

FACULTY MEETING
May 18, 2016

MOTION

Third Year

- i. An appointee considered by the department to be a candidate for reappointment at the end of the second year will be evaluated in the third year according to department procedures. The department must submit its recommendation, positive or negative, with supporting evidence to the Associate Dean of the Faculty (faculty affairs) on or before January 15 of the appointee's third year. The evidence must include a cover letter from the Chair and letters from full-time faculty and those holding shared appointments in the department concerned who are in at least their third year of fulltime service at Skidmore, and (where appropriate) Program Directors.

program must also demonstrate need and the candidate's professional quality according to guidelines described for departments in paragraph two above.

For proportional tenure-track faculty appointments that are shared between two departments, a department and an ID program or two ID programs, ~~supporting evidence sent to the Associate Dean of the Faculty (faculty affairs) must include a cover letter from both Department Chairs/ or Program Directors or PPC Chairs and letters from faculty on the ID Program Personnel Committee, the department and (where appropriate) Directors of other programs or Chairs of departments~~ must submit, at a minimum, separate letters that summarize 1) the department or program's recommendation, positive or negative, and 2) evidence supporting the recommendation to the Associate Dean of the Faculty (faculty affairs). If faculty members eligible to write on the candidate's behalf as indicated by department or program procedures disagree with the consensus letter and therefore cannot sign it, faculty members may write an individual letter to the Associate Dean of the Faculty (faculty affairs) on or before January 15³ with their recommendation and a summary of the supporting evidence for the recommendation. The departments and programs sharing the appointment must also demonstrate need and the candidate's professional quality according to guidelines described for departments in paragraph two above.

Part One, Section VIII, Part D.4.b.i Evaluation of the Faculty, Reappointment, Reappointment of Instructors, Third Year

Third Year

- i. An appointee considered by the department or program to be a candidate for reappointment at the end of the second year will be evaluated in the third year according to department procedures. The ~~department~~ Department or PPC Chair must submit, at a minimum, its a letter that summarizes 1) the department or program's recommendation, positive or negative, and 2) evidence supporting the recommendation with supporting evidence to the Associate Dean of the Faculty (faculty affairs) on or before January 15 of the appointee's third year. If faculty members eligible to write on the candidate's behalf as indicated by department or program procedures disagree with the consensus letter and therefore cannot sign it, faculty members may write an individual letter to the Associate Dean of the Faculty (faculty affairs) on or before January 15³ with their recommendation and a summary of the supporting evidence for the recommendation. The evidence must include a cover letter from the Chair and letters from full-time faculty and those holding shared appointments in the department concerned who are in at least their third year of fulltime service at Skidmore, and (where appropriate) Program Directors.

RATIONALE

Currently, full-time faculty in their third year and beyond are required to write letters of evaluation for departmental and program colleagues at a candidate's third year review and at the point of tenure. While many faculty believe it is important for a plurality of voices be represented at the point of tenure in the form of individual letters to CAPT, it is less important at the third year review that individual voices are represented. As is the current practice, the Department or PPC Chair produces a letter that represents the overall recommendation of the department or program. The audience for this letter is the ADOF who depends heavily on the consensus of the departmental or program when forming her own recommendation for

