review of affiliated members (see section VIII.B.2.a).

Included here are the most recent versions of departmental/program procedures submitted to the Office of the Provost/Dean of the Faculty.

Please contact Hayley Spizz, Faculty Policies Specialist (*hspizz@smith.edu* or x3005) with questions or to update your departmental/program procedures.

Please access the bookmarks icon on the left to find hyperlinks to procedures for individual departments/programs.
SMITH COLLEGE  
Department of Afro-American Studies  
Plan for the Evaluation and Guidance of Teaching for Untenured Faculty  

Section I. Personnel Committee Functions

1. All the tenured permanent members of the Department of Afro-American, including those with formal appointments and shared appointments will constitute the Personnel Committee. Members of the Personnel Committee will serve as liaisons for untenured faculty on a rotating basis by academic year. It is the liaison’s responsibility to see that the plans for the evaluation and guidance of teaching are carried out, to observe, supervise and provide feedback to the untenured faculty member regarding his/her teaching, and to report back to the Personnel Committee.

2. Normally the chair of the Department shall act as the chair of the committee.

3. The committee shall meet at least once a year, and in addition as often as is deemed necessary by the chair.

4. The schedule for personnel evaluation and decisions conforms to the schedule of the college, with the following restraints:
   
   a) New untenured members on any appointment other than a terminal one-year appointment be evaluated at the end of their first year of teaching, and be provided feedback regarding their performance.
   
   b) During the first year of a multiple-year appointment, the chair of the Department and the new untenured member shall discuss the contents of this document as well as a tentative schedule of her or his evaluations up to the date of a tenure decision.
   
   c) For non-tenured members, including lecturers and senior lecturers, there will normally be one, full evaluation carried out in a single academic year.
   
   d) An appraisal will not be made during a year in which an untenured faculty member concerned is on sabbatical leave or leave of absence for the entire year.

5. The functions of the committee shall be:
   
   a) to evaluate in accordance with the schedules outlined above, the work of the untenured members of the Department, within the framework established by the Faculty Code and the "Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College,": so that eventual recommendations for reappointment, promotion, or tenure shall rest on a solid, long-term basis;
   
   b) to provide, in accordance with the schedules outlined above, to each untenured member of the faculty a statement of the committee's appraisal of her or his professional performance.

6. The Personnel Committee shall, before submitting its recommendation to the College, invite the individual participation of all tenured permanent members of the Department for purposes of discussing the performance of the untenured candidate. The purpose of this invitation is to effect an active exchange of views among all members of the Department to ensure that:
a) no pertinent information is overlooked
b) there is full awareness throughout the Department of what evidence is being considered
c) material which can influence the Personnel Committee in making a decision be exposed to critical discussion by all tenured permanent members of the Department.

The Departmental discussion shall be closed to the untenured candidate. The proceedings of the discussion shall be confidential. The untenured candidate will be invited to meet with the Personnel Committee once the deliberations are complete. At that time the Committee and the untenured candidate will discuss key points that emerged from the deliberation. The Chair shall then transmit in writing to the untenured candidate a summary of the main points considered.

7. When the Personnel Committee has concluded its deliberations, its recommendations should be made known to the Department, the untenured candidate, and the College administration in accordance with the Yellow Document.

8. Copies of the Departmental Procedure for evaluating untenured personnel shall be distributed at the beginning of each academic year to every member of the Department.

Section II. Procedures for the collection of information

1. The committee shall be entrusted with maintaining a file on each untenured faculty member, such file to be deposited with the chair. The information to be included in the file shall include:

   a) correspondence and materials pertaining to the untenured member's original appointment;
   b) any correspondence from outside reviewers solicited as part of an official evaluation;
   c) copies of yearly statements of appraisals provided by the committee to the untenured member and memoranda covering official consultations between her/him and the committee.
   d) Faculty Record Sheets and current CV.

2. The untenured candidate for evaluation shall be entrusted with developing a file of information deposited with the Chair for safe-keeping and privacy. The information to be included in the file shall include:

   a) syllabi or course outlines and other materials used in teaching and evaluating students,
   b) a record of student evaluations of courses, provided such material was collected in systematic and unbiased fashion,

3. When the Committee deems it desirable comments may be invited from persons outside the Department who have been associated with the untenured candidate, or know of his or her work. This will especially be the case when the untenured faculty member makes a substantial contribution to another department or program.
4. An Untenured candidate may add to the file any other material that she/he wishes to submit in her/his own behalf.

5. An untenured candidate shall have the right to inspect all material in her/his own file except invited confidential letters from persons outside the Department, a list of such letters shall be appended to each file.

Section III. Consultations between the Committee and an Untenured Faculty Member

1. Consultations between the Committee and an untenured faculty member shall include:
   
   a) opportunity to explain the planning and conduct of one's courses at the invitation of either the Committee or the untenured faculty member,
   
   b) classroom visits, to be arranged in consultation with the untenured faculty, to be followed by a conference between the visitor and untenured faculty member,
   
   c) a yearly conference between the committee members and the untenured faculty member, explaining the committee's statement of appraisal, reporting all criticisms, questions, or problems raised during consideration of the untenured faculty member's performance, and taking note of the untenured faculty member's own formulation of her or his duties, and replies to the committee's appraisal.

2. Memoranda covering these official consultations shall be open to inspection by the untenured candidate in question, so that she/he may be aware of their contents and, if she/he so desires, add her/his own written comments.
AMS Procedures for Review, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion
Approved by the American Studies Executive Committee on November 5, 2014

The procedures below reflect the Program’s commitment to gather information and provide feedback to faculty members in ways that are collegial, constructive and substantive. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and untenured members of the AMS Program Committee that focus on achieving excellent teaching and on constructive discussions of scholarly work in progress. These procedures supplement the requirements outlined in the *Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure*.

I. Procedures for Untenured Faculty Members with Full or Joint Appointments in AMS

a. Personnel Review Committee

For tenure-track faculty members hired with full or joint tenure-track appointments in the Program, the Program will create a personnel review committee at the time of hiring that will continue through the candidate’s probationary period. The personnel review committee will be composed of tenured faculty members with full and joint appointments in the Program, augmented by additional tenured members of the AMS Program Committee (up to a committee membership of five, plus an alternate). In the event that a member of a personnel review committee is unable to continue serving on the committee, the alternate will join the committee for the remainder of the candidate's probationary period. During the course of the probationary period, all members of the personnel review committee will take turns visiting classes, offering feedback on work in progress, and participating in annual reviews. All personnel review committee members will vote on reappointment and tenure.

b. Annual Class Visits

During each year of the probationary period, a member of the personnel review committee will visit a class at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited. The visitor will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the candidate within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The untenured faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report, and any response, will be filed with the Chair and may be summarized, along with other reports, in letters concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.

c. Annual Review

At the conclusion of each academic year, the Chair of AMS and at least one additional member of a faculty member's personnel review committee will conduct an annual review. This review includes a meeting that will provide an opportunity for the untenured faculty member to identify specific goals for the coming year so that the
Program can assist the candidate in developing a dossier. Discussion will address teaching, scholarship (including work in progress), and service. A letter summarizing this discussion and any recommendations made during the meeting will be sent to the untenured member, who may respond to or amend the summary if necessary.

d. Reappointment and Tenure Procedures

At the time of review for reappointment or tenure, all members of the personnel review committee (typically even if they are on sabbatical or leave) will review the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate, in accordance with the policies of the college. The personnel review committee will solicit all tenured members of the current AMS Program Committee to contribute information related to any of the criteria for reappointment or tenure for which they have first-hand knowledge.

II. Procedures for Faculty Members Affiliated with AMS

The AMS Program will, at the invitation of the candidate, contribute to the tenure and promotion review process conducted by home departments of any faculty members who have served on the Program Committee for three or more years, but will not have a vote in these decisions. The Chair, in consultation with the candidate and with members of the Executive committee, will provide a letter to the candidate’s department in time for its review and to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The letter will assess the candidate’s teaching and scholarship, as well as describe the candidate’s contributions to the Program. A copy will be provided to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to that letter.
Department of Anthropology
Draft: Procedures for the Review of Instructors (May 1, 2008)

The following procedures will apply to any person hired under the terms of a full-time non-tenure track appointment of at least one year in duration.

1) The Chair, or other appointed tenured faculty member, will review the Instructor’s syllabi in advance of each semester to provide feedback as to work load and assignments.

2) In the first semester of the Instructor’s appointment, the Chair and one other faculty member, will arrange with the Instructor to visit one class (not a seminar). The date, which must be prior to mid-term, will be selected by the Instructor and he/she will provide information about the expected content of the class session (including a list of readings). The faculty reviewers will meet with the Instructor promptly after the class visit to discuss the quality of the teaching performance and they will provide a written report within one week of the review.

3) In the exceptional case that the class review should reveal serious difficulties in teaching, the Chair will assign an instructional mentor to work with the Instructor on his/her pedagogy. This mentor will be chosen in consultation with the Instructor. The mentor and the Instructor will develop a plan of regular consultations and, as the mentor considers necessary, additional class visits.

4) A class visit in the second term will be at the discretion of the Chair. It would follow the same procedures.

5) In the case of a multi-year appointment, one class visit will be required each year, following the same procedures as in the first year’s review.
SMITH COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology

Department Procedures for the Review and Mentoring
of Faculty During the Probationary Period

Year 1:

There will be no formal review in the first year of a tenure-track hire, unless that
person has had at least one prior year of full-time teaching at another institution (in which
case the procedures for Year 2 apply). The Chair will meet informally with the new
colleague at least twice during the year, no later than the end of the final examination
period each semester. There will be no written record from this meeting; it is intended to
be an opportunity to discuss the new member’s teaching experiences and research plans.
At the request of the new member, either the Chair or another tenured member may also
do an informal class visit during the year.

Year 2:

The Chair, or another tenured member, will visit at least one class selected by the
untenured faculty member. A written report on the class, not to be included in the formal
dossier, will be made available to the member as soon as practical after the visit. In
addition, the Chair, or another tenured member, will meet with the untenured member at
the end of the year for a more formal review of scholarship, teaching and service. A
report will follow and will be circulated to the other tenured members with the current
CV (or Faculty Record Sheet) of the untenured member. All tenured members will meet
before the end of second semester to discuss the untenured faculty member’s progress.
The Chair, one other tenured member and the untenured member will subsequently meet
to discuss the full range of views expressed by tenured members. This discussion will be
scheduled promptly after the meeting of tenured members.

Year 3: Reappointment

The current College procedures for reappointment and the Department’s
procedures for the review of teaching will be in effect.

Year 4 or 5 (depending on sabbatical schedule):

The procedures from Year 2 will be repeated, with an increasing sensitivity to the
pending tenure decision.

Year 6: Tenure

The current College procedures for tenure reviews and the Department’s
procedures for the review of teaching will be in effect.

Adopted by the Department of Anthropology
December 13, 2002; amended March 12, 2003
Department Procedure for the Evaluation of Teaching
For Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

Department decisions regarding reappointment, promotion, and appointment to tenure will be based upon its evaluation of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and contribution to the College and professional community at large. The evaluation of teaching will follow this procedure:

All members eligible to vote must make at least one classroom visit either in the semester when the review is undertaken or in one of the two preceding semesters. The member being evaluated will supply several dates and times when visits would be acceptable, and will make the course syllabus available to the visitors one week prior to the scheduled observation. All visits must be made in groups of two or more; participation in class discussions by visitors is strongly discouraged. Independent letters of evaluation shall be written by each visiting member and submitted to the member being evaluated within a reasonable time following the visit. The person under consideration may request an additional formal visit from the same evaluator(s).

In addition to these direct observations, voting members may consider evidence from College teaching evaluations, lectures given to the College community at large and presentations at departmental events that include faculty and students. The member being evaluated is encouraged to provide copies of course syllabi and any other documentation she/he considers relevant to a full assessment of teaching.

Approved by the Department of Anthropology
December 13, 2002
Department of Art
Governance Guidelines

Approved by Art Department, 3 May 2017
To go into effect, 1 July 2017

This document outlines Art Department practices for mentoring, class visits, and annual reviews for faculty as they move through the reappointment, tenure and promotion process.

Review Committee

Every fall semester, in conjunction with a Department-wide meeting, the Chair will appoint two tenured members of the Department to serve on the Art Review Committee (ARC). Tenured members of the Department are expected to rotate through this role, with members normally drawn from both wings (art history, studio). Normally, every fall, the tenure-track faculty of the Department will discuss our guidelines for mentoring and class visits.

Over the course of the academic year, the ARC will help tenure-track faculty set goals for teaching, research, and service; the ARC will also produce written feedback on teaching, based on a class visit. As mentors, the ARC will also be available to discuss opportunities that support teaching and research (these discussions will vary from faculty member to faculty member, but may include funding opportunities, programs sponsored by the Sherrerd Center or Jacobson Center, projects led by colleagues in programs or departments elsewhere at Smith or in the Five Colleges). Discussion of such opportunities may take place at any point in the year, and may be quite informal (e.g., although in keeping with College guidelines, at least one meeting is expected or required).

Annual Class Visits: Untenured Faculty

Because the teaching of art history, studio art and architecture does not lend itself to video recording, all class visits will be done in person.

In years that do not include reappointment or tenure evaluation, the ARC shall attend at least one class of every tenure-track faculty member (the ARC may attend more, if tenure-track faculty so wish). Scheduling will normally be initiated by the ARC and coordinated with the tenure-track faculty.

In advance of the annual class visit, the tenure-track faculty member will share a copy of the relevant syllabus with the ARC. Normally, within two-three weeks of the annual class visit, the ARC shall produce written feedback on the class, share this written feedback with the tenure-track faculty member, and meet with that person to discuss the class and document. This written feedback, as well as any written responses produced by tenure-track faculty, shall become part of the departmental personnel file. All such of these documents shall be considered by voting members during deliberations for reappointment and tenure.
Class Visits: Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion

Because the teaching of art history, studio art and architecture does not lend itself to video recording, all class visits will be done in person. The Chair, in conjunction with candidates for reappointment, tenure or promotion, shall coordinate the scheduling of class visits for all voting members of the Department. These class visits will be done in small groups (e.g., pairs of voting faculty or triplets).

For reappointment, tenure, and promotion evaluations, all voting members will visit one regular class meeting (e.g., a lecture, colloquium or studio class). In advance of all visits, candidates for reappointment, tenure or promotion will share relevant syllabi with the voting members.

Written feedback related to reappointment visits will be collected in the Art Department Office, where it will be made available for candidates. Whenever possible, voting members shall make their class visits in the same semester as the reappointment, tenure, or promotion vote and submit their written reviews in a timely fashion.

Annual Review: Untenured Faculty

In advance of the College-mandated annual meeting between the Chair and a tenure-track faculty member, the Chair shall review the current CV of the tenure-track faculty member with tenured members of the Department (normally at a Department meeting). The objectives of this discussion are to seek feedback appropriate for review at the annual meeting with the tenure-track faculty member, and to familiarize tenured members of the Department with the tenure-track faculty member’s current work. At the annual meeting, the ARC teaching letter will also be addressed. In addition, the department’s Guidelines for Annual Meetings—which focus on scholarship and creative practice—shall form a touch point for these meetings.

Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion

At a Department meeting set by the Chair, a vote to recommend for contract renewal (reappointment), tenure and promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor will be taken by secret ballot after a discussion of the candidates’ scholarship and/or creative practice, teaching, and service. In keeping with the Policy and directives from the President and Provost, the Department letter that registers its recommendation situates the tenure-track faculty member’s work within her/his respective field; it also summarizes the key points of voting members’ discussion that led to the recommendation.
Guidelines for Annual Meetings

The Department wishes to be as clear as it can in terms of the kind of scholarship and creative work valued in the field (be it art history, studio art or architecture). Towards this end, these guidelines offer talking points for the Chair and tenure-track faculty at the time of annual review. As is the case with all guidelines, these points represent possibilities for discussion (e.g., they are not intended as a script).

The topics normally discussed at the annual meetings between the Department Chair and untenured faculty may include the following:

A. Teaching:

   Class visits
   Syllabi for each course taught during the year period and sample assignments
   College-wide teaching evaluations
   Any other relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness that tenure-track faculty wish to have considered (including, for example, Jacobson Center Mid-Semester Assessments, applications for curricular development grants, and leadership of Teaching Arts Circles, etc.)

B. Scholarship and Creative Practice

   The Chair shall stress the importance of peer-reviewed materials with a national or international audience for both scholarship and creative practice. In addition, conversation may address:

   For Art History:


   As well as:

   Participation in scholarly conferences and invited talks
   Successful and/or submitted grant applications
   Curatorial projects
   Digital humanities projects
   Examples of public scholarship
   Works in progress
For Studio:

The relative importance of invited and juried exhibitions (or equivalent, such as acquisitions, commissions, curatorial projects, performances, public art, publications, site-specific installations, etc.).

As well as:

- Artist Residencies
- Successful or submitted project proposals, and/or applications for awards, grants or fellowship
- Self-initiated work outside of conventional institutional frames
- Written peer-reviewed articles
- Published critical reviews and essays on the candidates' work, or other evidence of critical reception.
- Lectures and conference presentations
- Works in progress

For Architecture and Urbanism:

The relative importance of built work of any scale, as a result of commission or competition, invited or juried exhibitions (or equivalent, such as successful or submitted juried competition entries, virtual or digital projects, publications, etc.).

As well as:

- Successful or submitted project proposals, and/or applications for awards, grants or fellowships
- Written peer-reviewed articles
- Published critical reviews and essays on the candidates' work, or other evidence of critical reception
- Lectures and conference presentations
- Examples of public creative practice
- Works in progress or unrealized projects

C. Service (for all untenured members of the Department)

Topics to discuss may include the relative importance of service within the Department, within the College, or to the profession, participation in peer review of various kinds, collaboration and program-building inside and outside the college. Examples include: Departmental committees and advising, College-wide appointed or elected committees, and within one’s profession, serving on panels that review proposals or assess outcomes; participating as a juror for exhibitions or guest critic at an outside institution; and reviewing manuscripts or artistic production for a journal, press, or funding source; as well as other forms of professional collaboration.
The Department of Astronomy at Smith College is a partner in the joint Five College Astronomy Department (FCAD). The Smith Department has sole responsibility for (1) its introductory level curriculum, including courses for majors and the broader college community; (2) integrating the instrumentation and computing facilities in the Astronomy Lab and the McConnell Rooftop Observatory into the curriculum, and (3) advising astronomy students from Smith. In our collaboration with the FCAD we (1) offer a curriculum for an undergraduate major and minor in astronomy, (2) offer research opportunities to Five College students, including honors projects, and (3) participate in the graduate program and research initiatives of the Department of Astronomy at the University of Massachusetts. In this memo we clarify the procedure to be used to evaluate a professorial candidate in the Department of Astronomy at Smith College for tenure and/or promotion. The procedure described herein will be instituted in the year before a candidate comes up for evaluation. Before that time, the candidate will be mentored by the Department Chair, who will brief the candidate on his/her progress in annual meetings and written reports.

**FCAD Evaluation Committee**

In recognition of the small size of the Smith Astronomy Department and of our role within the FCAD, the evaluation of a Smith professorial candidate for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Astronomy will be conducted by an FCAD Evaluation Committee. The Committee will be appointed by the Provost of Smith College after consultation with the chair of the Smith Astronomy Department. Membership of the Committee will consist of at least 4 tenured FCAD faculty, will include faculty both from the University and at least one other College in the consortium, and will include the chair of the FCAD. The Evaluation Committee will be chaired by the Smith Astronomy Department Chair. The Committee will be selected for expertise in evaluating undergraduate teaching and for expertise in providing an internal assessment of the candidate’s professional accomplishments and research program, including supervision of graduate and undergraduate students on research, and for his/her contribution to overall FCAD initiatives.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

Teaching will be evaluated from a combination of (1) classroom visits, (2) course critiques, and (3) the candidate’s record in supervising graduate and/or undergraduate students. Classroom visits will be conducted by members of the FCAD Evaluation Committee, once per semester during the year prior to the evaluation. Class visits should be arranged with the instructor in advance.
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Evaluation of Professional Accomplishments
An assessment of the candidate's professional record will be evaluated from a combination of (1) departmental research colloquia given by the candidate, at least one of which must be within a year of the evaluation, (2) the candidate's professional accomplishments, including publications, external grants, and invited talks, (3) the candidate's participation in departmental research initiatives, and (4) assessment of letters from external reviewers of the candidate's research record.

Evaluation of Service
The candidate's contribution to service for the Smith Astronomy Department, for the FCAD, for Smith College, and for the wider astronomical community will be included in the evaluation.

Vote and Individual Letters for Smith's Committee on Tenure and Promotion
A vote on the case for tenure and/or promotion of the candidate will be made by each member of the Evaluation Committee. Individual letters will be requested from each member of the committee after the full dossier has been reviewed and discussed and letters from external reviewers have been received.
I. Appointment to the Biochemistry Program

The Biochemistry Program welcomes all faculty whose teaching and scholarly interests intersect with the discipline of Biochemistry and who wish to become members of the program. Faculty members who wish to join the Program should inform the Biochemistry Program Director.

Members of the program will receive a letter from the Provost officially appointing them to the Biochemistry Program that defines the expectations for Program Members (see Section I.A). They will also be informed of the Biochemistry Program’s Review Policy and Procedures for members undergoing reappointment, tenure or promotion in their home units (Sections II and III of this document).

Normally, members will be appointed for a term of five years. Faculty may be reappointed to the Biochemistry Program at the end of their term and will receive a letter of reappointment to the Program from the Provost, along with a reminder of the Program’s Review Policy and Procedures.

A. Expectations for Biochemistry Program Members (as stated in the Program’s appointment letter to be sent by the Provost)

“As a Biochemistry Program member, you are expected to attend regular program meetings and events hosted by the program and to serve as an academic advisor for Biochemistry majors. In addition, you may be asked to perform a specific task or service for the program, such as coordinating seminars, serving as the Library Liaison, Director of Honors, representative to the SCCD or Program Director. Most importantly, members of the program are called upon to provide research opportunities for Biochemistry majors by mentoring students in Special Studies and Honors Thesis projects. These types of hands-on research experiences are critical to the future success of our majors, and we depend upon the expertise of our program faculty to make these opportunities possible.”

B. Representation from the Chemistry and Biological Sciences Departments

Normally, the Biochemistry Program Committee has at least 3 representatives from the Chemistry Department and 3 from the Department of Biological Sciences. Ideally, these faculty members are also Members of the Program (as described above). However, in the case where a faculty member is simply serving as a departmental representative to the Biochemistry Program Committee, they would not be subject to the expectations set for program members as described in this document.
II. Review Policy for Biochemistry Program Members undergoing Reappointment, Tenure or Promotion in their Home Units

As described in Section I of this document, each faculty member will be informed of the Biochemistry Program’s Review Policy and Procedures before being appointed to the Program and reminded of these procedures at the time of their reappointment to the Program (normally every 5 years).

All Tenured/Tenure-track Program Members
All Program members who are being considered for reappointment, promotion or tenure in their home units will be reviewed with respect to their service to the Biochemistry Program. We consider the Special Studies (BCH 400) and Honors (BCH 430, 432) research opportunities that we offer to our students to be a critical part of the BCH curriculum. Therefore, we will review the scholarship of Program members and examine the ability of their research program to provide these experiences for our majors.

Tenured/Tenure-track Program Members who Regularly Teach Core Courses
In addition, those Program members who regularly teach in the Biochemistry core courses (BCH 252, BCH 352, and CHM 335) will have their teaching in those courses reviewed to allow the Program to give input into the quality of teaching that our majors experience in their required coursework.

III. Review Procedure for Biochemistry Program Members undergoing Reappointment, Tenure or Promotion in their Home Units

The procedures outlined below reflect the Program’s commitment to gather information and to provide feedback to faculty participating in the Program in ways that are collegial, constructive, substantive and cognizant of the expectations of the candidate’s home unit. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and pre-tenure members of the Program Committee and are intended to clarify the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

Annual Meetings with the Program Director
At the end of each academic year, the Director will meet individually with all pre-tenure Program members and the Chairs of their home units. The annual meeting provides an opportunity for the pre-tenure member to identify specific goals for the year so that the Program can be of most use in helping the candidate develop his or her progression through the ranks. For example, the pre-tenure member may wish to focus on teaching (e.g. visiting classes of senior colleagues and inviting them to visit, reviewing syllabi, developing new courses,) or on scholarship (e.g. having tenured colleagues read and comment on work in progress, consulting with senior colleagues about submitting work for publication) or both. It also provides an opportunity for the Program Director to be informed of the expectations of the home unit with respect to progression toward tenure and promotion. Pre-tenure members may elect to have their assigned Program mentor (see Biochemistry Program Mentoring document for details) join the annual meeting, another more senior Program member(s) of their choosing, or neither.

Composition of the Review Committee
When a member of the Program is being reviewed for reappointment, tenure or promotion, the Director, after consultation with the candidate and the Chair of the candidate’s home unit, will appoint a review committee composed of up to three tenured members of the
Program, senior in rank to the candidate. All tenured members are eligible to serve on the review team except 1) members of the Program who will vote in the candidate’s home unit and 2) members who will vote on the College’s Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The review committee will be finalized upon consultation with the Provost.

**Access to Review Materials and Evidence**

The candidate will provide the Program review committee with his or her dossier in order for the committee to review the relevant sections. In the cases where the candidate regularly teaches in the Biochemistry core courses, the review team will acquire first-hand knowledge of teaching within three semesters prior to a personnel review through class visits. Information about the candidate’s teaching in Special Studies (BCH 400) and Honors (BCH 430, 432) may be obtained through examination of the candidate’s dossier and discussions with the candidate. The review committee will also examine copies of the external evaluators’ comments provided by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

**Evaluation of Teaching (for those who regularly teach in the Biochemistry core courses)**

Classroom visits should occur regularly, guided by the timetable set in annual meetings with the director, and should not be limited to the semester immediately preceding personnel decisions. Classroom visits will be conducted by faculty members at times suggested by the faculty member being visited. Classroom visits between tenured and pre-tenured faculty can be reciprocal to increase the benefits to both and are encouraged outside the purposes of personnel reviews. The visits should be followed within two weeks by a conference to discuss outcomes.

For evaluation purposes, class visits should be limited to the review team only unless opened to other Committee members by the candidate. When class visits are related to tenure and promotion decisions, they should be arranged in consultation with the home unit. Classroom visits are a valuable, but not the sole, means of acquiring first-hand knowledge of teaching and improving teaching effectiveness. Discussion of syllabi, assignments and attending public presentations given by the candidate are also important means of gathering information.

**Review Committee Evaluation**

Before writing its evaluation, the review committee will meet with all tenured members of the Biochemistry Program senior in rank to the candidate to discuss its recommendations and to solicit additional information concerning the candidate. Given that expectations for progress toward tenure and promotion can differ in different scholarly disciplines, the Program Director, assisted by senior Program members from the candidate’s home unit, will be asked to provide context for the review committee concerning the expectations for scholarship, service, and teaching (where applicable) in both the candidate’s home unit and discipline at large. This will ensure that the review committee will be mindful of the expectations for progress toward tenure and promotion that have been consistently expressed to the candidate before writing their review.

The Chair of the review committee will provide a letter on or before November 15 to the candidate's home unit in time for their review, to the Provost (in cases of reappointment to the home unit), and to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure (for cases of tenure and promotion) detailing the results of the review and highlighting the candidate's contributions to the Biochemistry Program. A copy of the letter will be provided to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to that letter.
PROCEDURES FOR ADVISING AND EVALUATING UNTENURED FACULTY

Department of the Biological Sciences
Smith College

July 2002
Guiding and mentoring untenured faculty

The activities of the members of the department of Biological Sciences include a broad range of teaching (from classroom presentations to guiding students involved in original research), doing laboratory and/or field research, and service on departmental and college committees. To welcome and help new faculty members become active participants in the department, the senior members take responsibility for providing guidance regarding teaching, research and service. Thus, each new faculty member is assigned a mentoring committee of two or three senior faculty members. Assignments to this committee are made by the chair in consultation with the untenured and senior members. The committee should include a minimum of one individual whose scholarship relates to that of the untenured member, and that individual should serve for the entire probationary period, sabbaticals not withstanding. The remaining membership of the committee is expected to change from year to year, as teaching responsibilities, leaves, and sabbaticals dictate. Ideally, but not essentially, most of the senior members of the department should have served on the mentoring committee of each untenured member by the end of the individual’s probationary period. The mentoring committee of an untenured faculty member who contributes to an interdepartmental program should also include a senior colleague from the complementary department during most years of the probationary period.

Once a candidate accepts the invitation to join the Smith faculty, the mentoring committee should contact her or him to coordinate nuts-and-bolts matters and to assure the readiness of the research and teaching facilities into which the new member is moving. It is likely that expectations regarding space and facilities will have been discussed previously with the search committee and chair of the department. Subsequently, the committee is expected to provide support and advice to the untenured member through ongoing discussions on items such as designing syllabi, evaluating students, mentoring students in research labs, writing papers, and obtaining funding. The committee will report each spring to the tenured members of the department on the untenured member’s progress in all three areas of professional development: teaching, scholarship and service. The mentoring committee will also meet with the untenured faculty member after s/he receives the department’s annual spring letter to discuss priorities for the following year. The members of the committee should consult with the chair, other members of the department, and each other to insure that the untenured member is receiving consistent, appropriate advice. The committee should also provide guidance in the preparation of a candidate’s curriculum vitae, faculty record sheets, and dossiers to be submitted to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

A principal responsibility of the mentoring committee is to provide continuing guidance on balancing efforts devoted to teaching, scholarship and service. Of these three areas, teaching and scholarship should be regarded as equal in importance. While it is important not to shirk service to the college, such efforts do not substitute for excellence in both teaching and scholarship. Over the years, untenured faculty members would be expected to contribute increasingly to service. The senior members of the mentoring committee are available to offer advice regarding the balance between teaching and research responsibilities and the untenured member’s commitment to service.
To advise untenured faculty members on their progress, the chair annually provides a letter (usually in the early summer) to each untenured colleague and then meets with each individual to discuss the letter and any issues that it might address. The letter is based on input from the mentoring committee and other tenured members and a progress report submitted beforehand by the untenured colleague. The progress report should consist of a single-page overview of the past year’s accomplishments plus a current *curriculum vitae*, a draft of the faculty record sheet, and any additional materials deemed appropriate (e.g., newly-developed or significantly altered course syllabi, examples of student assignments, reprints, manuscripts in preparation, grant applications and/or descriptions of unusually heavy service). The chair’s letter should refer explicitly to all three areas of performance, and should specifically advise the untenured member on strategies for balancing the competing demands of these areas.

Ultimately, the senior members must vote on matters of tenure and promotion, which requires evaluation of the full extent of the untenured faculty member’s accomplishments during the entire probationary period. Evaluation throughout the untenured member’s probationary period (including advice communicated at times of reappointment) is intended to provide guidance on how to develop strengths and minimize weaknesses and to prepare the candidate for the tenure process. We urge untenured members to raise questions and seek help and guidance from any tenured member of the department.

**Criteria for evaluating professional advancement in the Department of Biological Sciences**

**Teaching.** We recognize that teaching is accomplished in a variety of contexts, including classroom presentations, laboratory instruction, seminar discussions, and one-on-one mentoring of independent research students. While each of us confronts these diverse demands in our own individual manner, a member of the department is expected to demonstrate strengths in all these contexts. Superior teaching performance requires the ability to speak engagingly and coherently in the classroom, to stimulate and manage classroom discussion, to keep one’s courses abreast of new developments and discoveries, and to challenge the best students without discouraging the more challenged ones. The development of clear and informative syllabi, meaningful assignments, and effective methods of evaluation are also important to successful teaching performance.

**Scholarship.** To provide the level of education in the biological sciences that we strive to achieve requires that we be scholars who practice as well as teach biology. Members of the department are expected to contribute to the progress of their disciplines and be recognized as productive scholars in their fields of study. This requires us to maintain active research programs that enrich and complement our teaching efforts and involve undergraduate students in the excitement of discovery. In a liberal arts setting, integrating students in research is considered of high priority. The generation of substantive publications in peer-reviewed journals is our principal criterion for evaluating scholarship. We recognize that appropriate rates of publication can vary from one area of research to another, and that collaborative efforts, frequently involving co-authorship of articles, are often required. In the case of collaborative research, contributions to intellectual content better reflect a faculty member’s development as a scholar than purely technical contributions. Untenured
members should provide sufficient explanation in progress reports regarding collaborative efforts. We recognize that it can take time to equip a laboratory and obtain outside funding, that a single publication can represent the cumulative scholarly contribution of several shorter ones, and that involvement of undergraduates in research, which we strongly encourage, can sometimes compromise productivity.

Scholarly productivity can also be compromised by the demands of service to the college and department. Untenured members are strongly encouraged to consult the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College on this topic. That document specifies (II.A.3) that “Each faculty member should carry his or her appropriate share of departmental and college duties...,” that when a faculty member is asked to bear “…an abnormal load of committee or administrative duties...that shall be taken into account when judging the individual’s scholarly activity,” but that “Such service cannot be considered as a substitute for achievement in teaching and scholarship...”

Mentoring committees should provide untenured faculty with guidance regarding the various channels of scholarship they might pursue and levels of productivity they should strive to attain. As a very general and informal guideline, and taking into account time for establishing a laboratory or field study, a publication record equivalent to one substantive, peer-reviewed article per year can usually be regarded as excellent scholarly productivity. We understand that, in the first few years, these papers may emerge from work accomplished prior to the untenured member’s coming to Smith College. At the same time, however, the new member is expected to establish a research program at Smith, so that – after a few years – publications would derive from work accomplished at Smith College. While faculty are becoming established at the college, we encourage them to seek out collaborative associations with others at Smith, in the Five College Consortium, or farther afield. The members of the mentoring committee can often provide advice regarding such collaborations.

We also recognize that active scholarship can lead to contributions other than the publication of traditional research articles. These include, but are by no means limited to, the following:

- working with students on research projects
- attending and giving presentations at scholarly meetings.
- peer reviewing and providing editorial work for professional journals and publishers.
- preparing grant applications and progress reports.
- reviewing grant proposals and serving on review panels.
- reviewing books.
- publishing textbooks.
- developing research-related web sites and software.
- providing service to professional societies.

Keeping in mind that published research in peer-reviewed journals is our principal criterion for evaluating scholarship, untenured members are strongly encouraged to involve themselves in any efforts through which they contribute to, and earn recognition in, their field. In particular, we encourage our colleagues to seek outside funding for their research, especially when this is necessary to insure productivity. The ability to attract outside funding also reflects the status of an investigator in his or her field. However, we recognize that outside funding can be difficult and time-consuming to obtain, and its importance varies
among research areas. Untenured faculty are encouraged to talk with senior members who carry out scholarship in closely related areas about the appropriate balance of scholarly activities in the field.

Service to the department and college. The Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (II.A.3), specifies that untenured faculty members are expected to serve on department and college committees. However, these duties should be carefully balanced with efforts devoted to teaching and scholarship. Service to the department and college is inherently difficult to evaluate since untenured faculty have little control over whether they are appointed or elected to committees, especially at the college level. As noted above, the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College also clearly states (II.A.3) that “Such service cannot be considered as a substitute for achievement in teaching and scholarship…”

In general, we seek evidence that an untenured member has appropriately balanced that service with the demands of teaching and scholarship. Assignments of untenured faculty to departmental tasks and committees should be carefully adjusted to the performance and responsibilities of those individuals in their teaching and scholarship. Before agreeing to serve on any college committee, untenured faculty members should carefully evaluate the workload they would be assuming. They should feel welcome to confer with their chair and mentoring teams, and comfortable in declining to serve if they feel that doing otherwise would compromise their effectiveness and development as teachers or scholars. Extraordinary demands, such as membership on a time-consuming committee, handling the extra work that necessarily accompanies sole responsibility for a very large class, or exceptionally heavy advising duties, are occasionally made of untenured faculty members. Such demands nearly always compromise scholarly productivity more than teaching. When this is the case, every effort should be made to provide relief via reduced teaching or committee responsibilities in subsequent semesters.

**Evaluation of untenured faculty**

**Teaching.** Each member of an untenured colleague’s mentoring committee is expected to attend two or three of the untenured member’s classes and/or laboratories each year. These visits should be scheduled in consultation with the untenured member so as to be minimally disruptive. The untenured member is expected to provide explanations of the goals of the segment of the course observed by a senior member. After the visitations, the senior member is expected to provide written comments regarding the untenured member’s teaching and to meet with the individual to review these comments. The members of a mentoring committee should also communicate their evaluations to their senior colleagues.

Although not required, the untenured members are welcome to attend classes presented by the senior mentors. This arrangement may be especially helpful if a senior member employs a unique approach to teaching.

Members of the department eligible to vote on the reappointment, promotion, or tenure of an untenured member, but who have not observed the latter’s teaching as members of a mentoring committee, must observe the individual’s teaching at least once prior to voting.
Such observations may be made through class visits, team teaching, or attendance at lectures appropriate for student audiences.

Other sources of information regarding teaching performance include the college course critique and unsolicited comments from students and faculty in other departments. While information from such sources can be informative, they must be interpreted with care and cannot substitute for the first-hand observations of an untenured member’s teaching. Unsolicited negative comments of a substantial or recurring nature made by students to any tenured member of the department should be directed to the chair. The chair may communicate those comments to the faculty member concerned with the identity of the student kept confidential. If the chair determines that a problem exists, s/he and the untenured member will jointly seek a means of resolving it. Unsolicited negative comments should never be discussed in deliberations on reappointment, tenure, or promotion without having been previously communicated to the individual concerned. By the same token, it is important to convey positive comments made by students to the untenured faculty member.

Scholarship. The senior members of the mentoring committee are expected to maintain ongoing discussions with the untenured member about scholarship, and to share their impressions with both the untenured member and with their senior colleagues. The member whose research area is closest to the untenured member’s should be especially familiar with the latter’s publications and should advise the tenured members of the department on the untenured member’s progress. The chair’s annual letter to the untenured member should explicitly address the individual’s development as a scholar.

During the final two years of his or her probationary period, each untenured member is expected to schedule and present a Biological Sciences Colloquium lecture that summarizes his or her research efforts for students and faculty.

All members of the department eligible to vote on a matter of reappointment, promotion, or tenure should carefully evaluate the record of their untenured colleague’s scholarly productivity, as documented in the individual’s Curriculum Vitae.

Service to the department and college. The Curriculum Vitae of a candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure should document all aspects of service to the department and college that the individual wishes the senior members to consider. The mentoring committees shall review those records and inform the untenured faculty members of any concerns.
**Procedure for Evaluating Teaching**

**Tenure Track Positions**

Department of Chemistry, Smith College
5 December 2001

**Statement of Principle:** The members of the department of chemistry are committed to excellence in teaching. We believe that all of us, both tenured and non-tenured members, can learn to teach more effectively. This is best achieved by the opening of our classrooms to each other and by communication between us on all aspects of teaching. We recognize that the processes of mentoring, in which we attempt to develop strengths and minimize weaknesses, and of evaluation are closely connected in the operational sense. Meetings in addition to those described below hopefully will be part of an overall mentoring program within the Department. It is our intent to place primary emphasis on the improvement of teaching, since we are colleagues, all interested in conceiving and testing effective methods of instruction. Teaching evaluations are to be performed within the context of this primary emphasis.

**Definitions:** Members of the Department who are eligible to vote on the reappointment, promotion, or tenure of a lower ranked member of the Department will be responsible for the evaluation of the teaching of that member and will be designated as “senior” for the purpose of this document. “Candidate” is the member of lower rank who is to be considered for reappointment or promotion. The “evaluation period” shall be the year preceding the departmental recommendation to the College administration on behalf of the candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure.

**Evaluation:** At the beginning of the evaluation period, the candidate and senior members will agree upon a schedule for class visitation and meeting(s). The meeting(s) will serve as a discussion forum on the following topics:

**Classroom Visitations**
To make a well-founded judgment of teaching ability, it is necessary for members of the Department to visit each other’s classes. During the evaluation period, senior members shall gather first hand information about the teaching ability and effectiveness of the candidate. In general, a reasonable evaluation will require more than a single classroom visit. Classroom visitations should be, if logistically possible, for at least three consecutive sessions. Earlier visits made for mentoring purposes prior to the evaluation period will provide a background and context for the evaluation. Following these evaluating class visits, the senior member will promptly summarize her or his evaluation in writing. Copies of this document shall be given to the candidate and placed in the candidate’s departmental file. The candidate and senior member will then meet to discuss the visitation and the document.
Course Design, Preparation, and Assessment
We recognize that there is more to teaching than the actual delivery of the material. The way a course is designed, the breadth and flow of course content, preparation of classroom sessions and meaningful assignments, as well as the development of effective means for student assessment are all part of the candidate’s overall teaching ability and should be included in the discussion(s) between the candidate and the senior members.

College-Administered Student Evaluations:
The candidate’s college-administered student evaluations will be included in the departmental teaching evaluation and as such should be included in the discussion(s) between the candidate and the senior members.

For tenure and promotion (or at the request of a candidate for reappointment), the teaching evaluation shall include departmental student evaluations.

Departmental Student Evaluation:
Written student evaluations are the mechanism by which senior members can learn about the “one-on-one” teaching that occurs in Special Studies and Honors context, and, for instance, the success of the candidate in helping students during office hours. In preparation for a review for tenure or promotion, the Department shall solicit from current and former students of the candidate written evaluations of the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. The group of students selected should normally include majors that have graduated during the most recent three years, current majors, and, if appropriate, students who have recently taken courses that are not exclusively populated by majors. The group to be contacted shall be agreed upon by the senior members and the candidate. In order to facilitate frank and open comments from the students, the letters will be treated as confidential.

Documentation: A file for each member of the Department shall be kept in the Science Center office. An individual’s file shall be open to the individual and to the senior members of the Department. Each file shall contain: (1) a departmental copy of the record of the individual’s professional activities, as specified in Section II B. 1.b of the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College; (2) copies of evaluations of the individual’s teaching made by senior members; (3) student evaluations, and (4) any additional material the individual may wish to add. The files shall not be taken from the Science Center.
Feb. 5, 1983; revised April 28, 1983

Smith College
Department of Classical Languages and Literatures

In evaluating candidates for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the Department of Classical Languages and Literatures follows the criteria and guidelines set forth in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College.

Each member of the department senior to and eligible to vote on a candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure shall evaluate the candidate as far as teaching, scholarship, and service to the department and the college are concerned.

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING TEACHING

In a vote taken February 1983, the Department of Classics approved the following procedures for classroom visitation, as one means of evaluating teaching ability. Other evidence is provided by proposals for new courses, syllabi, examinations, paper topics and study questions, corrected papers, and other teaching materials. Student opinion, as expressed in the college-wide course critique, is also taken into consideration.

Normally, each department member eligible to vote on a candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion shall visit at least one of that candidate's classes during each term of appointment.

In the beginning of the academic year, the Chair, in consultation with the members of the department eligible to vote on a candidate shall determine who is to visit that candidate's classes in the course of the year. In setting up visits, every attempt will be made to have as many different types of courses observed as schedules permit, and to avoid disrupting classes unnecessarily.

There will be no unannounced visits. Visits are to be scheduled by the visitor(s) and the person visited at a mutually convenient time, exclusive of the first and last weeks of the semester.

Before a visit takes place the colleague to be visited should provide the visitor(s) with a syllabus and such other materials as would help to place a particular class meeting in a
larger context.

Normally, only one visitor shall attend a class meeting, but if the person visited so elects, two or more visitors may observe the same session of a class.

At the request of either the visitor or the person visited, the visitor may visit the class again as soon as possible. There shall be no more than two visits by the same visitor to the same course in any semester.

After each visit [or, when two visits are scheduled, after the second visit] the visitor shall record his/her comments and evaluation in a written report to be placed in the departmental files. The junior colleague shall have full access to the report, which shall form the basis for a subsequent conference, and should receive the report no later than the day preceding the conference.

The visitor and his/her junior colleague shall meet at a mutually agreeable place and time, no sooner than two and no later than ten days after the final visit.

Within a week after the conference, the junior colleague shall sign the report if she/he agrees that the substance of the report has been discussed during the conference, and shall have the opportunity to append comments if she/he wishes. The co-signed report (with any appended comments) shall then be placed in the departmental files.

Senior members who ask a junior colleague to lead a class in one of their courses should follow the standard procedures for a visit to the class of a junior colleague.

The foregoing procedures shall apply to all faculty teaching in the department.
Review Procedures
Program in Comparative Literature (CLT)
(approved by the CLT Program Board on February 11, 2013
with a minor revision approved August 23, 2013)

(NOTE: These procedures supersede any earlier relevant policies.)

In the case of an affiliated faculty member whose FTE is entirely in another unit (or other units), including one who has contractual teaching responsibilities in CLT (but in whose case CLT’s recommendation would not be counted as a vote), CLT will not conduct a full evaluation or review. Instead, by November 15 of the year of a tenure or promotion review, the Director of CLT (or delegate) will provide a letter of appreciation detailing the colleague’s contributions to the Program in the areas of teaching, service, and, if applicable (as in the case of a colloquium presentation), scholarship.

The following procedures thus apply only to any faculty member whose FTE is entirely in CLT or who holds a formal joint appointment whereby CLT’s recommendation would count as a vote.

Annual meetings with Director

At the beginning of each academic year, the Director (or delegate) will meet individually with each untenured member of the Program. The annual meeting provides an opportunity for the untenured member to identify specific goals for the year so that the Program can best help the candidate. The untenured member may decide whether to focus on teaching (visiting classes of senior colleagues and inviting them to visit, reviewing syllabi, or participating in faculty development events); or on scholarship (having tenured colleagues read and comment on work in progress, consulting with colleagues about submitting work for publication, or reviewing a research and writing agenda); or on both.

Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

Reflecting the Program's commitment to provide collegial, constructive and substantive feedback on teaching and scholarship, these procedures clarify and amplify the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. Please refer to the Program’s Mentoring Plan for further discussion of exchanges between Program members to promote scholarship and excellent classroom teaching.

Constitution of the Review Committee

When a colleague whose position is located in whole or in part in CLT is being reviewed for reappointment, tenure or promotion, the program will follow the procedures indicated in the Policy for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion. In the case of joint appointments, members who will vote in the member's home department or program will not participate in the CLT review.
Review Process

The candidate will provide the review committee with his or her dossier. The Committee on Tenure and Promotion will provide the review committee with copies of external evaluators’ comments. The review committee will thoroughly review the candidate's scholarship. In reviews for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the review team will observe teaching within three semesters prior to a personnel review through class visits. In reviews for promotion to full professor, class visitations are not required but may be elected.

Following its evaluation, the review committee will meet with all Program members senior in rank to the candidate to discuss its recommendations and to solicit additional information on the candidate's contributions to the Program. In the case of joint appointments, the chair of the review team will provide a letter by November 15 to the candidate's home unit, as well as to the Provost (in cases of reappointment) and to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure (for cases of tenure and promotion). The letter will detail the review of teaching and scholarship, as well as the candidate's contributions to the Program. A copy will be provided to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to this letter.

Evaluation of Teaching

In the case of untenured tenure-track faculty, classroom visits should be guided by a timetable set in the annual meetings, and should not be limited to the semester immediately preceding personnel decisions. Classroom visits will be conducted by pairs of faculty members at times suggested by the member to be visited. The tenured members will draft one joint report or individual reports of the visits. Within two weeks, the visitors will meet with the untenured member to discuss the draft report(s). The untenured member may respond in writing to the report(s). The report(s) and any response will be filed with the Director and may be summarized, along with other reports, in letters concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

When class visits are made for tenure and promotion evaluations, in the case of joint appointments they should be arranged in consultation with the home unit.
Memorandum

Subject: Teaching Evaluation Procedures

Date: May 17, 1993

To: Dean Robert Merritt

From: Merrie Bergmann, Chair
Department of Computer Science

TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Computer Science Department

The Computer Science Department evaluates the teaching of each junior faculty member annually, with a classroom visitation by a senior member of the department and a subsequent meeting. Details of the visitations are arranged each year by the Department Chair and the junior faculty member.

In addition to the annual visitation, the Computer Science Department assigns a senior faculty mentor to each junior faculty member who is teaching a course for the first time. The assignment will be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the junior faculty member. The senior faculty mentor will meet with the junior faculty member before, during, and following the semester in which the latter first teaches the course, and will discuss the content of the course and its relation to other courses, the students’ work loads, grading policies, and other aspects of the course. After the semester, when course critiques become available from the Dean’s office, the mentor, the junior faculty member, and the Department Chair will meet for a retrospective discussion and review of the course.

REAPPOINTMENT STANDARDS FOR JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBERS

A. First reappointment. This reappointment is made based on the Computer Science Department’s expectation that the candidate is likely to receive a positive tenure recommendation. At the time of first reappointment, the Computer Science Department requires:

1. Quality teaching, with good reason to expect that the candidate’s teaching will evolve to the level of excellence that is required for a positive tenure recommendation.

2. A continuing research effort, with promise that excellent and sustained scholarship will be forthcoming.

3. Some contribution to college and departmental business.

B. Tenure. The Computer Science Department requires excellent teaching and scholarship, and some and some contribution to departmental and college business, in accordance with the Policy II.A.
Here are the FCDD policies:

FCDD Junior Review policies

- A review committee consisting of the home campus Dance Program Chair/Coordinator, the FCDD Chair and a third member chosen in consultation with the Program coordinator and the candidate. The Chair of the committee shall be the FCDD Chair, except in cases where home campus policies direct the Coordinator to chair the committee.

- The reviews "are conducted in the spirit of mentorship, indentifying and encouraging perceived strengths, and noting any areas of concern which should be addressed for future reviews."

- The committee reviews and evaluates the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, creative/scholarly work and service. They review student teaching evaluations, samples of creative/scholarly work and the candidate's updated CV.

- The committee also reviews classroom teaching: preferably 2 different courses, with two FCDD committee members observing the candidate teaching the same course twice. These observations will be arranged in advance with the candidate, and will focus on the candidate's knowledge and organization of the material and his/her ability to communicate with the students.

- The committee Chair writes a letter describing the committee's assessment, addressing strengths and making suggestions for attention to any areas of concern. Upon completion of the review, a copy of this letter is sent to the candidate and to the candidate's FCDD confidential personnel file.

- Once the candidate has received the Chair's review letter, a meeting will be convened for the candidate, Committee Chair and the home campus coordinator. The third member of the Committee may be invited to this meeting at the request of the candidate.
A. Evaluation Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

The criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure on each campus includes excellence in teaching, evidence of fine creative/scholarly work, and Departmental or community service, evaluated within the context and goals of the home Department/program.

1. Teaching

   a. Observation of Classes

   Two Five College Dance Department Personnel Committee members will each observe the candidate teaching one course twice, or the equivalent as determined by the Committee and the candidate. Candidates must agree ahead of time to be observed. The time of observations will be arranged with the candidate. At Amherst College prior consent must be obtained from the Chair of the Department of Theater and Dance. The criteria to be observed will be the candidate's knowledge of the material and his/her ability to communicate with the students.

   b. Student Course Evaluations

   Each campus has some method for soliciting student evaluations. The Committee will review the student evaluations in the form they are available on each campus. A Five College Dance Department evaluation form may be used in addition. (See Appendix I.)

   The Five College Dance Department forms will be kept in the Department Office for 6 years. They will be made available to an institutional committee on request.

2. Creative/Scholarly Activity

   At the time of the personnel action it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of creative/scholarly work. This may include course syllabi, reviews, videotapes of choreography and/or performance, articles, books, research activities or other pertinent materials.

3. Service

   Service to the Department, development of new courses, and, community service should be documented and made available to the Committee.

4. Full Faculty Participation

   Letters relating to the personnel action for a candidate shall be invited from faculty in the Five College Dance Department.

5. Outside Evaluators

   When outside evaluators are required for an action, in most cases the home institution will be responsible for contacting them. The Five College Dance Department will help in any way it can to suggest and/or contact outside evaluators.

6. See Appendix A. CAMPUS PERSONNEL PROCEDURES.
2. **Personnel Committee**
   
a. **Membership and Description**

   The Personnel Committee shall consist of the Chair of the Five College Dance Department and two elected members from the Department. The Chair of the Five College Dance Department will chair the Personnel Committee.

   The Chair of the Department shall identify eligible candidates for full Departmental vote. The candidates shall have tenure or 10 year appointment, or be a member of the Five College Dance Department for at least 5 years, providing it is not the terminal year of appointment.

   There will be no more than 1 member on the Personnel Committee from each campus. Home campus procedures will prevail in Personnel Committee composition. The member will step down for any personnel action on his/her behalf.

   The membership of the Personnel Committee will be modified to accommodate the personnel requirements on each individual campus.

   b. **Responsibilities**

   (1) Ascertain and act upon all personnel actions within the Department in adherence to Evaluation Procedures approved by the full Department and the Deans/Deputies.  
       (See II. PERSONNEL PROCEDURES and Appendix A)

   (2) Prepare annual evaluations of junior faculty according to Departmental guidelines.  
       (See II. PERSONNEL PROCEDURES)

3. **Ad Hoc Committees**

   Ad Hoc Committees will be appointed by the Five College Dance Department Chair and will take action when the Chair, Executive Committee, full Department or Five College Coordinator consider it advisable.

II. **PERSONNEL PROCEDURES**

   The Five College Dance Department is involved in personnel actions for dance faculty on all campuses. These actions include evaluation for reappointment, promotion, tenure, junior faculty evaluations and when appropriate, merit actions at UMass.

   Since each campus has different regulations for personnel actions, procedures will vary from campus to campus. The role of the Five College Dance Department Personnel Committee will vary accordingly.  
       (See Appendix A.)
Governance: Campus Personnel Guidelines
Smith College

A. Notification of Actions Upcoming and results:
The Smith College Dance Coordinator will notify the FCDD Chair of a pending action. The Smith College Dean of the Faculty, the Provost, or the President, which ever is appropriate, will inform the Chair of the outcome.

B. Composition/Responsibility of Review Committee:
For Reappointment, the Personnel committee of the FCDD will be the recommending committee for the re-appointment if the following criteria are met: a) all members rank above the candidate b) there is a Smith College Dance faculty member on the Committee.

If there is no appropriate Smith College Dance faculty member available, a non-dance faculty member from Smith College, appointed by the Dean will serve on the Committee. If there are more than one Smith College faculty who rank above the Candidate, they shall all be included on the Committee.

For Promotion and Tenure: The same qualifications as for Reappointment. In addition: a) there will be a minimum of two senior Smith faculty members on the Committee; b) if there are not two senior Smith Dance Faculty members available, the Committee will include one senior non-dance faculty member from Smith College; c) the senior dance faculty member from Smith College will chair the Committee. If none is available, a non-dance senior faculty member will chair.

The recommendations from this Committee will be sent to the Smith College Dean of Faculty for reappointment and to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for promotion and tenure.
Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures
Department Policy on
Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure

Revised May 2009

1. Appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure of regular faculty members.

1.1 All regular faculty members of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures shall serve as voting members in searches for all full-time instructional staff in the Department. In searches for regular instructional staff at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher, the Department, after consulting with the dean, may choose to invite one or more members from the regular faculty of the East Asian Studies Advisory Committee, the Program in Comparative Literature or another language or literature department at the College to participate in the search as a voting member.

1.2. All eligible members of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures shall serve as voting members on the review committees for reappointment, tenure and promotion of the Department's instructional staff. In cases where there are insufficient members to establish a committee (a minimum of three will be needed, with four the optimum number), the Department, after consulting with the dean, may choose to invite one or more members from the regular faculty of the East Asian Studies Advisory Committee and/or of another language or literature department at the College to participate in the committee. Generally faculty member from outside the department who participated in the search will be invited to participate in the review committee for the same faculty member. All members serving on such committee for the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures shall abide by the rules and regulations of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures.

1.3. The policy of appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be reviewed every three years by regular faculty of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures.

2. Evaluation of teaching of tenure-track faculty members.

Evaluation of teaching shall include class visits, examination of the candidate's Faculty Record, syllabi and other course materials provided by the candidate and students' teaching/course evaluations, both departmental and college.

2.1 Class visits

2.1.1 Timing
For Reappointment: (See the College's Policy, Section I.B.2.)
Each eligible member shall make at least one visit to the candidate's classes, and both the visiting team or the candidate may request a second visit by each team, either to the same course or to additional courses. The schedule for class visits shall be arranged with the candidate well in advance of the actual visits. Following the visits, the evaluating team shall hold a conference with the candidates.

Under special circumstances, the regular faculty may choose to simplify the review process for candidates who have already undergone a review within the past three years. This may result in a reduction of the number of visits, visitors, and/or information to be submitted for the review. The chair of the department will consult with the candidate and regular members of the faculty before the simplified review is enacted.

All members who are serving on such committees for EALL shall abide by the rules and regulations in the College's Policy, unless specified otherwise above.

The above policies and Procedures will replace all previous policies.
Procedures for Review of Faculty

Affiliated with East Asian Studies but not appointed in it

Approved by the Program in fall 2014

for inclusion among Common Practices

Unless the initial letter of appointment specifies otherwise, East Asian Studies does not review faculty affiliated with the Program for the purpose of reappointment, promotion or tenure. The Program's participation in such reviews is limited, upon the request of the faculty member, to a letter of appreciation addressed to the Department or Program of appointment and through it to the Committee on Tenure & Promotion.
1. Members of the Program eligible to vote in a decision for reappointment, tenure, or promotion visit classes of the candidate for the purposes of evaluating his or her teaching. The timing of these visits shall be arranged in consultation with the Chair by the candidate and the visiting members. Program members normally attend one class and at least two members attend the same class meeting. The candidate will circulate the syllabus and relevant reading assignments to members prior to the class to be observed. Observations of the candidate made during the course of team-teaching or at public presentations to student-faculty audiences may count toward such visits. After completing class visits, each member must confer with the candidate and share his or her observations and suggestions regarding the candidate’s teaching. In addition, each member fills out the department form “Report on Class Visit,” one copy of which should be placed in the candidate’s personnel file and another given to the candidate.

2. Members eligible to vote in a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion who will be on leave or otherwise away from campus during the semester of the decision are to be informed during the previous semester by the Chair that an evaluation is pending and are notified of all meetings related to the evaluation.

3. At the meeting for which a decision about reappointment, tenure, or promotion is to be made, member’s reports on class visits and copies of the College’s formal course critiques are made available to all participants, and constitute the basis for discussion of the candidate’s teaching.

4. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, or promotion are also encouraged to visit their colleague’s classes informally to facilitate exchanges about teaching.
REPORT CLASS VISIT

To facilitate discussions with candidates and eligible voting members of the Program about teaching, please provide detailed answers to the questions below:

Instructor’s Name:

Class Visited:

Date of Visit:

Visitor’s Name:

1. What specifically was the subject matter of this class period?

2. Was the material of the class period well structured and planned?

3. Was discussion (if appropriate) successfully elicited and directed? To what degree did the students appear engaged with the class?

4. Additional comments on this particular class?

5. Please provide any additional remarks that might be helpful in assessing the contribution of this candidate and course to the program.
SMITH COLLEGE

Northampton, Massachusetts

Department of Economics

Departmental Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Appointment to Tenure
Approved by the Department on February 3, 2016

These Procedures are meant to supplement those in the College’s Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure, hereinafter referred to as the Policy. In case of any conflict between these Procedures and the Policy, the latter takes precedence.

The person upon whom a decision is being made is referred to below as “the candidate”. Those members of the department authorized by the Code of Faculty Legislation and Administrative Practice and/or the Policy to vote on the candidate’s reappointment, promotion, or appointment to tenure are referred to as “voting members.” “Chair” refers to the chair of the department. However, when the chair is not a voting member, the voting members shall elect a chair to serve in the role called for herein.

1. By the fourth week of the semester before the one in which the candidate comes up for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the Chair shall meet with the candidate to explain the following procedures. (If the candidate declares an intention to put themselves forward after this date, the meeting with the Chair shall take place as soon after that declaration as practicable.)

Submission of Dossier

2. The candidate shall provide the Department with the following materials on or before the date set by the Provost’s Office for submission of the dossier. It is understood that candidates may subsequently add material to their files up to the date for last additions specified by the Policy or the Provost’s Office.

   a. A curriculum vitae, which should include a list of publications, professional activities outside the College (attendance at professional meetings, editorial work, etc.), activities at the College other than classroom teaching and research (College committee service, speaking to various groups, etc.), and any other information the candidate may wish to bring to the attention of the Department.

   b. A teaching record. This should include a list of courses taught at Smith since the candidate’s appointment to the faculty or since the candidate’s most recent promotion or tenure, and for each course, the syllabus, copies of problem sets and exams, descriptions of paper assignments, and any other course material the candidate may wish to submit. When the candidate has taught a course more than once during the period under review, only one set of materials for that course need be submitted.
c. A statement on current scholarship and teaching, and plans for the future.
d. Published or unpublished materials that may help the voting members in their evaluation.
e. Any other materials the candidate wishes the department to consider.

Teaching Evaluation

3. Knowledge of the candidate’s teaching shall be gained in the following manner:

a. Systematic knowledge of student opinion about the courses of all candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion will be obtained from files of college course critiques maintained by the department chair and the Provost’s Office.
b. In the case of tenure consideration and consideration for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor, all voting members shall normally visit at least one class conducted by the candidate within three semesters of the vote. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor must notify the Chair of the Department of their intention to stand for promotion far enough in advance to allow class visitations.
c. When reappointment is being considered, the chair shall, in consultation with the voting members, select two of the voting members to form a class visitation committee to visit a class conducted by the candidate within one year of the vote. Any voting faculty member may attend the class of a candidate if they wish to do so. The candidate may invite additional class visits from the class visitation committee or from other of the voting members if they choose to do so.
d. All visitors shall visit the class of the candidate during a mutually agreeable time with advanced notice to the candidate. To the extent possible, visitors should arrange to visit in pairs or, when appropriate to the class, in larger numbers. After each visit, the voting member shall make a written evaluation for submission to the voting members, with one copy sent to the candidate.
e. In the case where every voting member must observe a class and when, after every option has been exhausted for an in-person class visit, an in-person class visit is not possible, the chair may arrange for the video recording of a live class for viewing by those voting members unable to make an in-person observation of a class. The chair will work with the candidate to establish a mutually agreeable time for the recording.

Scholarship Evaluation

4. Voting members shall familiarize themselves with the scholarly works of the candidate. Any candidate may request an outside review of his or her scholarship. Alternatively, the voting members of the Department may request an outside review of a candidate’s scholarship. In the case of promotion or tenure, when an outside review is required by the Policy or is requested by either the candidate or by the voting members, the candidate’s scholarly works shall be sent outside the College by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion for evaluation in accordance with the provisions of the Policy.
In the case of a reappointment, the reviewers shall be chosen in the same manner as outlined in the Policy. The reviewers shall be chosen no later than October 1 for the first-semester decisions and no later than March 1 for second-semester decisions, and the material for review shall be sent out by the Department.

It is understood that close friends of the candidate shall not serve as outside reviewers.

Other Procedures

5. Non-voting members of the Department are welcomed, but not required, to submit written comments, favorable and/or unfavorable, on the qualifications of candidates in the Department.

6. In cases of tenure with or without promotion:
   a. There will be a preliminary meeting of the voting members for discussion of the tenure candidate. No vote will be taken at this meeting, but a letter will be sent to the candidate describing the issues and questions raised at the meeting.
   b. A subsequent meeting with the candidate and the voting members will be held at which time these issues could be addressed more fully. The candidate may waive his or her right to the meeting.
   c. A third meeting of the voting members will follow, at which time a final vote will be taken.
   d. An optional subsequent meeting might be held between the candidate and the chairperson if the former requests it.
   e. The results of the vote and the reasons for it will be communicated to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion in accordance with the provisions of the Policy.

7. In cases of reappointment or promotion without tenure, following the prescribed College policies, the voting members shall consider the candidate’s qualifications, vote, and prepare a recommendation for submission to the President or to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, as appropriate. A copy will be delivered to the candidate’s campus mailbox at least three days before it is forwarded to the President or the Committee. In cases where college procedures call for a draft of the recommendation to be submitted to the Provost or President prior to the submission of the final letter, that draft shall also be delivered to the candidate with the same timing and in the same manner as described in the previous sentence. The candidate shall be invited to meet with the voting members to discuss the recommendation whether as a draft or in its final form before it is forwarded. The candidate may decline or accept this invitation.

8. The chair of the department, or the chair’s designate, shall conduct an annual review of the scholarship, teaching and service of each non-tenured member. The untenured member being reviewed may ask that one or more other tenured members of the department be present at the annual review and those members may change from year to year.
Affirmed

Subject
To
Dean of the Faculty Office

The procedures for evaluation of candidates for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion in the department shall remain the same.

Smith College MEMORANDUM

Subject: Update of Departmental Evaluation Procedures
Date: October 5, 1982
To: Kenneth McCartney, Dean of the Faculty
From: Alan L. Marvelli, Chair
Education & Child Study

Evaluation of non-tenured members of our department is now conducted in strict compliance with the guidelines set forth in the "Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College." All senior members of the department make advanced arrangements to observe classes taught by each junior member. Following each visit, there is an opportunity for discussion after which a report of the class observation is filed with the Chair (A copy is given to the junior member as well). When problems are noted, senior members often will make recommendations and then visit classes at a later date.

At appropriate times all scholarly works of the non-tenured member are reviewed. Service to the department and College are also given proper consideration.
Picker Engineering Program

Program Procedure for the Evaluation of Teaching of Tenure-Track Faculty: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Programmatic recommendations regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure will be based on the evaluation of a candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Program, College, and the candidate’s professional communities at large. The evaluation of teaching will follow the procedure below. Note, this policy does not pertain to already tenured faculty seeking promotion.

All members eligible to vote must make at least one classroom visit during the three-semester period consisting of the semester of the review and the two semesters preceding it. The candidate being evaluated will provide several dates and times when visits would be acceptable, and will make the course syllabus available to visitors prior to the scheduled observation. All visits must be made in groups of two or more; participation in class discussions by visitors is strongly discouraged. Independent letters of evaluation shall be written and submitted to the candidate in draft form within two weeks of the visit (if more than one observation is conducted by a given visitor, a single letter can be written within two weeks of the final observation). The contents of the draft letter shall also be discussed with the candidate face-to-face. The candidate is encouraged to respond to the draft letter, with the response reflected in the final version of the letter. The candidate may also write a formal response if s/he chooses. A copy of all final teaching observation letters and any written responses by the candidate will be placed in the candidate’s departmental file (in the engineering program office). The candidate may request an additional formal visit (and written observation summary) from the same evaluator(s) if desired. Every effort will be made to observe the full range of courses being taught by the candidate.

In addition to these direct observations, voting members may consider evidence from teaching evaluations, talks given to the College community, participation in learning groups, and presentations at Program events that include faculty and students. For the purposes of reappointment, the candidate will also be asked to submit one copy of a dossier for review by the voting members of the Program, which should include:

- Current CV (Smith format)
- Personal statement on teaching, scholarship, and service
- Materials that the candidate wishes to have considered in the reappointment review, which might include: course syllabi; examples of assignments and student work; teaching assessments/evaluations, reflections on course evolution over time; published papers; works in press or in review; funded and/or submitted grants proposals.

Modified and approved by the faculty in Engineering on: May 16, 2014.
Picker Engineering Program

Program Procedure for the Evaluation of Teaching of Tenured Faculty: Promotion from Associate to Full Professor:

Programmatic recommendations regarding promotion will be based on the evaluation of a candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to the Program, College, and the candidate’s professional communities at large. The evaluation of teaching will follow the procedure below.

All members eligible to vote must make at least one classroom visit during the three-semester period consisting of the semester of the review and the two semesters preceding it. The candidate being evaluated will provide several dates and times when visits would be acceptable, and will make the course syllabus available to visitors prior to the scheduled observation. All visits must be made in groups of two or more; participation in class discussions by visitors is strongly discouraged. Formal feedback regarding the visits is not expected, but the candidate is welcome to follow up with the visitors if she or he desires.

In addition to these direct observations, voting members may consider evidence from teaching evaluations, materials from the candidate’s dossier submitted for promotion, talks given to the College community, participation in learning groups, and presentations at Program events that include faculty and students.

Approved by the faculty in Engineering on October 22, 2014.
Procedures for Evaluating Teaching
English Department

The Department of English has (in votes taken in May 1977, February 1979, October 1983, May 1987, March 1992, October 2005, and October 2013) approved the following procedures for regular classroom visits. The purposes of classroom visiting are: (1) to assist and support members of the Department in developing their skills as teachers, and (2) to give the Department objective and reliable firsthand information about the teaching of its members to be used in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions, as required in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College.

1. One tenured member shall be delegated by the Committee on Committees as the Director of Classroom Visiting to arrange for classroom visits.

2. Teachers to be visited shall be notified of their assigned visitor by the end of the third week of the first semester each year. Visitors should be free at the times of both classes of the teacher being visited so that the teacher visited may choose which class is to be visited. By Department custom, seminars and advanced writing classes have not normally been considered suitable for visiting.

3. Members above the rank of the teacher visited, including assistant professors, may participate in the visiting and the filing of reports.

4. Tenure-track teachers in their first and second years shall be assigned two visitors during each year; the semester(s) in which such visits occur may be chosen by the teacher being visited. Each visitor need make only one visit; additional visits are optional at the discretion of the teacher being visited.

5. For teachers in their third year and beyond, one visitor shall attend one class each year. Further visits are optional, at the discretion of the teacher being visited.

6. No visits need be made in the semester before the twelve-month period in which tenure candidates are visited by the entire Department, although candidates may choose to be visited if they wish.

7. Visitor and visited shall observe professional courtesy: i.e., both will have ample time to know when a visit is to take place, and punctuality will be observed by the teacher visiting.

8. A reciprocal visit (to take place, perhaps, first) is encouraged, but not required.

9. Visits shall be followed by conferences within one week after the visit. Visitors may wish to use a draft of the teaching report as a basis for the conferences. Visitors will provide the teacher visited with a copy of the final teaching report before the end of the semester in which visits occur.
10. The conference following a visit shall take place in a suitably formal setting (for example, an office) unless the teacher visited states a preference for a more informal atmosphere.

11. Every visitor shall file a report of the visits and conference with the Director of Classroom Visiting before the end of the semester in which visits take place. The Director will keep a record of reports as they come in, in order that the Department may keep a record of individuals and classes visited, and pass reports on to the Chair of the Department for the personnel file of the teacher being visited.

12. In the semester a teacher is to be considered for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the Director of Classroom Visiting will specify the dates the visiting reports are due so that the reports will be available for review by the members of the Department eligible to vote on reappointment, promotion, or tenure. In the case of promotion to full professor, it's the department's custom to appoint a subcommittee of voting professors to visit classes.

13. Teachers visited shall have the option of scheduling visits at any mutually convenient time during the semester, exclusive of the first and last weeks.

14. In the case of any serious scheduling conflicts, the teacher visited shall have the option of requesting an additional visitor or a change in the assigned visitor for a particular year.

15. Teachers holding appointments that do not automatically make them candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are to be visited only once a year and only at their own request, unless they wish to be considered for employment in the future (in which case they must be visited).

16. Lecturers with continuing appointments will be visited annually by one visitor each year in their first three years. In the year they are considered for reappointment, they will be visited by two visitors. Lecturers may invite any member of the English Department to visit their classes more often, but they are not required to do so.

17. Instructors of ENG 118 are to be visited by experienced teachers of writing, either regular faculty members of the English Department or, with the approval of the Director of the Jacobson Center, members of the Jacobson Center staff. New instructors of ENG 118 are to be visited once in their first year of teaching, once in their second year, and thereafter at the request of the instructor, the Director of the Jacobson Center, or the Chair of the English Department.

18. These policies do not apply to the Conkling or Drew Professors, or to persons teaching English 399, the teaching methods class.
Environmental Science & Policy Program Governance Guidelines
Approved on 6 May 2014 by the ES&P Program Committee
Revisions approved on 19 December 2017 by the ES&P Program Committee

Composition and Expectations of Service

The ES&P Program Committee is comprised of tenured, tenure-track, and visiting faculty who have been nominated by the committee, recommended by their host department or program for service on ES&P, and appointed by the Provost for renewable 3 to 5-year terms. The committee includes those with full-time or joint appointments in the program and can include those who teach courses listed as requirements and electives, as well as scholars working in environmental studies. Members shall vote (or achieve consensus) on matters of curriculum, programming, policy, and hiring.

Membership on the ES&P Program Committee consists of an array of expectations, including:

- Advising a share of ES&P major advisees, in coordination with the program director and coordinator;
- Attending regular (monthly) program meetings and occasional retreats;
- Assisting in the development of policies associated with program administration;
- Serving on at least one of the program subcommittees;
- Communicating regularly with the program director and coordinator about course offerings; and
- Participating in events/receptions on a regular basis – e.g., Conversations during First-Year Orientation, presentations of the major, lectures sponsored by the program, presentation of research findings by honors students and students in the capstone course, events, etc.

Election of the Program Director

The Director of the Program shall be appointed by the Provost on the recommendation of the voting members of the Program Committee and may be reappointed for subsequent terms. The Director shall ordinarily be selected from those holding permanent positions on the faculty, and preferably from the ranks of full professors. The selection of the Director shall normally take place every three years. The Director shall be selected no later than February and take office on or about the first of July.

Procedures for Review, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

ES&P complies with the provisions of Sections 52-55 of the Code of Faculty Legislation and Administrative Practice.

The Program is committed to gathering information and providing feedback to faculty members in ways that are collegial, constructive and substantive. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and untenured members of the ES&P Program Committee that focus on achieving excellent teaching and on constructive discussions of scholarship – including works in progress. These procedures supplement the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.
a. Personnel Review Committee

For tenure-track faculty members hired with full or joint tenure-track appointments in the Program, the Program will create a personnel review committee at the time of hiring that will continue through the candidate’s probationary period in order to provide consistency and stability. The personnel review committee will normally be composed of tenured members (former or current) of the ES&P Program Committee (up to a committee membership of five, plus the director, plus an alternate). At least one member of the personnel review committee must have served on the search committee. In the event that a member of a personnel review committee is unable to continue serving on the committee, the alternate will normally join the committee for the remainder of the candidate’s probationary period. In the event that a member of a personnel review committee departs the ES&P Program Committee, that member is encouraged, but not required, to continue serving on the personnel review committee. If there is a change in directorship during the probationary period, the director normally will be added to the personnel review committee upon approval of the tenure-track faculty member. During the course of the probationary period, all members of the personnel review committee will take turns visiting classes, offering feedback on work in progress, and participating in annual reviews. All personnel review committee members will vote on reappointment and tenure.

b. Annual Class Visits

During each year of the probationary period, two members of the personnel review committee will visit a class at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited. The visitors will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the candidate within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The untenured faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report, and any response, will be filed with the Director and may be summarized, along with other reports, in letters concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.

c. Annual Review

At the conclusion of each academic year, the Director and at least one additional member of the faculty member’s personnel review committee will conduct an annual review. This review includes a meeting to provide an opportunity for the untenured faculty member to identify specific goals for the coming year so that the Program can assist the candidate in developing a dossier. Discussion will address teaching, scholarship (including work in progress), and service. A letter summarizing this discussion and any recommendations made during the meeting will be sent to the untenured member, who may respond to or amend the summary if necessary.

d. Reappointment and Tenure Procedures

At the time of review for reappointment or tenure, all members of the personnel review committee (even if they are on sabbatical or leave) will review the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate, in accordance with the policies of the college. The personnel review committee will solicit all tenured members of the Program Committee to contribute information related to any of the criteria for reappointment or tenure for which they have first-hand knowledge.
Exercise & Sport Studies
Teaching Evaluation Procedures

1. The candidate will meet with the chair or Acting Chair of the Department to design a plan to review his/her teaching.

2. The plan shall be approved by the Department.

3. Members of the Department of the rank above the candidate shall visit classes and evaluate the candidate.

4. The plan shall include:
   
   a. The opportunity for all members of the Department, eligible to vote on this decision, to make pre-arranged visits to two classes.

   b. Conferences following each visit.

   c. At least one evaluation in the area of the candidate’s field of specialization.

   d. A written report of the evaluation shall be placed on file in the Department Office.

   e. If requested by the candidate, a written assessment of his/her teaching at the time of reappointment.

   f. Opportunity to solicit student evaluations in addition to those solicited for the course critique.

(Revised 11-15-01)
Visiting Procedures: Film Studies Program

Premises:
Although classroom visits are mandated by the College for necessary and important purposes of evaluating non-tenured faculty members, we intend such visits to be collegial and advisory, offered in the spirit of helpfulness and constructive suggestion, encouragement and the sharing of teaching ideas. We regard this as particularly important for relatively new colleagues, as well as for more experienced ones.

Rules:
1. Courses with a primary listing in FLS taught by non-tenured members of the Faculty shall be visited at least once each year by one member (or more, if mutually agreeable) of the Film Studies Board whose rank is above that of the person visited.

2. Visits shall be made by prior arrangement with the person visited.

3. The teacher visited shall have the option of requesting a second visit.

4. The teacher visited is encouraged to visit a class or classes taught by the visitor, or by any other member of the Film Studies Board.

5. All classroom visits shall be followed by a conference, in a setting acceptable to the person visited, held--at the earliest--one day after the visit, but not later than two weeks thereafter. The visitor may wish to use a draft of the teaching report as a basis for the conference about the class visit.

6. Every visitor shall file a written report of the classroom visit with the current chair of the Film Studies Executive Committee. The visitor will provide the teacher visited with a copy of the final teaching report.

7. If the teacher visited wishes to comment on the final report, he or she may file a written statement with the visitor and with the current chair of the Films Studies Executive Committee.

Terms:
"The Film Studies Board" designates that group of faculty members who in any given year are teaching FLS courses or courses cross-listed in FLS.

"Film Studies Executive Committee" designates the group of tenured faculty members appointed by the Dean of the Faculty to oversee the work of Ben Singer.
DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH STUDIES
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

AMENDED 8 OCTOBER 2003

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

All members of the Department of French Studies are invited to visit language, literature, and cultural studies classes of colleagues senior in rank to them and/or to discuss ideas about teaching with them at any time. In addition, all members of the department are encouraged to attend their colleagues’ lectures, open class meetings, papers delivered at professional meetings and other public presentations.

TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES
TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. CLASS VISITS

A. Second year of a tenure-track position

During the third or fourth semester of a faculty member’s renewable tenure-track appointment, several senior faculty will visit at least two of the candidate’s classes, preferably two different courses, including, if possible, one language course. They will visit in teams of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. An additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved and by agreement of all. The visitors’ final reports ought to mention that more than one class visit took place. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

B. Reappointment to a tenure-track position

During the three-semester period consisting of the semester of any recommendation for reappointment and the two semesters preceding it, all faculty members eligible to vote on the reappointment in question will visit at least one of the candidate’s classes, so that a variety of classes is evaluated. They will visit in teams of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.
After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. An additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved and by agreement of all. The visitors' final reports ought to mention that more than one class visit took place. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

C. Tenure decision

During the three-semester period consisting of the semester of any recommendation for tenure and the two semesters preceding it, all faculty members eligible to vote on the tenure in question will visit at least one of the candidate's classes, so that a variety of classes is evaluated. They will visit in teams of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. An additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved and by agreement of all. The visitors' final reports ought to mention that more than one class visit took place. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

D. Promotion to assistant or associate professor

During the semester of a promotion decision, all faculty members eligible to vote on the promotion will visit at least one of the candidate's classes, so that a variety of classes is evaluated. They will visit in teams of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. An additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved and by agreement of all. The visitors' final reports ought to mention that more than one class visit took place. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

E. Promotion to full professor

For promotion to full professor, members of the department eligible to vote on the promotion may appoint a committee that will decide, in consultation with the candidate, what measures, consistent with the policies of the Department of French Studies, are appropriate for evaluating the candidate's teaching.
2. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

The department will use only the official College Course Critique in its considerations of reappointment, tenure and promotion. Intra-departmental course surveys may also be consulted, if the candidate and eligible voting members of the department agree to do so.

The Chair of the department and one other senior member will have a discussion with tenure-track faculty about their student teaching evaluations during their annual meeting.

TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES
NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

1. CLASS VISITS

At least two senior faculty will visit a course taught by a non-tenure-track faculty member during his or her contract period. They will visit in teams of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the instructor and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. The instructor may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

Visits to a non-tenure-track faculty member’s classes after her or his initial contract period may be arranged by agreement of the instructor and eligible voting members of the department.

2. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

The department will use only the official College course critique in its considerations of a non-tenure-track faculty member’s teaching. Intra-departmental course surveys may also be consulted, if the faculty member and eligible voting members of the department agree to do so.

The Chair of the department or a representative from among the department members eligible to vote on a non-tenure-track renewal will discuss student teaching evaluations with a non-tenure-track member of the department once during her/his first contract period and thereafter as the Chair finds appropriate.
SMITH COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING
May, 2000
*** *** ***

The evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching in the geology department shall be governed by the following guidelines:

1. Each non-tenured faculty member shall have one course evaluation each year, the course to be evaluated being decided by discussion between that faculty member, and those eligible to participate.

2. At least two members of the geology department faculty of higher rank than the faculty member being evaluated shall participate in the evaluation. Insofar as possible, those participating shall be chosen so that each faculty member being evaluated will be visited by all eligible faculty at least once every two years.

3. Each faculty member participating in an evaluation must make a minimum of two class visits. Each visit is to be for a full class meeting period.

4. Before the first visit for evaluation there shall be a conference attended by the course instructor and the prospective visitors. The purpose of this conference is to review and discuss the goals of the course. This pre-visit conference must take place before the end of the fourth week of the semester. To facilitate discussion and enhance the value of the pre-visit conference the instructor shall bring any pertinent course materials, e.g. a syllabus or course outline, readings, etc., to the conference. It is the responsibility of all instructors eligible for reappointment, tenure or promotion to ensure that these materials are on file with the chair of the department and are kept up to date.

5. There shall be a post-visit conference between the visitors and the instructor at the end of the semester during which the visits were made. The purpose of this meeting will be to review the course in light of the objectives identified at the pre-visit conference and to recommend and discuss possible ways in which the teaching of the course might be improved. A written summary of this discussion should be approved by all participants, and it will become a permanent part of the instructor’s record.

Tenured faculty members shall have their teaching evaluated in their fourth year in rank and in the year when being considered for promotion. All faculty eligible to vote on the promotion shall participate in the evaluation, which should follow the procedures outlined in items 3. – 5. above.
SMITH COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY
PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

*********

Student evaluation of the teaching of geology faculty shall be obtained according to the following course evaluation guidelines:

1. Information concerning courses shall be obtained by means of a questionnaire drawn up jointly by the student liaisons and the geology department faculty.

2. Each course shall be evaluated each time that it is taught.

3. Student responses shall be anonymous.

4. Every effort shall be made to ensure that all students in a course respond to the questionnaire, including both geology majors and non-majors. Time should be set aside during a class meeting for the completion and collection of responses. Distribution and collection of questionnaires shall be the responsibility of the student liaisons or their appointees. The confidentiality of the evaluations must be strictly maintained throughout.

5. The questionnaire should incorporate a question or questions designed to determine the extent of the respondent's background in geology.

6. A record of the total enrollment in each course and the percentage of response shall be kept by the department.

7. All responses shall be kept by the evaluated individual and must be made available to those department members who are in the process of making a formal evaluation with respect to reappointment, promotion or tenure of said individual.
SMITH COLLEGE DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN STUDIES
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

I. Classroom Visits

A. Each permanent member of the department must visit each non-tenure-track faculty member in the first semester of his/her employment at Smith College.

B. In the first semester of his/her employment at the College each non-tenure-track faculty member should normally visit one class taught by each permanent member of the department.

C. Each permanent member of the department should normally visit each non-tenure-track faculty member once a year in subsequent semesters.

D. In subsequent semesters each non-tenure track faculty member should normally visit one class taught by a permanent member of the department.

E. A schedule of visits will be arranged by mutual agreement; there will be no unannounced visits. If agreeable to the non-tenure-track faculty member, s/he may be visited by more than one eligible member at a time and/or on two consecutive class days.

F. Each visit will be discussed in a conference between the non-tenure-track faculty member and his/her visitor(s).

G. The visitor will record his/her evaluation and comments in a written report that will be given to the non-tenure-track faculty member by the end of the semester in which the visitation took place. A copy of this report should be placed in the departmental files. The non-tenure-track faculty member shall have full access to such reports and may respond to them in writing.

H. All department members, regardless of rank are encouraged to visit their colleagues teaching courses on similar topics or levels.

II. Supporting Evidence

A. Permanent members of the department must also consider course structure, organization, assignments given, and the care taken and methodology employed in assessing student performance. To this end, the non-tenure-track faculty member must furnish visitors with copies of all course syllabi, reading lists, quizzes, bibliographies, final examinations, and other instructional materials used in all courses.

B. The permanent members of the department should also consider the participation of the non-tenure-track faculty member in courses, lectures, discussion groups outside of the department or the college (e.g., Five-College, Interterm, interdisciplinary offerings) as well as his/her publication record.

C. The non-tenure-track faculty member is urged to submit the results of peer review conducted by other departmental colleagues who are not permanent members of the department as well as by faculty, staff, or other non-student visitors from outside the department who have participated in his/her courses.

D. Information on student assessment obtained from the supplemental departmental evaluation will be placed in the departmental file of the non-tenure-track faculty member.
Department of Government

Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Appointment to Tenure

Introduction:

The Department's procedures for reappointment, promotion, and appointment to tenure are governed by the college-wide policies enumerated in the Yellow Document. In addition to carrying out those explicitly outlined in the Yellow Document, departments are mandated to establish their own procedures in the following three areas:

1. Non-tenured members are to be reviewed annually by each department. That review is to cover scholarship and service to the College. (Mandated by Sections II.B.2.a. and e.; II.B.3.; II.B.4.) *Note:* A statement of the Department's analysis of the effect of institutional considerations is explicitly required only in conjunction with the original letter of appointment and subsequent letters on reappointment, promotion, and tenure (see Sections I.A.2.e. and II.B.5.a.). Institutional considerations need not, therefore, be part of the required annual review.

2. All voting members are required "to acquire first-hand knowledge" of a candidate's teaching during the year prior to a decision on tenure. This requirement is mandated in Section II.B.2.d., but procedures are left up to the individual departments.

3. Continued evidence of teaching of an excellent quality must be gathered as part of a decision on the promotion of tenured members. (Mandated by Sections II.A.1.c. and d.)

The Department is not required to develop additional procedures for evaluating scholarship in conjunction with a vote on promotion or tenure: those procedures are dealt with explicitly in the Yellow Document.

1. For promotion to Assistant Professor, see II.A.1.a.

2. For promotion to Associate or Full Professor, see III.A.1.e.-f.

3. For appointment to tenure, see IV.B.2.c.-e.
I. **Departmental procedures for the annual review of non-tenured members.** Sections II.B.2.a. and e.; II.B.3.; II.B.4.

The Chair and another senior member of the Department shall meet annually with each regular non-tenured member to discuss and evaluate the member's teaching, scholarship, and service to the College, pursuant to the provisions of Sections II.B.2.a. and e.; II.B.3.; II.B.4.

II. **Departmental procedures for consideration of the reappointment of a non-tenured member.**

1. A reappointment review committee will be chosen following the procedures specified under I. above.

2. Review of Teaching.

   a. The committee will visit at least one course. The committee and non-tenured member will decide how many class meetings are to be attended and which class(es) are appropriate for visitation.

      a.1. **At the option of the candidate, the candidate may meet with the committee before the visit(s) to prepare for the visit, and to discuss the place of the class(es) in the course(s) as a whole.**

   b. Class visits will be followed by a conference with the non-tenured member at which the visitors will discuss their reactions to the class(es). After the conference between the non-tenured member and the committee, the members of the committee will write a report (either jointly or separately) which will be circulated to the other tenured members of the department and then placed in the permanent file. The non-tenured member will receive a copy of the report(s) and may write a reply for the file.

   c. For an initial appointment, there will be no visitation in the first year, unless the candidate requests it.

   d. The above procedure is only concerned with classroom visitation. For other acceptable methods of evaluation teaching, see III. Below.
3. Review of scholarship and service.

Candidates should submit an up-dated c.v. (being sure to include in it conference participation and other professional activities); copies of any materials published since hiring or the last evaluation; and a statement of current research and future plans. Candidates may, at their option, submit work in progress.

The reappointment committee shall review the candidate’s record of scholarly activity and service to the College (see II.A.2.b. and II.B.1.b.). The members of the committee will write a report either jointly or separately. The candidate will receive a copy of the report(s) before the Department meets to consider the reappointment and may write a reply for the file. The report(s) and any reply from the candidate will be circulated to the other members of the Department eligible to participate in the decision and placed in the candidate’s permanent file.

External reviews of scholarship are not required by the College in the case of reappointment. If requested by the candidate, these shall be solicited by the Department Chair, following as closely as possible the procedures outlined for the Tenure and Promotion Committee in III.A.1.e.-g. of the Yellow Document.

III. Departmental procedures for evaluation teaching in conjunction with a tenure decision

In accordance with College regulations (see II.B.2.d.), the voting members of the Department are to “acquire first-hand knowledge” of a candidate’s teaching during the year prior to a decision on tenure. The following practices may be utilized in any combination to achieve such “first-hand knowledge.”

1. Attendance at public lectures either at the College or at professional meetings.

2. Joint teaching with the candidate.

3. Class visits under the following procedures:
   a. Visitors will consult with the candidate as to whether they should attend class on a particular or at their own convenience.
   b. Visitors will normally attend classes in groups of two or more.
   c. Following the visit the visitors will write a report, either separately or jointly, which will be placed in the candidate’s permanent file. If the candidate wishes, he/she may read that report and write a reply for the file.
d. The Chair of the Department will keep a record of the visits.

IV. Departmental procedures for evaluating teaching in conjunction with a promotion decision

In case of the promotion of a non-tenured member to associate professor, or a tenured member to full professor, all members voting on the promotion must have first-hand knowledge, as described above, of the candidate's teaching. All voting members must also review the candidate's scholarship. External review is required for these candidates, in accordance with III.A.1.e.-g. of the Yellow Document.
Non Tenure-Track Faculty
If there is no anticipation that the appointee will ever teach in Smith History again, there is no class visit, unless the appointee requests it for a letter of recommendation.
If an appointee might be hired again, two tenured or tenure-track members of the Department visit a class.
The visitors should discuss the class with the faculty member visited.
The visitors report verbally to the Department and curriculum committee.
A written Report on the Visiting of Classes is not required.
If a visitor fills out a class visit form for the departmental personnel file, the person visited also gets a copy.
Such visits need not be repeated in subsequent years.

Tenure-Track Faculty
Annual class visit by two tenured members of the Department.
Conversation about class with visited faculty member.
A written Report on the Visiting of Classes is required sometime before a month after the visit has taken place.
The person visited gets a copy of the Report on the Visiting of Classes.
A copy goes into the departmental personnel file.
Annual end-of-year conference with chair.
Another senior Department member or a member of a related Program may also attend.
Brief report to Provost that conference has taken place.
A written summary of the meeting is given to the tenure track colleague.
A copy of the summary is placed in the personnel file.

Reappointment
All tenured members visit classes, at least 2 people at a time (more only with approval of visited faculty)
Meet with candidate to discuss class.
Fill out class visit form.
Copy of class visit form to candidate.
Copy of class visit form to departmental personnel file.
At the meeting to decide on reappointment, reports on class visits and copies of the college-wide formal course critiques are made available to all participants, and provide a basis for discussion of the candidate's teaching.

Tenure
As for reappointment.

* Not included here are procedures specifically mandated by the yellow document about dossiers, outside reviewers, etc. See also History Department Mentoring Guidelines.
Italian Department
Procedures for Evaluating Teaching Ability

I. Classroom Visits

A. Whenever possible, each candidate for re-appointment, promotion, or tenure will be visited once a year by an eligible voting member in each course he/she teaches. An "eligible voting member" is a member of the department eligible to participate and vote in the candidate's re-appointment, promotion and/or tenure decision.

B. Each eligible member is expected to visit each candidate at least once during his/her first year at Smith as well as in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure decision years.

C. A schedule of visits will be arranged by mutual agreement; there will be no unannounced visits. If agreeable to the candidate, he/she may be visited by more than one eligible member at a time and/or on two consecutive class days.

Visitors should not limit their evaluations to the class presentation alone but, wherever appropriate, consider course structure, organization, assignments given, and the care taken in assessing student performance. To this end, the candidate may wish to supply his/her visitors with copies of the course syllabus, reading lists, bibliographies, and other instructional materials used in the course.

D. Each visit will be discussed in a conference between the candidate and his/her visitor(s).

E. The visitor will record his/her evaluation and comments in a written report which will be placed in the departmental files by the end of the semester concerned. The candidate shall have full access to such reports and may respond to the report in writing.

F. All department members, regardless of rank, are encouraged to visit their colleagues teaching courses on similar topics or levels.

II. Supporting Evidence

A. Wherever appropriate, the departmental committee should also consider evaluations of the candidates' participation in courses, lectures, panels, and discussion groups outside of the department.

B. The candidate is urged to submit the results of peer review conducted by departmental colleagues who are not eligible voting members, as well as by faculty, staff, or visitors from outside the department who have participated in his/her courses.

3-10-88
These procedures apply to faculty appointed in Jewish Studies.

Reviews for reappointment, tenure, or promotion

1. If the Director of the Program is to be evaluated, the Chair of the Advisory Committee coordinates the evaluation, in accordance with these procedures.

2. Within the three semesters leading up to a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion, members of the Program eligible to vote at least one course in Jewish Studies or cross-listed in Jewish Studies, for the purpose of evaluating the candidate's teaching. The timing of all such visits is mutually agreed between the visiting members and the candidate in advance. Normally, two members attend the same class meeting.

3. After completing the visit, each member confers individually with the candidate, and shares observations and suggestions. In a timely fashion, each member draws up a written report on the class meeting visited for the candidate's Program file. The candidate receives a copy of that written report and may reply verbally and/or in writing for the file. In addition, the candidate or a visitor may request a second visit, to be conducted in accordance with the above procedures.

4. Members of the Program eligible to vote in a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion who will be on leave or otherwise away from campus during the semester of the decision are informed during the previous semester by the Director, or in the event that the Director is to be evaluated, by the Chair of the Advisory Committee, that the decision is pending and are notified of all meetings relating to the decision.

5. At the meeting at which a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion is to be made, members' reports on class visits, candidate's replies, year-end reports from past Directors, communications from other Departments or Programs for which the candidate teaches, the results of the College-wide formal course critiques, and any other material related to teaching that the candidate submits, are made available to all participants, and constitute the basis for discussion of the candidate's teaching.
Mentoring

1. The Director, or a designate, plus another member of the Jewish Studies Program, visits classes of candidates on the tenure-track during the first or second year they teach, and at least once during the period between the first review for reappointment and the year of the tenure review.

2. In these or other years, a candidate may request additional visits. At the candidate’s request, these observations may also be written up.

3. Reciprocal visits, by candidates to the classes of senior colleagues, are welcome.

4. Normally a member of the Program on the tenure track will meet annually with the Director, or with the chair of the advisory committee, to review teaching, scholarship, and service. A second member of the Program, or a representative from another Department or Program for which the candidate teaches, at Smith College or in the Five Colleges, may also attend. Following an annual meeting, the Director summarizes it in writing. A copy of the report is provided to the member on the tenure track, who may reply verbally or in writing. Reports on annual meetings and any written replies from a candidate are preserved in the candidate’s Program file.
Reviews for reappointment, tenure, or promotion

1. Any current member of the Advisory Committee in Jewish Studies who has completed one or more years of service as a member of that Committee during the period the candidate has taught at Smith College is eligible to vote in decisions on reappointment, tenure, or promotion, provided that that member holds a rank above the rank of the candidate.

2. If the Director of the Program is to be evaluated, the Chair of the Advisory Committee coordinates the evaluation, in accordance with these procedures.

3. During the academic year of a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion, members of the Program eligible to vote visit at least one course in Jewish Studies or cross-listed in Jewish Studies, for the purpose of evaluating the candidate's teaching. The timing of all such visits is arranged by the visiting members and the candidate. Normally, two members attend the same class meeting.

4. After completing the visit, each member confers individually with the candidate, and shares observations and suggestions. In a timely fashion, each member draws up a written report on the class meeting visited for the candidate's Program file. The candidate receives a copy of that written report and may reply verbally and/or in writing for the file. In addition, the candidate or a visitor may request a second visit, to be conducted in accordance with the above procedures.

5. Members of the Program eligible to vote in a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion who will be on leave or otherwise away from campus during the semester of the decision are informed during the previous semester by the Director, or in the event that the Director is to be evaluated, by the Chair of the Advisory Committee, that the decision is pending and are notified of all meetings relating to the decision.
6. At the meeting at which a decision on reappointment, tenure, or promotion is to be made, members' reports on class visits, candidate's replies, year-end reports from past Directors, communications from other Departments or Programs for which the candidate teaches, the results of the College-wide formal course critiques, and any other material related to teaching that the candidate submits, are made available to all participants, and constitute the basis for discussion of the candidate's teaching.

Evaluations outside review for reappointment, promotion or tenure

7. Following the above procedures, the Director, or a designate, plus another member of the Jewish Studies Program, visits classes of candidates on the tenure-track during the first or second year they teach, and at least once during the period between the first review for reappointment and the year of the tenure review.

8. In these or other years, a candidate may request additional visits, which are carried out in accordance with the procedures above.
LALS Governance Guidelines
Approved July 27, 2016 by the LALS Program Committee

The Latin American and Latino/a Studies Program operates under the provisions of Sections 52-55 of the Code of Faculty Legislation and Administrative Practice.

Composition of the LALS Steering Committee of the Program Committee and Expectations of Service

The LALS Steering Committee of the Program Committee is normally comprised of three tenured and tenure-track faculty members who have been nominated by the Program Committee for renewable three-year terms and appointed by the Provost. The Committee includes those with contractual full-time or joint appointments in the Program and may include those who teach courses cross-listed in the Program and/or who are scholars in the field. In all matters of curriculum, programming, policy, and hiring in the LALS program, voting members shall be those members of the Steering Committee qualified to vote at faculty meetings.

Membership on the Steering Committee entails these minimum expectations of service:

1. Regular attendance at monthly meetings and retreats
2. Advising: Academic (majors and minors), Honors and Study Abroad advising
3. Other commitments to the intellectual work of the Program as identified by the Program Director and Committee (see below)

These service commitments may include teaching a course with a LAS or LS prefix or a course cross-listed in the Program, representing Smith on the Five College Latin American, Caribbean and Latina/o Studies Council, serving as a mentor to new faculty and serving on a LALS subcommittee (e.g. personnel, curriculum, assessment, or ad hoc).

Composition of the LALS Program Committee and Expectations of Service

The LALS Program Committee is comprised of faculty who teach courses cross-listed in the Program and/or who are scholars in the field, who have been nominated by the Committee and appointed by the Provost for renewable five-year terms. Affiliation entails these minimum expectations of service:

1. Attendance at one designated Program meeting per semester, as scheduled by the Director
2. Additional service commitments as designated in a Memorandum of Understanding authorized by the Provost; these may include appointment to search committees, the
Personnel Committee of untenured members of the Program Committee, or the Review team for Affiliated members of the Program, for example.

Election of the Program Director

The Director of the Program shall be appointed by the Provost on the recommendations of the voting members of the Program Committee and may be reappointed for subsequent terms. The Director shall ordinarily be selected from those holding permanent positions on the faculty, and preferably from the ranks of full professors. **The selection of the Director shall normally take place every three years.** The Director shall be selected no later than February and take office on or about the first of July.

Procedures for Review, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

The procedures below reflect the Program’s commitment to gather information and provide feedback to faculty members in ways that are collegial, constructive and substantive. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and untenured members of the LALS Program Committee that focus on achieving excellent classroom teaching in a variety of modes and on constructive discussions of scholarly work in progress. These procedures supplement the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

1. **Procedures for Untenured Faculty Members with Full or Joint Appointments in LALS**

a. **Personnel Review Committee**

For tenure-track members hired with full or joint tenure-track appointments in the LALS Program, the Program will create a personnel review committee at the time of hiring that will continue through the candidate’s probationary period. The requirement to serve as appointed on the personnel review committee remains in place even when a Program Committee member cycles off the committee. The personnel review committee will normally be composed of at least three faculty members drawn from: tenured faculty members with full and joint appointments in the Program, and/or additional tenured members of the LALS Program Committee, and/or additional tenured faculty affiliated with LALS (up to a committee membership of five, plus an alternate). At least one member of the personnel review committee must have served on the search committee. In the event that member of a personnel review committee is unable to continue serving on the committee, the alternate will join the committee for the remainder of the candidate’s probationary period. During the course of the probationary period, all members of the candidate’s personnel review committee will take turns visiting classes, offering feedback on
work in progress, and participating in annual reviews. All personnel review committee members will vote on reappointment and tenure.

b. Annual Class Visits

During each year of the probationary period, the personnel review committee will visit a class together, at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited. The visitors will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the candidate within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The untenured faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report, and any response, will be filed with the Director and may be summarized along with other reports, in letters concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.

c. Annual Review

At the conclusion of each academic year, the Director of LALS and at least one additional member of a faculty member’s personnel review committee will conduct an annual review. This review includes a meeting that will provide an opportunity for the untenured faculty member to identify specific goals for the coming year so that the Program can assist the candidate in developing a dossier. Discussion will address teaching, scholarship (including work in progress), and service. A letter summarizing this discussion and any recommendations made during the meeting will be sent to the untenured member, who may respond to or amend the summary if necessary.

d. Reappointment and Tenure Procedures

At the time of review for reappointment or tenure, all members of the personnel review committee (even if they are on sabbatical or leave) will review the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate, in accordance with the policies of the college. The personnel committee will solicit all tenured members of the current LALS Program Committee to contribute information related to any of the criteria for reappointment or tenure for which they have first-hand knowledge.

II. Procedures for Program Committee Members

When a member of the Steering Committee of the Program Committee, or a member of the Program Committee who has contributed substantial additional service under the auspices of a Memorandum of Understanding and/or whose affiliation with the Program began before 2016, is being reviewed for reappointment, tenure or promotion, the Director, in consultation with the candidate, will appoint a review committee composed of three tenured faculty members, senior in rank to the candidate, drawn from: members of the LALS Steering
Committee of the Program Committee, and/or faculty members with full and joint appointments in the Program, and/or additional tenured members of the LALS Program Committee. All tenured members are eligible to serve on the review team except 1) members of the LALS Program Committee who will vote in the member’s home department/program or vote on the candidate in another affiliated program; 2) members who will vote on the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The candidate will provide the review committee with his or her dossier. At the candidate’s request, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion will provide the Program with copies of external evaluators’ comments. The review team will acquire first-hand knowledge of teaching through class visits within three semesters prior to the review, and will thoroughly review the candidate’s dossier. Class visits will be arranged in advance with the candidate and must be conducted in pairs.

As part of its evaluation, the review committee will solicit additional information concerning the candidate’s contributions to the Program from tenured members of the Program Committee. The chair of the review committee will provide a letter to the candidate’s department in time for its review and to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The letter will assess the candidate’s teaching and scholarship, as well as describe the candidate’s contributions to the Program. A copy will be provided to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to that letter.

Under normal circumstances when Program Committee members have not contributed additional service under the auspices of a memorandum of understanding, the Director will write a letter of appreciation concerning the candidate’s service to the Program.
GENERAL PRINCIPLES
All members of the Landscape Studies Program are invited to visit classes of colleagues senior in rank to them and/or to discuss ideas about teaching with them at any time. In addition, all members of the program are encouraged to attend their colleagues’ lectures, open class meetings, papers delivered at professional meetings and other public presentations.

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

I. TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. Class visits
Reappointment to a tenure-track position
During the three-semester period consisting of the semester of any recommendation for reappointment and the two semesters preceding it, all faculty members eligible to vote on the reappointment in question will visit at least one of the candidate’s classes, so that a variety of classes is evaluated. They will visit in groups of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. One additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved. The visitors’ final reports should mention that more than one class visit took place when this is the case. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

Promotion to associate professor
During the three-semester period consisting of the semester of any recommendation for promotion and the two semesters preceding it, all faculty members eligible to vote on the promotion will visit at least one of the candidate’s classes, so that a variety of classes is evaluated. They will visit in groups of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. An additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved and by agreement of all. The visitors’ final reports should mention that more than one class visit took place. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

Tenure decision
During the three-semester period consisting of the semester of any recommendation for tenure and the two semesters preceding it, all faculty members eligible to vote on the tenure in question will visit at least one of the candidate’s classes, so that a variety of classes is evaluated. They will visit in groups of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.
After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the candidate and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. An additional class visit may be arranged at the request of any of the individuals involved and by agreement of all. The visitors’ final reports should mention that more than one class visit took place. The candidate may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

**Promotion to full professor**

For promotion to full professor, members of the department eligible to vote on the promotion may appoint a committee that will decide, in consultation with the candidate, what measures, consistent with the policies of the Program of Landscape Studies, are appropriate for evaluating the candidate’s teaching.

**2. Student evaluations**

The department will use only the official College Course Critique in its considerations of reappointment, tenure and promotion. Intra-departmental course surveys may also be consulted, if the candidate and eligible voting members of the department agree to do so.

The Chair of the department and one other senior member will have a discussion with tenure-track faculty about their student teaching evaluations (as well as their scholarship and service) during their annual meeting.

**II. REAPPOINTMENT**

See II.A. and II. B., yellow document for evaluation of scholarship and service

**ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE FOR REAPPOINTMENT**

All officially appointed members of the Landscape Studies Program for the year in which the review is to take place and who hold a higher rank than the candidate are eligible to vote on re-appointment. For 2007-2008, this group consists of the following: Dean Flower, Andrew Guswa, Helen Horowitz, Barbara Kellum, Ann Leone, Michael Marcotrigiano, Douglas Patey.
I. TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. CLASS VISITS

At least two senior faculty members will visit a course taught by a non-tenure-track faculty member during his or her contract period. They will visit in groups of two or three; all concerned will agree in advance on the date of the visit.

After the class, each visitor will write a preliminary report on the class observed. She or he will distribute this preliminary report to the instructor and the other visitor(s). Shortly thereafter, all concerned will discuss the class and any relevant course materials. The instructor may respond in writing to the final reports. These reports and any responses will become part of the departmental personnel files.

Visits to a non-tenure-track faculty member's classes after her or his initial contract period may be arranged by agreement of the instructor and eligible voting members of the department.

2. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

The department will use only the official College course critique in its considerations of a non-tenure-track faculty member’s teaching. Intra-departmental course surveys may also be consulted, if the faculty member and eligible voting members of the department agree to do so.

The Chair of the department or a representative from among the department members eligible to vote on a non-tenure-track renewal will discuss student teaching evaluations with a non-tenure-track member of the department once during her/his first contract period and thereafter as the Chair finds appropriate.

II. REAPPOINTMENT

See Sections V and VI of the yellow document.
Program in Medieval Studies
Review Procedures
Approved September 5, 2014 by the Medieval Studies Program Committee

Medieval Studies does not review faculty affiliated with the program for the purpose of reappointment, promotion or tenure. The program's participation in such reviews is limited, upon the request of the faculty member, to a letter of support addressed to the Tenure & Promotion Committee.
The guidelines below are meant to supplement those obligations set forward in the Policy of Appointment, Reappraisal, Promotion and Tenure. While the primary intention of the procedures set out here is for evaluation, we hope it also provides an opportunity for the exchange of ideas between junior and senior colleagues. It is an opportunity to hear each other’s perspectives on teaching.

Primary Teaching Evaluation:
Those members of the department who are either tenure track or replacement faculty will receive a primary teaching evaluation at least once each year. Evaluations shall be carried out by those members of the department who are designated in the Policy as being eligible to vote on a recommendation to reappoint or promote the member being evaluated. The chair will assist in assigning reviewers. The following are guidelines for a primary teaching evaluation.

1. An evaluation will be conducted by two reviewers.
2. Prior to any class visits the instructor and the reviewers will have a discussion about the courses the instructor is teaching. This discussion will provide a context for class visits. The discussion should include course content, textbook choice, methods of student evaluation, pedagogical approach, class dynamics etc.
3. The instructor should provide the reviewers with material such as a syllabus, examples of the work of the course, and access to the course Moodle page as appropriate.
4. Together the reviewers should observe at least one meeting of the class. The class to be visited should be agreed upon with the instructor at least 2 days in advance.
5. The reviewers or the instructor may request additional class visits.
6. When observing a class, reviewers are expected to be quiet observers. They may ask to look at a student’s book or copy of an assignment, but should otherwise not engage with the class.
7. A follow-up discussion should take place within a week of the class visit(s).
8. The reviewers will write a report. This report will often include a discussion of the syllabus and content of the course as well as the teaching and classroom dynamics. The document will be given to the instructor and placed in the departmental files. The instructor can place a response in the departmental files. The department copy is for use within the department only and other senior faculty may review them. The department will not share them with anyone outside the department with out permission of the instructor. Normally, the written report will be completed within 2 weeks of the class visits.

Instructors and reviewers may together agree to minor modification of these procedures to suit particular circumstances. In addition, in semesters where the number of instructors to be evaluated equals or exceeds the number of senior colleagues available to perform evaluations the chair may assign single reviewers to some junior colleagues.

Secondary Evaluations:
Occasionally, additional senior faculty members will evaluate the teaching of a lower ranked colleague. These evaluations may be made at the request of either party. Such an evaluation will usually not be as extensive as the primary evaluation described above, but may still be used in the review of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions. The
following will be sufficient for a secondary evaluation. Both parties will agree to the terms of the evaluation.
1. The reviewer will attend at least one meeting of a class.
2. The instructor and reviewer will have a discussion about the course to be visited either before or after the class visit.
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Guidelines for Mentoring Junior Faculty
Approved December 7, 2011

1. New tenure track faculty will be paired with a tenured colleague who will serve as a mentor during the junior person’s first 2 years at Smith. The mentoring pair should meet at least 2 times each semester.

2. Tenure track faculty will meet with a Chair’s committee each year. The committee will consist of the chair and at least one other tenured faculty member. The composition of the committee should vary. Normally such a meeting will be held in the spring. The junior member should provide the previous year’s faculty record sheet and cv and appropriate updates. The chair should have copies of the teaching reports and student evaluations from the past 2 semesters. The meeting should include a discussion of teaching, research and service. Both current performance and future plans should be discussed.

3. Non-tenure track faculty in multi-year positions will meet with the Chair each year. The meeting should be similar to those held with tenure track faculty.

4. When possible, new faculty will be assigned to teach sections of a course also being taught by a permanent colleague. The permanent colleague will be available to help the new member to help with all aspects of the course from setting the syllabus to writing exams. Except as departmental policy dictates, the new instructor will not be required to follow the exact plans of the senior colleague.

5. Members of the department are encouraged to discuss their thoughts about teaching and pedagogy. In particular, any member of the department may request to observe another member’s class. Such a visit should be agreed upon by all parties, normally at least 2 days in advance. Normally the visitor will be expected to be a quiet observer.

6. Visiting faculty will be apprised of the possibilities for renewals as early as is feasible.

Expectations of all faculty members.

1. Excellent teaching is expected. This is gauged by departmental reviews as described above and by student feedback.

Additional expectations for visiting Full and ¾ time faculty:
1. There are no explicit research expectations for visiting faculty, however, visitors should be aware that there are significant scholarship expectations for those in the tenure track.

2. Some departmental service is expected. For example participation in department meetings, curriculum discussions, attendance at departmental events (lectures, presentations). The expectation is greater for multi-year positions.

Additional Expectations for tenured and tenure track faculty:
1. Excellent research and scholarship is expected. This is gauged primarily by publications (including journal quality). Other factors include invitations to speak and participate in conferences or visit colleagues, organization of meetings/special sessions.

2. Departmental service is expected. This includes such things as active participation in departmental decisions, and contribution to departmental initiatives.
3. Contribute to student learning beyond regular classes through such things as honors, special studies, advising, and research projects.
Music Department Evaluation of Teaching Policy

The Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College makes the Chair of the department and the senior faculty, or some portion therefore, responsible for the evaluation of the teaching, scholarship, and creative endeavor of their junior colleagues. Evaluation of teaching in the Music Department will normally be based on the following items, which are listed here in no particular order of priority.

a) Teaching materials and syllabi;
b) Performances by students of the candidate and/or ensembles coached or conducted by the candidate;
c) Persuasive arguments by colleagues who have greater knowledge of the candidate’s work than others;
d) Conversations with the candidate about matters pertaining to teaching;
e) The student course critique or evaluative statements from students;
f) Class, lesson, or rehearsal visitations.

Except when the Policy mandates that all eligible-to-vote members of the department are to make class, lesson, or rehearsal visitations, the Chair of the department will appoint a visitation committee, consisting of three eligible-to-vote members of the department, to evaluate the teaching of the candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, be that candidate a tenured or tenure-track member of the department, a senior lecturer, or a lecturer appointed for half-time or more responsibilities. Members of this visitation committee will arrange class, lesson, or rehearsal visits, as a group or independently, at a time or times agreed to by the candidate. Normally members of the visitation committee will visit one or no more than two classes or lessons in a given semester. Each visit shall be for the entire period of the class or lesson. After each visit, members of the visitation committee will prepare a collective written evaluation, or separately written evaluations, that will be given to the candidate and placed in his or her personnel file.

In some cases this evaluation process may be carried out by videotaping, an alternative, when mutually acceptable to visitors and candidates, of which the department approves.

Drafted by Peter Bloom, February 11, 2008
Emended and approved, October 14, 2015
I. Composition and Expectations of Service

The Neuroscience Program welcomes all faculty whose teaching and scholarly interests intersect with the discipline of neuroscience and who wish to become members of the Program Committee. Faculty members who wish to join the Program Committee should inform the Neuroscience Program Director.

Members will receive a letter from the Provost officially appointing them to the Neuroscience Program Committee. Normally, members will be appointed for renewable five-year terms. They will also be informed of the Neuroscience Program’s Review Policy and Procedures for members undergoing reappointment, tenure or promotion in their home units (Sections II and III of this document).

A. Expectations for Neuroscience Program Members

Neuroscience Program Committee members are expected to attend regular program meetings and events hosted by the program and to serve as an academic advisor for Neuroscience majors. In addition, members may be asked to perform a specific task or service for the program, such as coordinating seminars, serving as the Director of Honors, representative to the SCCD or Program Director. Members of the program are called upon to provide research opportunities for Neuroscience majors by mentoring students in Special Studies and Honors Thesis projects. These types of hands-on research experiences are critical to the future success of our majors, and we depend upon the expertise of our program faculty to make these opportunities possible.
II. Review Policy for Neuroscience Program Committee Members undergoing Reappointment, Tenure or Promotion in their Home Units

As described in Section I of this document, each faculty member will be informed of the Neuroscience Program’s Review Policy and Procedures before being appointed to the Program Committee and reminded of these procedures at the time of their reappointment to the Program Committee.

All Tenured/Tenure-track Program Members

All Program members who are being considered for reappointment, promotion or tenure in their home units will be reviewed with respect to their service to the Neuroscience Program. We consider the Special Studies (NSC 400) and Honors (NSC 430) research opportunities that we offer to our students to be a critical part of the NSC curriculum. Therefore, we will review the scholarship of Program Committee members and examine the ability of their research program to provide these experiences for our majors.

Tenured/Tenure-track Program Members who Regularly Teach Core Courses

In addition, those Program Committee members who regularly teach Neuroscience courses (any NSC listed courses) will have their teaching in those courses reviewed to allow the Program to give input into the quality of teaching that our majors experience in their required coursework.

III. Review Procedure for Neuroscience Program Committee Members undergoing Reappointment, Tenure or Promotion in their Home Units

The procedures outlined below reflect the Program’s commitment to gather information and to provide feedback to faculty participating in the Program in ways that are collegial, constructive, substantive and cognizant of the expectations of the candidate’s home unit. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and tenure-track members of the Program Committee and are intended to clarify the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

Annual Meetings with the Program Director

At the end of each academic year, the Director will meet individually with all tenure-track Program Committee members and the Chairs of their home units. The annual meeting provides an opportunity for the tenure-track member to identify specific goals for the year so that the Program can be of most use in helping the candidate develop his or her progression through the ranks. For example, the tenure-track member may wish to focus on teaching (e.g. visiting classes of senior colleagues and inviting them to visit, reviewing syllabi, developing new courses,) or on scholarship (e.g. having tenured colleagues read and comment on work in progress, consulting with senior colleagues about submitting work for publication) or both. It also provides an opportunity for the Program Director to be informed of the expectations of the home unit with respect to progression toward tenure and promotion. Tenure-track members may elect to have their assigned Program mentor (see Neuroscience Program Mentoring document for details) join the annual meeting, another more senior Program member(s) of their choosing, or neither.

Composition of the Review Committee

When a member of the Program is being reviewed for reappointment, tenure or promotion, the Director, after consultation with the candidate and the Chair of the candidate’s home unit, will appoint a review committee composed of up to three tenured members of the
Program, senior in rank to the candidate. All tenured members are eligible to serve on the review committee except 1) members of the Program who will vote in the candidate’s home unit and 2) members who will vote on the College’s Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The review committee will be finalized upon consultation with the Provost.

Access to Review Materials and Evidence
The candidate will provide the Program review committee with his or her dossier in order for the committee to review the relevant sections. In the cases where the candidate regularly teaches in NSC-listed courses, the review committee will acquire first-hand knowledge of teaching within three semesters prior to a personnel review through class visits. Information about the candidate’s teaching in Special Studies (NSC 400) and Honors (NSC 430) may be obtained through examination of the candidate’s dossier and discussions with the candidate. The review committee will also examine copies of the external evaluators’ comments provided by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

Evaluation of Teaching (for those who regularly teach in NSC-listed courses)
Classroom visits should occur regularly, guided by the timetable set in annual meetings with the director, and should not be limited to the semester immediately preceding personnel decisions. Classroom visits will be conducted by faculty members at times suggested by the faculty member being visited. Classroom visits between tenured and tenure-track faculty can be reciprocal to increase the benefits to both and are encouraged outside the purposes of personnel reviews. The visits should be followed within two weeks by a conference to discuss outcomes.

For evaluation purposes, class visits should be limited to the review committee only unless opened to other Committee members by the candidate. When class visits are related to tenure and promotion decisions, they should be arranged in consultation with the home unit. Classroom visits are a valuable, but not the sole, means of acquiring first-hand knowledge of teaching and improving teaching effectiveness. Discussion of syllabi, assignments and attending public presentations given by the candidate are also important means of gathering information.

Review Committee Evaluation
Before writing its evaluation, the review committee will meet with all tenured members of the Neuroscience Program senior in rank to the candidate to discuss its recommendations and to solicit additional information concerning the candidate. Given that expectations for progress toward tenure and promotion can differ in different scholarly disciplines, the Program Director, assisted by senior Program members from the candidate’s home unit, will be asked to provide context for the review committee concerning the expectations for scholarship, service, and teaching (where applicable) in both the candidate’s home unit and discipline at large. This will ensure that the review committee will be mindful of the expectations for progress toward tenure and promotion that have been consistently expressed to the candidate before writing their review.

The Chair of the review committee will provide a letter detailing the results of the review and highlighting the candidate's contributions to the Neuroscience Program to the home unit and the Provost (in cases of reappointment) or the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (in cases of tenure and promotion) by the required deadlines. A copy of the letter will be provided to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to that letter.
These procedures are intended to improve the quality of teaching in the philosophy department as well as to provide data for the evaluation of junior members' teaching skills.

By the end of April,

each member whose work is to be evaluated must provide to the department secretary:

- a record of courses taught that academic year, syllabi or descriptions for those courses, enrollment figures and a copy of those pages of the Student Course Evaluation pertinent to her courses.

each senior member, not on leave or sabbatical (but including regular half-time appointments), must have visited a regularly scheduled class of the junior member and observed her teaching.

In the late spring, all senior members should meet to discuss the junior member's teaching, reviewing all pertinent documents and observations. They should summarize their conclusions, both positive and negative, in a written report to the junior member and invite a response. This response may be either a written addendum to the department's report, or a meeting between senior members and the junior member whose work is being reviewed.
Department of Physics
Plan for Assessment and Feedback for New Faculty Members
Last updated Fall 2013

Class visits
Each tenured member of the faculty will observe the new faculty member’s teaching 1-2 times each semester during their first year at Smith (unless prevented by scheduling conflicts). Each tenured faculty member will again observe a class 1-2 times in the year before reappointment, and again in the year before the tenure review. Following each such observation the tenured faculty member will provide written feedback to the new faculty member. In each year in which they observe the new faculty member’s teaching each tenured faculty member will submit a written summary of their evaluation to be kept by the department chair.

Evaluation of teaching
The departmental evaluation of the new faculty member’s teaching will include the written evaluations from class observations, course evaluations by students, and (to a lesser extent) professional presentations such as departmental seminars and Sigma Xi lunch talks.
SMITH COLLEGE
Department of Psychology
Plans for Mentoring and Evaluating Faculty

Section I. Statement of Purpose

1. The purpose of this document is to outline the Department of Psychology’s plans for mentoring and evaluating faculty who are facing review and/or promotion within the framework established by the Faculty Code and the “Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at Smith College” (referred to hereafter as the “Yellow Document”). Together with Psychology’s Personnel Committee, each faculty member will have the opportunity to clarify departmental expectations and receive feedback regarding his/her teaching, scholarship, and service. In order to provide transparency about departmental procedures for mentoring and evaluation, copies of the Departmental Procedure for evaluating personnel shall be distributed at the beginning of each academic year to every member of the Department.

Section II. Personnel Committee Functions

1. All the permanent members of the Department of Psychology will constitute the Personnel Committee. Members of the Personnel Committee will serve as liaisons for junior faculty on a rotating basis by semester with liaison assignments announced each spring. It is the liaisons’ responsibility to see that the plans for mentoring are carried out; to observe, supervise and provide feedback to the junior faculty member regarding his/her work; and to report back to the Personnel Committee.

2. Normally, the chair of the Department shall act as the chair of the Personnel Committee.

3. The committee shall meet at least once a year, and in addition as often as is deemed necessary by the chair.

4. The schedule for personnel evaluation and decisions conforms to the schedule of the college, with the following constraints:

   a) New members on any appointment other than a terminal one-year appointment be evaluated at the end of their first year of teaching, and be provided feedback regarding their performance.

   (b) During the first year of a multiple-year appointment, the chair of the Department and the new member shall discuss the contents of the Yellow Document as well as a tentative schedule of her or his evaluations up to the date of a tenure decision.
(c) For non-tenured members, including Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, there will normally be a full evaluation carried out in the year preceding their contract renewal review.

(d) Evaluation of members of the permanent staff below the rank of Professor, shall be conducted every third year unless the faculty member concerned requests an earlier appraisal.

(e) Normally, an appraisal will not be made during a year in which a faculty member concerned is on sabbatical leave or leave of absence for the entire year.

5. The functions of the committee shall be:

(a) to evaluate in accordance with the schedules outlined above, the work of the members of the Department, within the framework established by the Faculty Code and the "Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College," so that eventual recommendations for reappointment, promotion, or tenure shall rest on a solid, long-term basis;

(b) to provide, in accordance with the schedules outlined above, to each member of the faculty below the rank of full professor a statement of the committee's appraisal of her or his professional performance.

6. The Personnel Committee shall, before submitting its recommendation to the College, invite the participation of members of the Department for purposes of discussing the performance of the candidate. The purpose of this invitation is to effect an active exchange of views among all members of the Department to ensure that:

(a) no pertinent information is overlooked;

(b) there is full awareness throughout the Department of what evidence is being considered; and

(c) material which can influence the Personnel Committee in making a decision be exposed to critical discussion by all permanent members of the Department.

The proceedings of the discussion shall be confidential, but the Chair shall transmit in writing to the candidate a summary of the main points considered.

7. When the Personnel Committee has concluded its deliberations, its recommendations should be made known to the Department, the candidate, and the College administration in accordance with the Yellow Document.
Section III. Procedures for the collection of information

1. The committee shall be entrusted with maintaining a file on each faculty member, such file to be deposited with the chair. The information to be included in the file shall include:

   (a) correspondence and materials pertaining to the faculty member's original appointment;

   (b) any correspondence from outside reviewers solicited as part of an official evaluation; and

   (c) copies of yearly statements of appraisals provided by the committee to the faculty member and memoranda covering official consultations between her/him and the committee.

2. The candidate for evaluation shall be entrusted with developing a file of information deposited with the Chair for safe-keeping and privacy. The information to be included in the file may include:

   (a) syllabi or course outlines and other materials used in teaching and evaluating students;

   (b) a record of student evaluations of courses, provided such material was collected in systematic and unbiased fashion; and

   (c) any other materials relevant to his/her professional performance, such as Faculty Record Sheets, personal statements, recent reprints, etc.

3. The chair of the Personnel Committee, in consultation with the faculty member, determines whether additional information will be solicited from persons outside the Department who have been associated with the candidate, or know of his or her work (e.g., in the case in which a faculty member regularly contributes to, or teaches in, another department or program).

4. A candidate may add to the file any other material that she/he wishes to submit on her/his own behalf.

5. A candidate shall have the right to inspect all material in her/his own file except invited confidential letters from persons outside the Department. A list of such letters shall be appended to each file.
Section IV. Consultations between the Committee and a staff member

1. Consultations between the Committee and a faculty member shall include:

   (a) opportunity to explain the planning and conduct of one's courses at the invitation of either the Committee or the faculty member;

   (b) classroom visits by liaisons as well as other visitors, to be arranged in consultation with the faculty member, to be followed by a conference between the visitor(s) and faculty member; and

   (c) a yearly conference between the chair and/or other committee members and the faculty member, explaining the committee's statement of appraisal, reporting all criticisms, questions, or problems raised during consideration of the faculty member's performance, and taking note of the faculty member's own formulation her or his duties, and replies to the committee's appraisal.

2. Memoranda covering these official consultations shall be open to inspection by the candidate in question, so that he/she may be aware of their contents and, if she/he so desires, add his/her own written comments.

Voted:
May 10, 1973
May 24, 1973

Amended:
September 30, 1975
May 16, 1979
November 10, 1993
February 14, 2001
March 15, 2012

Filename:
MentoringPolicy2012.doc
Composition of the REEES Program Committee and Expectations of Service

The REEES Program Committee is comprised of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time lecturers who have been nominated by the Committee for renewable five-year terms and appointed by the Provost. The Committee will include faculty members with contractual full-time or joint appointments in the Program, as well as faculty who teach courses cross-listed in the Program and/or those faculty working in the field of Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies whose full-time appointments are in other Smith departments. In all matters of curriculum, programming, policy, and hiring in the REEES Program, voting members shall be those members of the Program Committee qualified to vote at faculty meetings.

Membership on the Program Committee entails these minimum expectations of service:

1. Attendance at REEES Program meetings and retreats;
2. Advising majors and minors when asked;
3. Assisting in Program development;
4. Contribution to the REEES curricular offerings, either through teaching courses with the REEES prefix or cross-listed by the Program;
5. Communicating regularly with the Program Director about course offerings, events, programs and extra-curricular activities that have direct relevance to the Program as a whole;
6. Other contributions to the intellectual work of the Program. These may include attendance at program events, representing Smith on the steering committee of the Five College REEES Program, serving as a mentor to new faculty, serving on a REEES subcommittee, and so forth.

Election of the Program Director

The Director of the REEES Program will be appointed by the Provost on the recommendation of the voting members of the Program Committee for a three-year term, and may be re-appointed for a subsequent three-year term. The position of Director, however, shall ordinarily rotate among those holding permanent positions on the faculty, and preferably from the ranks of full or associate professor. The Director shall be selected during the spring semester and take office on or about the first of July.
Procedures for Evaluating Tenure-Track Faculty

- During each year of the probationary period, tenured members of the REEES Program Committee normally visit at least one class taught by the tenure-track faculty member. The timing of the class visits is mutually agreed upon between the visiting members and the candidate in advance.

- Within the month following the class visit, the visitors will draft a report on the class visit and provide a copy to the candidate and the Program director. The Program director will meet with the candidate to discuss the report. If the Program director did not personally visit the class, one of the visitors will also attend this meeting. The junior faculty member may respond in writing to this report.

- A copy of this report (and any response) will be filed in the faculty member’s Program personnel file, and may be consulted and summarized in letters regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

- The candidate may also request a second visit, to be conducted in accordance with the procedures above.

- Normally, during the probationary period, the Program director meets annually with the candidate at the conclusion of each academic year in order to discuss teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as potential areas for improvement. Another member of the REEES Program Committee may also be present. In preparation for this meeting, the junior faculty member is urged to draft a brief statement regarding their academic accomplishments over the past year, and to bring a current c.v. and any other information they consider pertinent to the meeting. Following the meeting, the Program director will provide written report of the meeting for the candidate’s Program personnel file and also share it will the candidate. This letter will include observations and recommendations of members of the REEES Program Committee.

- A copy of this letter will be filed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file. The faculty member may respond to this letter in writing, and the response will also be placed in their departmental personnel file.

- The Program director will notify the Provost that the annual meeting has taken place.

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

- Within one year of the vote for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, each eligible voting member of the REEES Program Committee will normally visit at least one class in order to evaluate teaching. The timing of the class visits is mutually agreed upon between the visiting members and the candidate in advance. The Program director will ensure that at least two courses are visited for each review.
Within the month following the class visit, the visitors will draft a report on their class visit and provide a copy to the candidate and the Program director. The Program director will meet with the candidate to discuss the report. If the Program director did not personally visit the class, one of the visitors will also attend this meeting. The junior faculty member may respond in writing to this report.

At the time of review for reappointment or tenure, eligible voting members of the Program Committee will review the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate, in accordance with the policies of the college.

In accordance with current College policies, unless there are compelling reasons, all eligible members of the Program must vote (including those on sabbatical or leave) and be informed of meetings pertaining to the reappointment, tenure and promotion.
Department of Religion and Biblical Literature
Procedures for Evaluating the Teaching Ability of Candidates for
Reappointment, Promotion, or Tenure
(Updated and approved by the Department March 14, 1990)

The following statement is provided pursuant to Section II.B.2.e of the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College 1989-90 (hereinafter: Policy), which requires that a statement describing the procedures the Department considers effective in evaluating the teaching of its members under review for promotion, reappointment, or tenure shall be filed with the Dean and shall be provided all new members of the department at their initial appointment.

1. The Religion Department has two principal introductory courses (101a and 105a/A) in which the weekly lectures are shared in turn by most of the Department members. All members sharing responsibility for such a course customarily attend these lectures. Thus, over the years, they have formed an impression of how each member does in this role. These courses also give opportunity for shared discussion, so that members see colleagues in operation as discussion leaders as well.

2. Every member of the Department eligible to vote in a particular decision visits at least one class of the junior member (besides the team-taught classes mentioned above) within twelve months before a decision is made. Such class visits are expected to be in teams of at least two persons, and it is expected that arrangements for such visits shall follow the provisions and recommendations of Section II.B.2.a of the Policy.

3. Following such visits, the members who visited the faculty member under consideration shall communicate to him or her individually, in writing and/or in conference, an assessment of the member's teaching.

4. The Department's review of a candidate includes taking into account those student evaluations of the candidate's teaching that are contained in the official course-critique administered College-wide by the college Administration.

5. At the time of reappointment, pursuant to Section II.B.2.b of the Policy, the Department will provide a junior member with a written assessment of his or her teaching if the member so requests.
Program in Statistical and Data Sciences
Guidelines for Governance, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion
(Approved by the Steering Committee at its meeting on September 17, 2015)

Composition of the SDS Steering Committee and Expectations of Service
The SDS Program Committee is comprised of tenured, tenure-track, and visiting Smith faculty members who have at least half-time appointments in SDS. In addition, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the Department of Computer Science and each department regularly teaching a statistics or data science course will normally have a seat on the Steering Committee with the representatives of those departments being appointed by the Provost for three-year, renewable terms. In all matters of curriculum, programming, policy, and hiring in the SDS program, voting members shall be those members of the Steering Committee qualified to vote at faculty meetings.

Membership on the Steering Committee entails these minimum expectations of service:
1. regular attendance at Steering Committee meetings and retreats,
2. advising majors and minors when asked,
3. working with majors and minors on Honors and Special Studies projects as appropriate, and
4. participating in events and receptions on a regular basis – e.g., Conversations, presentations of the major, lectures and seminars sponsored by the program, and presentations by SDS students of Honors and other projects.

The Program Director
The Director of the SDS Program shall be appointed for a fixed term by the Provost on the recommendation of the voting members of the Steering Committee and may be reappointed for subsequent terms. The Director shall ordinarily be selected from those holding appointments in the Program and having tenure-track or tenured positions on the faculty, and preferably from the tenured ranks. The selection of the Chair shall normally take place every three years. The Director shall be selected no later than February and take office on or about the first of July. The Director shall serve as the chair of the Steering Committee.

Procedures for Review, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion
The procedures below reflect the Program’s commitment to gather information and provide feedback to faculty members in ways that are collegial, constructive and substantive. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and untenured members of the SDS Steering Committee that focus on achieving excellent teaching and on constructive discussions of scholarly work in progress. These procedures supplement the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.
I. Procedures for Untenured, Tenure-track Faculty Members with Full or Joint Appointments in SDS

a. Personnel Review Committee
For tenure-track faculty members hired with full or joint tenure-track appointments in the Program, the Provost will appoint a personnel review committee at the time of hiring that will continue through the candidate’s probationary period. The personnel review committee will be composed of tenured faculty members who would typically be members of the SDS Steering Committee. In the event that a member of a personnel review committee is unable to continue serving on the committee, the Provost will appoint an alternate who will join the committee for the remainder of the candidate’s probationary period. During the course of the probationary period, all members of the personnel review committee will take turns visiting classes, offering feedback on work in progress, and participating in annual reviews. All personnel review committee members will vote on reappointment and tenure.

b. Annual Class Visits
During each year of the probationary period, two members of the personnel review committee will visit a class at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited. The visitors will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the candidate within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The untenured faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report, and any response, will be filed with the chair of the personnel review committee and may be summarized, along with other reports, in letters concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.

c. Annual Review
At the conclusion of each academic year, the chair and at least one additional member of a faculty member’s personnel review committee will conduct an annual review. This review includes a meeting that will provide an opportunity for the untenured faculty member to review the past year’s teaching, scholarship and service, and to identify specific goals for the coming year so that the Program can assist the candidate in developing a dossier. Discussion will address teaching, scholarship (including work in progress), and service. A letter summarizing this discussion and any recommendations made during the meeting will be sent to the untenured member, who may respond to or amend the summary if necessary.

d. Reappointment and Tenure Procedures
At the time of review for reappointment or tenure, all members of the personnel review committee (even if they are on sabbatical or leave) will review the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate, in accordance with the policies of the college. The personnel review committee will solicit all tenured members of the current SDS Steering Committee to contribute information related to any of the criteria for reappointment or tenure for which they have first-hand knowledge.
II. Procedures for Non-tenure Track Faculty with One-year or Longer Appointments in SDS

a. Annual Class Visits
During first two years of the faculty member’s appointment, two members of the Steering Committee will visit a class at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited. The visitors will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the faculty member within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report, and any response, will be filed with the Director of the Program and may be summarized, along with other reports, in letters concerning any reappointment of the faculty member. The faculty member may request additional class visits either during or after this initial two-year period.

b. Annual Review
At the conclusion of each academic year and at the option of the faculty member, the Director of the Program and at least one additional member of the Steering Committee will conduct an annual review. This review includes a meeting that will provide an opportunity for the faculty member to review the past year’s teaching, scholarship and service, and to identify specific goals for the coming year so that the Program can assist the candidate in moving forward in their career. Discussion will address teaching, scholarship (including work in progress), and service (although service expectations should be consistent with the nature of the faculty member’s appointment). A letter summarizing this discussion and any recommendations made during the meeting will be sent to the faculty member, who may respond to or amend the summary if necessary. If the faculty member is recommended for reappointment, these letters may form part of that recommendation.

d. Reappointment
At the time of any review for reappointment, the Director of the Program will appoint three members of the Steering Committee to visit a class or classes of the faculty member at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited in the semester during which the reappointment is being considered, or in the prior semester. The visitors will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the candidate within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report and any response will be forwarded to the members of the Steering Committee senior to the candidate. The candidate will also supply those members with a dossier that includes a statement of teaching, a full CV, and any information about scholarship and service that the candidate feels would be relevant to her or his reappointment. The Director of the Program (or a more senior member of the Steering Committee if necessary) will forward the recommendation of those members of the Steering Committee as called for in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.
DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND APPOINTMENT TO TENURE

Department decisions regarding reappointment, promotion, and appointment to tenure will be based upon its evaluation of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and contribution to the College and professional community at large.

I. In accordance with College regulations, voting members of the Department are expected to consider the candidate’s ability in teaching. In order to do so, each voting member should have a reasonable basis for such an evaluation. Among other criteria, the following will be taken into consideration in the evaluation of teaching ability:

A. Lectures to the College community at large
B. Lectures to departmental seminars including faculty and majors
C. Joint teaching
D. College teaching evaluations
E. Class visits under the following procedures:

In the year in which a member is under consideration for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, all members eligible to vote must make at least one classroom visit. Either the visitor or the person under consideration may request an additional visit. All visits must be made in groups of two or more. Independent letters of evaluation shall be written by each visiting member and submitted to the member being evaluated within a reasonable time following the visit. A member being evaluated may request an additional formal visit from the same evaluator.

II. The candidate will submit a list of the evidence of scholarship upon which his/her candidacy will be evaluated by the appropriate voting members of the Department. This list will include all published works as well as works in progress. The candidate shall provide the Chairperson with samples of research which may include books, reprints of published articles, papers delivered at professional meetings, draft chapters of dissertation or book.
III. The candidate should also provide the Chairperson with a list of activities at the College other than classroom teaching and research. This list could include advising student groups or serving on various College committees.

IV. The candidate should also provide the Chairperson with a list of professional activities outside the College. This list could include attendance at professional meetings, presentation of papers, service as Chairperson for sessions at professional meetings, discussant, editor, officer, or committee member in professional organizations.

V. The candidate should feel free to bring any other information to the attention of the Department which he/she feels has a bearing on the evaluation process.

VI. The candidate will be informed in writing of the Department's recommendation within one week of its having been made.

This document was approved by the full Department of Sociology and Anthropology at its meeting on May 11, 1977, revised at its meeting of February 12, 1986, and revised subsequently at the meeting of the Department of Sociology on December 7, 1993.
Procedures for the Evaluation of Teaching
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Class Visitations

In evaluating the teaching of candidates under consideration for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese follows the criteria set forth in Section II of the “Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College.”

The Department has adopted a policy of periodically visiting classes. These visits are followed by conferences with the instructor concerned, at which time the critical evaluations are expressed, methods and results are discussed and constructive recommendations are made. In accordance with this model, the Department follows the visiting procedures described below.

Department of Spanish and Portuguese Visiting Procedures

1. Visits shall be made by prior arrangement with the instructor visited.

2. The instructor visited shall have the option of requesting a second visit.

3. Class visits should be followed by a conference, in circumstances acceptable to the instructor visited. A draft of the teaching report may serve as the basis for the conference.

4. The visitor shall provide the instructor visited with a copy of the final teaching report.

5. Copies of this report should be filed with the Chair of the department of the instructor visited.

6. If the instructor visited wishes to comment on the final report, he or she may file a written statement with the visitor and the Chair.

7. All faculty members are expected to participate in any review for which they are eligible, unless they are on leave, in which case participation is voluntary. To this end, and in accordance with the criteria set forth in the “Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure at Smith College”: Assistant Professors and Senior Lecturers participate in the reappointment of Lecturers. Senior Lecturers do not review Assistant Professors. Tenured members of the department visit and evaluate the classes of Assistant Professors and Senior Lecturers.
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The Program for the Study of Women and Gender operates under the provisions of Sections 47-50 of the Code of Faculty Legislation and Administrative Practice.

Composition of the SWG Program Committee and Expectations of Service

The SWG Program Committee is comprised of tenured, tenure-track, and visiting Smith faculty members who have been nominated by the Committee for renewable five-year terms and appointed by the Provost. The Committee includes those with contractual full-time or joint appointments in the Program and may also include those who teach courses cross-listed in the Program and/or those who are scholars in the field. In all matters of curriculum, programming, policy, and hiring in the SWG program, voting members shall be those members of the Program Committee qualified to vote at faculty meetings.

Membership on the Program Committee entails these minimum expectations of service:

1. regular attendance at monthly meetings and retreats,
2. advising majors and minors when asked, and
3. at least two other commitments to the intellectual work of the Program.

These major commitments may include teaching a course with the SWG prefix or a course cross-listed in the Program, participating in a faculty development seminar, planning and participating in a SWG-sponsored conference or residency, participating in SWG 100 Issues in Queer Studies or SWG 101 SWG Reads, representing Smith on the steering committee of the Five College Women’s Studies Research Center, serving as a mentor to new faculty, and serving on a SWG subcommittee (e.g. curriculum, assessment, ad hoc, or prize committees).

Election of the Program Chair

The Chair of the Program shall be appointed by the Provost on the recommendation of the voting members of the Program Committee and may be reappointed for subsequent terms. The Chair shall ordinarily be selected from those holding permanent positions on the faculty, and preferably from the ranks of full professors. The selection of the Chair shall normally take place every three years. The Chair shall be selected no later than February and take office on or about the first of July.

Procedures for Review, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

The procedures below reflect the Program's commitment to gather information and provide feedback to faculty members in ways that are collegial, constructive and substantive. These procedures include regular opportunities for exchanges between tenured and untenured members of the SWG Program Committee that focus on achieving excellent teaching and on constructive discussions of scholarly work in progress. These
procedures supplement the requirements outlined in the Policy of Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

I. Procedures for Untenured Faculty Members with Full or Joint Appointments in SWG

a. Personnel Review Committee

For tenure-track faculty members hired with full or joint tenure-track appointments in the Program, the Program will create a personnel review committee at the time of hiring that will continue through the candidate’s probationary period. The personnel review committee will be composed of tenured faculty members with full and joint appointments in the Program, augmented by additional tenured members of the SWG Program Committee (up to a committee membership of five, plus an alternate). At least one member of the personnel review committee must have served on the search committee. In the event that a member of a personnel review committee is unable to continue serving on the committee, the alternate will join the committee for the remainder of the candidate’s probationary period. During the course of the probationary period, all members of the personnel review committee will take turns visiting classes, offering feedback on work in progress, and participating in annual reviews. All personnel review committee members will vote on reappointment and tenure.

b. Annual Class Visits

During each year of the probationary period, two members of the personnel review committee will visit a class at a time suggested by the faculty member being visited. The visitors will draft a report on the class visit and then meet with the candidate within two weeks of the class to discuss the report. The untenured faculty member may respond in writing to the report. The report, and any response, will be filed with the Chair and may be summarized, along with other reports, in letters concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.

c. Annual Review

At the conclusion of each academic year, the Chair of SWG and at least one additional member of a faculty member’s personnel review committee will conduct an annual review. This review includes a meeting that will provide an opportunity for the untenured faculty member to identify specific goals for the coming year so that the Program can assist the candidate in developing a dossier. Discussion will address teaching, scholarship (including work in progress), and service. A letter summarizing this discussion and any recommendations made during the meeting will be sent to the untenured member, who may respond to or amend the summary if necessary.

d. Reappointment and Tenure Procedures

At the time of review for reappointment or tenure, all members of the personnel review committee (even if they are on sabbatical or leave) will review the teaching, scholarship,
and service of the candidate, in accordance with the policies of the college. The personnel review committee will solicit all tenured members of the current SWG Program Committee to contribute information related to any of the criteria for reappointment or tenure for which they have first-hand knowledge.

II. Procedures for Faculty Members Affiliated with SWG

The SWG Program will contribute to the tenure and promotion review process conducted by home departments of any faculty members who have served on the Program Committee for three or more years, but will not have a vote in these decisions. The Chair, in consultation with the candidate, will appoint a review committee composed of three tenured members of the Program Committee, senior in rank to the candidate. All tenured members are eligible to serve on the review committee except 1) members of the SWG Program Committee who will vote in the member's home department or another program, and 2) members who will vote on the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Candidates will provide the review committee with a copy of their dossier. The Committee on Tenure and Promotion will provide the review committee with copies of external evaluators’ comments. The review committee will acquire first-hand knowledge of teaching through class visits and will thoroughly review the candidate’s dossier. Class visits will be arranged in advance with the candidate and must be conducted in pairs.

As part of its evaluation, the review committee will solicit additional information concerning the candidate's contributions to the Program from tenured members of the Program Committee. The chair of the review committee will provide a letter to the candidate's department in time for its review and to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The letter will assess the candidate’s teaching and scholarship, as well as describe the candidate's contributions to the Program. A copy will be provided to the candidate. The candidate may respond in writing to that letter.
PROCEDURES FOR THEATRE DEPARTMENT FACULTY REVIEW, APPOINTMENT, AND REAPPOINTMENT

a. For one-year appointments: there will be one visit by all faculty senior to the person under review, to one of that faculty member’s classes, to take place after the first half of the fall semester and no later than a deadline to be determined by the Chair.

b. For two-year appointments: there will be one class visit in the spring semester of the first year (again by all faculty senior to the person under review), and a second visit in the fall semester of the second year, to take place after mid-semester and no later than a deadline to be determined by the Chair.

c. For three-year appointments: there will be one class visit in the spring semester of the first year, a second visit in the fall semester of the second year, and a third visit in the fall semester of the third year, as above, by a deadline to be determined by the Chair.

d. In addition to visiting classes to observe teaching, there may be visits to show rehearsals and a follow-up discussion. It is normally expected that senior evaluating faculty will also attend productions.

e. Following every visit, there will be a written response and, if necessary, an additional written follow-up from either party involved. Although senior faculty have the option to visit any class sessions, it is preferable to arrange for a mutually agreed upon day for the class visit.

f. Evaluations of adjunct faculty: classes taught by adjuncts will be visited by select senior faculty, as appointed by the Chair, during the course of the semester.

g. Faculty who vote on reappointment, tenure and promotions must attend classes taught by the person under review in order to participate in the voting decision; any faculty member unable to observe classes may participate in discussion regarding reappointment, tenure and promotion, but may not vote on the decision.
THEATRE DEPARTMENT MENTORING OF JUNIOR FACULTY

We are a relatively small department with 7 full time and one half time members. Our mentoring practices remain informal, with senior members committed to mentoring junior members through accessibility, transparency and regular interaction: both scheduled meetings and unscheduled and informal conversations address teaching, scholarship, service and departmental matters.

We are now instituting a second, more formal level of mentoring. At least two senior colleagues will be assigned by the Chair to mentor a single junior colleague, from the beginning of his/her appointment. These appointed mentors (one of whom may be the Chair) will remain collegial, but will have meetings with the junior member, to discuss pertinent issues, including discussion of teaching practices, scholarship, and general adjustment to life at the college. The junior faculty will be encouraged to address all issues of interest and concern. We consider this mentorship to be part of the general responsibility of senior faculty to nurture and support junior members.

Finally, we have explicit guidelines regarding class visits, and the Chair meets annually with untenured colleagues to discuss teaching, service and scholarship.