

D. Faculty Evaluation Document 2023-2028

1. Scope of this Document

This document applies to the faculty of the undergraduate college in Annandale-on-Hudson, who are covered by the AAUP contract. That is, all undergraduate faculty holding teaching contracts for 6/13 or larger fractions. All references to faculty status, including fractional time and tenure, refer to such status only in the undergraduate college unless otherwise noted. For the avoidance of doubt, all College policies, including but not limited to the policies regarding Non-Discrimination and Gender-Based Misconduct, continue to apply with full force and effect.

2. Criteria for Evaluation of Tenure-track and Regular Non-tenure-track Faculty

a). General Statement on Faculty Evaluation

1. The purpose of the evaluation process is to ensure that faculty members are evaluated fairly, thoroughly and honestly, and to ensure that the College has faculty members who have demonstrated ongoing excellence in their work.
2. Faculty evaluations are based upon the three categories defined in Item I.D.3 of this Handbook: teaching, professional work, and service to the community. Success in all three categories, appropriately contextualized for each type of evaluation as described in Items I.D.2.b-f of this Handbook, is necessary for rehiring, tenure and promotion for tenure-line faculty members, for rehiring of non-tenure-track faculty members and, for conversion of non-tenure-track faculty to the tenure track.
3. Evaluations recognize the differences in the nature of teaching and professional work in each field, and unique programmatic circumstances.

b). Criteria for Reappointment for Tenure-track Faculty Members

The reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member is based upon the accomplishments of the faculty member in all three categories of evaluation up until the time of evaluation. The rehiring evaluation looks forward to the tenure decision and seeks to communicate to the evaluatee what changes, if any, might be needed for a positive tenure decision.

c). Criteria for Tenure for Tenure-track Faculty Members

The granting of tenure to a tenure-track faculty member is based upon both the accomplishments of the faculty member in all three categories of evaluation up until the time of evaluation and the potential of the faculty member to sustain such accomplishments for the remainder of their professional career.

d). Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor of Tenured Faculty Members

The College seeks to promote to full professor candidates who show evidence of excellence in all three categories of evaluation, while achieving a measure of leadership and increased stature in these endeavors. The college recognizes the value of encouraging faculty to take intellectual risks in the post-tenure period and therefore embraces a range of possible forms that distinction in scholarship or creativity may take. The college also acknowledges that successful candidates can differ in patterns of strength across these three categories, and that each tenured faculty member can find the appropriate balance to invest their energy, though appreciable achievement since tenure in all three areas is expected. In particular, the promotion evaluation considers leadership in the college, including an expectation of substantive faculty roles such as program director, divisional chair, and other signal leadership roles in faculty governance, academic centers, or campus-wide initiatives.

e). **Criteria for Reappointment of Regular Non-tenure-track Faculty Members and Conversion of Short-term Non-tenure-track Faculty Members to Regular Non-tenure-track Status**

In general, long-term faculty members should be in tenure-track or tenured positions. Every proposal for the conversion of a short-term non-tenure-track faculty member to regular non-tenure track status, or for the rehiring of a regular non-tenure-track faculty member, should specify the particular needs that the regular non-tenure-track position fills, including reference to each of the three categories of evaluation, and the rationale for having a regular non-tenure-track position rather than a tenure track position. The evaluation of such a faculty member will be based upon the accomplishments of the faculty member in all three categories of evaluation up until the time of evaluation.

f). **Criteria for Conversion of Non-tenure-track Faculty Members to Tenure-track Status**

In general, tenure-track faculty members are hired in national searches. Any proposal for the conversion of a non-tenure-track faculty member to tenure-track status should explain the rationale for conversion without a national search. Evaluations for faculty members under consideration for conversion to tenure-track status, prepared by the divisional evaluators, should refer to all three categories of evaluation, while keeping in mind the fact that non-tenure-track faculty members are not normally expected to be as active in Category III as tenure-track faculty members.

3. The Three Categories of Evaluation

a). Category I: Teaching

1. A successful evaluation requires excellence in teaching. Evaluation of teaching considers courses at all levels of the curriculum both in the program and elsewhere (for example in First-Year Seminar); work with students in the classroom and outside of it; tutorials, private lessons in music, independent studies, and Senior Projects; Moderation and Senior Project boards; advising; innovation in course design and pedagogical methods; participation in programmatic, divisional, and college-wide discussion of curriculum; contributions to relevant programs; fulfillment of curricular needs of the programs in which the evaluatee teaches; and the curricular needs of the college.

2. Success in teaching is determined by the overall evidence in the file regarding all aspects of teaching. Information about teaching includes, but is not limited to, student evaluations; class visit reports; letters from the college community, including faculty members, staff, students and alumni/ae; the EPC report; material submitted by the evaluatee, including an assessment of past work and plans for future work in this category; equitable share in programmatic advising; work advising tutorials, independent studies, and Senior Projects; and course enrollments.

b). Category II: Professional Work

1. A successful evaluation requires excellence in professional work, which consists of written scholarly work and performed or exhibited artistic work, in the public arena. The evaluation of professional work involves both work done prior to the evaluation and plans for future work, and it considers publications, exhibitions, performances and other activities that demonstrate an active scholarly or artistic engagement with the discipline at the professional level.
2. Success in professional work is determined by the overall evidence in the file. Information about professional work includes, but is not limited to, publications, preprints and other written work; evidence of exhibitions, performances, recordings, lectures and demonstrations; other material submitted by the evaluatee, including an assessment of past work and plans for future work in this category; grants and fellowships; letters from Bard faculty members; published reviews of work; and external evaluations.

c). Category III: Work within the Community

1. A successful evaluation requires demonstrated responsibility and ongoing contribution, commensurate with seniority, in work in the wider college community, which consists of all the types of faculty activity that are needed to make the pedagogical mission of the college succeed and that are distinct from work in Category I and Category II. Evaluation of work in the community considers from among the following: engagement with the community; the ability to work with colleagues; leadership as needed in programmatic, divisional, and college-wide affairs; effective participation in faculty committees and in hiring and evaluation processes; the interaction with, and impact on, intellectual and artistic life at the college; contributions to a diverse and inclusive campus; work with students on extracurricular activities; sponsorship of speakers and other events on campus; work with Bard's national and international networks and graduate programs; participation in study-away programs; contributions to civic, community, and public engagements activities, and other forms of outreach; and other college activities, such as work with Admissions, Alumni/ae Affairs and the Development Office; service to the professional field or discipline, as might include participation in external reviewing of professors at other institutions, or reviewing of manuscripts for publication. Faculty should have the freedom to determine how best to participate in the life of the community according to their individual motivation. Such expectations are to be commensurate with appointments in the college.
2. Successful work in the community is determined by the overall evidence in the file. Information about work in the community includes, but is not limited to, material submitted by the evaluatee, including an assessment of past work and plans for future work in this category, and letters from Bard students, faculty, and staff members.

4. Evaluation Procedures for Faculty Members

a). General Principles

1. That the evaluation of a faculty member's work by colleagues and students can help them improve the quality of that work.
2. That thorough, formal, and dignified procedures, regularly employed and applicable to all, are the best means of such evaluation.
3. That such procedures provide the best evidence for recommendations concerning reappointment, and promotion in all categories.
4. Tenure is a means to (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to people of ability.
5. Promotion to full professor is the result of continuing achievements in the categories used by the college as criteria for evaluation.

b). Meetings with the Dean of the College

1. Meeting of the dean of the college and the evaluatee

By the end of the academic year prior to the year of evaluation for tenure and promotion cases, and by the end of the semester prior to the semester of evaluation for rehiring (tenure-track and regular non-tenure-track) and conversion cases, the dean of the college or the decanal designee will meet with the evaluatee to review the evaluation document, the procedures it outlines, and the evaluatee's preparation of their file.

2. Meeting of the dean of the college, the divisional evaluators, division chairs, the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (FERC), the College Evaluation Committee (CEC), and the Educational Policies Committee (EPC)

The dean of the college or decanal designee will schedule a meeting with all divisional evaluators, all division chairs, the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee, and the members of the student Educational Policies Committee, no later than the 3rd Wednesday of each fall semester. In this meeting, the dean of the college will review the evaluation procedures and the list of faculty members to be evaluated during the academic year.

c). Community Input

1. Dates and list of evaluatees
 - a. The Faculty Executive Committee, at its final meeting of each academic year, will review a list of all relevant dates for the faculty evaluation process for the following academic year.
 - b. By the first week of each semester, the dean of the college will prepare and distribute to faculty, staff and students a list of all faculty members scheduled for evaluation during that

academic year and for whom written testimony is due in that semester and a list of deadlines for the submission of all testimony to the candidates' files.

2. Faculty files and submissions

- a. All faculty members being evaluated will submit the following to their files: (1) an updated curriculum vitae (including a list of courses, tutorials and/or independent studies taught, and Senior Projects directed); (2) an assessment of work since the last evaluation (or since the initial hiring for the first evaluation) and long-term plans for future work in each of the three categories of evaluation; and additional relevant materials, such as, but not limited to, representative course syllabi and assignments, articles, books, images and web links.
- b. Materials submitted by an evaluatee to their file must be given in both hard copy and electronic format to the Office of the Dean of the College by July 15 for faculty members being evaluated for tenure or promotion, August 15 for faculty members being evaluated for rehiring (tenure-track and regular non-tenure-track) or conversion in the fall, January 15 for faculty members being evaluated for rehiring (tenure-track and regular non-tenure-track) or conversion in the spring, August 15 for senior evaluations of tenured professors not being evaluated for promotion and rehiring evaluations of senior regular non-tenure-track faculty members in the fall, and January 15 for senior evaluations of tenured professors not being evaluated for promotion and rehiring evaluations of senior regular non-tenure-track faculty members in the spring. After the deadline for submission, the evaluatee may submit evidence of new accomplishments in professional work, including an updated curriculum vitae and other appropriate documentation. All other material submitted by the evaluatee after the deadline will be marked as late, and will be considered at the discretion of the DEs, FERC and CEC. The dean of the college will forward an updated curriculum vitae but no other materials to the outside evaluators for tenure and promotion cases.
- c. The dean of the college will maintain all faculty files, both past and present. At the conclusion of the evaluation process the files are deposited in the Office of the Dean of the College.
- d. Student evaluation forms will be administered each semester for all classes, tutorials, independent studies and Senior Projects. The Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment will oversee the administration of the student evaluations.
- e. The file of each faculty member has two parts, the open part and the closed part, each of which is accessible during the period of evaluation to different categories of faculty members and administrators. Open Part: This part is accessible to all faculty members and administrators and includes student evaluation forms; class visit reports; material submitted by the evaluatee, including the curriculum vitae, samples of research or artistic achievements, the assessment of work in the three categories of evaluation since the last evaluation (or since the initial hiring for the first evaluation), long-term plans for future work in the three categories of evaluation; and, at the discretion of the evaluatee, sabbatical reports. Closed Part: This part is accessible to the DEs, the FERC, the CEC, the divisional chair, the dean of the college and the president, and includes signed letters from faculty and

staff members and students; the EPC report; outside evaluation reports; DE reports as well as FERC or CEC transmittal letters from previous evaluations; and anything else not listed as being in the open file.

- f. No material will be placed in the evaluation file of a faculty member other than what is mandated in the Faculty Evaluation Document, unless requested by the FERC, CEC, dean of the college or the president.
- g. In their divisional reports, the DEs will make use of material in both parts of the file, quoting from them as they see fit, without revealing the identity of the author.

3. Class visits

- a. For each rehiring evaluation (tenure-track and long-term visiting), and each conversion evaluation, there will be two class visits in the semester prior to the evaluation.
- b. For each tenure and promotion evaluation, there will be one class visit in the spring semester prior to the evaluation year and one class visit in the fall semester of the evaluation year.
- c. Class visits are not required for a senior evaluation of a tenured professor not being evaluated for promotion or a rehiring evaluation of a senior regular non-tenure-track faculty member.
- d. In each evaluation case of a faculty member who is less than full time, or who takes a leave of absence when a class visit would be scheduled, the divisional chair, in consultation with the program director(s) and the dean of the college, may reschedule one or both class visits, without decreasing the number of them.
- e. At the beginning of each semester, the dean of the college will make a list of all faculty members scheduled for class visits.
- f. Each divisional chair, in consultation with the director of the relevant programs, will select class visitors for all those faculty members who need class visits, and whose teaching is primarily in that division. Eligibility to conduct class visits will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the divisional chair and the director of the relevant program.
- g. Additional class visits may be arranged by the divisional chairs, in consultation with the evaluatee, at the request of the evaluatee.
- h. Class visits will be arranged by the 4th Wednesday of each semester.
- i. Before each visit, the visitor will arrange the date for the visit with the evaluatee, and will discuss the purpose and scope of the course, texts, special procedures or techniques, and the relationship between the class visited and the whole course.
- j. During the class visit, the visitor should remain throughout the entire seminar, class, studio, or laboratory, unless a shorter time is agreed upon beforehand.

- k. The visitor will discuss the class that was visited with the evaluatee, with the aims of assisting the latter in improving their teaching. The visitor will make a written report of their observations on the conduct of the class, no later than two weeks after the class visit. A copy of the final report will be given to the evaluatee, and a copy will be placed in the evaluation file, no later than the 13th week of the semester.

4. Written testimony

- a. Nature and Purpose: All members of the college community, and especially tenure-line and regular non-tenure-track faculty in the immediate programs of a faculty member being evaluated, are invited and encouraged to submit signed written testimony concerning faculty being evaluated. The purpose of written testimony is to offer information and insight about the evaluatee's work in one or more of the evaluation categories. Letters should draw on the field specific expertise of the evaluatee's colleagues and/or on the observations of colleagues and community members from direct collaboration with or observation of the evaluatee, and in all cases should be specific about how the contents of the letter relate to the work of the person under review.
- b. Connecting Testimony to Category of Evaluation: Letters of testimony should specify which category or categories of evaluation they are addressing (i.e., Teaching, Professional Work, Work Within the Community). Letter writers are encouraged to address more than one category, but should be specific about how each element of their testimony relates to the relevant category of evaluation.
- c. Timing: All written testimony must be submitted no later than the final Wednesday of the fall semester for faculty members being evaluated for tenure or promotion, and by the 3rd Wednesday of each semester for all other faculty members being evaluated. After the deadline, all material submitted will be marked as late and will be considered at the discretion of the DEs, FERC, CEC, or the dean of the college, as appropriate. Testimony will not be accepted if the author has read the closed file or received DE reports. No written testimony should be submitted to the file after the divisional discussion.
- d. Eligibility to Write and Method of Collecting Testimony: The dean of the college will solicit written testimony from all segments of the Bard community and request that all such testimony be sent to the Office of the dean of the College. The Alumni/ae Office will reach out to student alumni/ae who have graduated within a 10-year period of the time of evaluation to convey announcements about upcoming faculty evaluations and calls for testimony sent by the Office of the Dean of the College.
- e. Evaluatees should not solicit testimony on their own behalf from current or former members of the Bard community. Divisional chairs will send reminders for all members of the division up for evaluation, including the dates that testimony is due. Divisional Evaluators may contribute written testimony to an evaluatee's file in their role as a faculty colleague rather than DE and should indicate so in their letter. No one, including DEs or divisional chairs, may submit testimony after reading the closed file.

- f. Reference to Letters of Testimony: Written testimony may be quoted, without attribution, in the DE report as part of the DEs' work in reflecting accurately the contents of the closed file. The DE report will not specify the number of letters submitted by faculty, staff, students, community members or alumni/ae as part of a tabulation. If the DEs deem the number of letters received to be relevant to illustrate a particular point about the contents of the file more broadly, then it will be at their discretion in consultation with the chair of the division whether to include them in the DE report.
- g. Letter writers should avoid unverified claims or information received from others that cannot be substantiated and which has not been raised through appropriate channels.

5. External evaluation

- a. For each faculty member being evaluated for tenure or promotion, outside evaluators will be asked to assess the quality of their professional work. The outside evaluators for tenure cases must have professional status comparable to tenured associate or full professors, and the outside evaluators for promotion to full professor cases must have professional status comparable to tenured full professors.
- b. In the spring of the year prior to the tenure or promotion decision, the director of the principal program in which the evaluatee is located, (or, in cases where that program director is the evaluatee, a tenured member of the principal division in which the evaluatee is located, as designated by the chair of that division) will prepare a list of at least five potential outside evaluators, complete with rationales explaining why these individuals are being proposed. At the same time, the evaluatee will also prepare a list of at least five potential outside evaluators, together with rationales for each of these individuals and descriptions of the degree of contact they have had with each of them. External reviewers should not have prior close affiliations with the candidate, such as having been collaborators or co-authors on projects or in a direct advisory role. In no case shall a potential evaluator be excluded solely for having shared in conference or panel activities, or similarly limited levels of collaboration. If they so wish, the evaluatee can also submit a list of outside evaluators who they think could not judge the merit of the file in an impartial manner. The evaluatee will submit their list to the dean of the college. The director of the program or the designate of the division will not reveal their own list to the evaluatee.
- c. The director of the program (or the designate of the division) will then meet with the dean of the college, and the two of them will decide which of the ten potential outside evaluators named in the two lists will be invited to serve and in what order they will be invited. There should be at least one outside evaluator from each list. No outside evaluators will be chosen from the list of unsuitable outside evaluators submitted by the evaluatee.
- d. The dean of the college will secure three outside evaluators from the list, for tenure cases, two for promotion to full professor, a process that must be completed no later than the 9th Monday of the fall semester. The outside evaluators will be contacted by the dean of the college, who will send the following material: the curriculum vitae; the evaluatee's assessment of professional work since the last evaluation (or since the initial hiring for the

first evaluation), which may include all three categories of work; long-term plans for future professional work; and samples of research or artistic achievements (selected by the evaluatee). The dean of the college will ask to receive the reports from the outside evaluators no later than December 1.

- e. Should the evaluatee ascertain the identity of an outside evaluator and enter into contact with this person regarding the evaluation prior to the submission of the letter, the letter of that evaluator will automatically be stricken from the file.
- f. External reviews for grant or fellowship application material cannot be included in the file or examined by the FERC unless placed there by the applicant.

d). Divisional and Programmatic Considerations

1. Programmatic and divisional affiliations

Every tenure-line faculty member and regular non-tenure-track faculty member will have a primary divisional affiliation. A secondary divisional affiliation may also be specified. In cases where a divisional affiliation is unclear, a division must be determined by division and dean by the time of the CEC review for renewal. These programmatic and divisional affiliations will be specified during the initial hiring of the faculty member, though they may be subsequently changed with agreement of the faculty member, the new program(s) and/or division(s), and the administration.

2. Divisional meetings

- a. Each rehiring, tenure, promotion or conversion evaluation will be discussed and voted upon by the evaluatee's primary division.
- b. The divisional meeting concerned with a rehiring or conversion case will occur in the semester of or the semester after the CEC evaluation, and the divisional meeting concerned with a tenure or promotion case will occur in the spring semester of the year of evaluation. The divisional chairs, in consultation with the DEs, will schedule these meetings. They should occur on the 6th, 7th or 8th Wednesday of the fall semester and the 3rd, 4th, 5th, or 6th Wednesday of the spring semester.
- c. All members of the division may attend and speak at divisional meetings concerned with evaluation cases. If an evaluatee teaches in programs or concentrations that are interdisciplinary or in other divisions, the members of those programs and concentrations may request a copy of the report, attend and speak at the divisional meeting concerned with the evaluation case, but not vote.
- d. The current or former spouse/partner of an evaluatee, even if they are a member of the appropriate program, concentration or division, may not attend the divisional meeting concerned with the evaluatee's case.

- e. After discussion of each evaluation case, there will be a vote by written ballot. Each ballot will include the vote of yes, no or abstain. The divisional secretary or divisional chair's designee will count the ballots and report the results at the divisional meeting.
- f. Faculty are eligible to vote on each rehiring, tenure, promotion and conversion evaluation if they are: tenured; tenure-track and have been rehired following the pre-tenure evaluation; or regular non-tenure track on a teaching contract of half time (.50 FTE) and above, and have successfully passed one CEC evaluation.]
- g. A quorum for divisional voting will be two-thirds of the divisional faculty members who are eligible to vote. A tie vote will be understood as against rehiring, tenure, promotion or conversion.
- h. If no quorum is reached in a divisional meeting designated for faculty evaluation, the discussion of the candidate's file and the vote must both be postponed until a time at which quorum can be attained.

3. Division chair

If the division chair is not tenured, or is being evaluated for promotion that academic year, the previous division chair will fulfill the role of the division chair in the evaluation process, instead of the current division chair; if the previous division chair is not tenured, or is being evaluated for promotion that academic year, or is on sabbatical during that academic year, the division will elect an alternate division member who is tenured and is not being evaluated for promotion that academic year, and who will fulfill the role of the division chair in the evaluation process, instead of the division chair. This role includes all references to the division chair in this Faculty Evaluation Document, including having access to the closed file of evaluatees. The election of the alternate division member will be at the first division meeting of the academic year.

e). **Divisional Evaluators**

1. Selection of the divisional evaluators

- a. Every academic year, no later than the end of April, two divisional evaluators (DEs) will be selected for each rehiring, tenure, conversion or promotion case that will take place the following year. The DEs will be chosen by the chair of that division, in consultation with the director of the evaluatee's principal academic program or tenured members of that program, if the evaluatee is the chair.
- b. Each DE must be tenured, 1/2 time or above, or must be an appointed, non-tenure-track faculty member who is also currently serving as director of the principal program in which the candidate is located. For each case one DE must be from the candidate's principal program, in the principal division, whenever possible; the other DE may be chosen from the same program or from another program in the same division. Under exceptional circumstances, the second evaluator may come from a division other than that in which the evaluatee is principally located. Neither DE can be scheduled for sabbatical or leave during

the semester of evaluation for one-semester evaluations, or second semester of a year-long evaluation. At least one of the DEs must not be scheduled for sabbatical or leave during the first semester of a year-long evaluation; if there is precisely one DE in the candidate's principal program, then that DE must not be scheduled for sabbatical or leave during the first semester. A DE must not be scheduled for evaluation by the FERC or CEC during the time when they serve as evaluator, and must not be a member of the FERC or CEC.

- c. It is expected that one faculty member can serve as a DE for more than one evaluatee in a given semester. It is expected that a faculty member can serve as a DE in addition to serving in other roles including program director and member of a major faculty committee (other than FERC or CEC).

2. Work of the divisional evaluator

- a. The DEs will conduct the preliminary evaluation for the rehiring, tenure, promotion or conversion case for which they were appointed.
- b. The preliminary evaluation will consist of reading the file, meeting with the evaluatee, meeting with the divisional chair and writing a preliminary divisional report.
- c. The DEs will meet with each evaluatee before they write the preliminary divisional report. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss issues that arose in the reading of the file by the DEs and to obtain information that might help the DEs contextualize and clarify these issues as they write the preliminary divisional report. Both DEs must be present at the meeting of the DEs with the evaluatee.
- d. The DEs will meet with the divisional chair of the evaluatee's primary division before they write the preliminary divisional report. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss both issues of substance that arise in the file and divisional norms for writing the preliminary divisional reports, with the aim of promoting fairness, uniformity and impartial representation of the file in these reports. Both DEs must be present at the meeting of the DEs with the divisional chair.
- e. The DEs will present a preliminary draft of the divisional report to the divisional chair at least four days before it is scheduled to be sent to members of the division. At this time the divisional chair can suggest changes to the DE report to ensure that it accurately and appropriately reflects the content of the file.
- f. In the course of preparing a preliminary divisional report, the DEs may seek clarification in writing regarding the evaluatee's file by consulting with members of the Bard community, as well as the outside evaluators. Any input solicited by such consultation must be placed in writing in the file.
- g. The purpose of the preliminary divisional report is not to state the personal assessment of the evaluatee by the DEs, but rather to assist the divisional discussion by providing relevant summaries of the file, and by highlighting the strengths and weaknesses in the file in each of the three categories of evaluation. The preliminary divisional report will be written using

the template given at the end of the Faculty Evaluation Document. The report will not identify the authors of any materials in the closed file. For rehiring evaluations of tenure-track and regular non-tenure-track evaluatees who are not senior faculty, the preliminary divisional report will anticipate the tenure decision or subsequent rehiring and will state briefly the areas in which improvement would be beneficial. For the evaluation of regular non-tenure faculty members, the report could recommend a transition to a five-year contract.

- h. After the divisional discussion and vote on an evaluatee, the DEs, having been present at the divisional discussions, will rewrite the preliminary divisional report to reflect the sense of the majority of the faculty members in the division, as well as the complexity of points of view expressed at the discussion. In order to do so, during the divisional discussion of an evaluation case, the DEs will summarize verbally what they hear the division as saying about each of the evaluation criteria and ask the divisional chair for confirmation of this summary. The rewritten divisional report will not attribute views to individual faculty members.
- i. Closed discussions in the division are confidential, and no part of these discussions may be reported outside the closed divisional meeting. After divisional discussion and vote, the numerical results will be conveyed in writing by the divisional chair to the evaluatee within 24 hours.
- j. The divisional report is meant to express the voice of the majority of the faculty members in the evaluatee's principal division. For that reason, DEs may, if they wish, contribute their own letters about the evaluatee to the file, which they may then quote just as they quote other faculty letters, and they may, if they wish, express their personal views during divisional discussion in addition to their assessment of the file as DEs.

3. Submission of the preliminary divisional report by the divisional evaluator

- a. The DEs will distribute preliminary divisional reports to all members of the division (as defined in III.C. of this Handbook), other than the evaluatee (and the spouse/partner of the evaluatee if they are a member of the division), by noon on the Monday preceding the divisional discussion via campus mail (and only via campus mail); if the Monday preceding the divisional discussion is anytime the campus post office is scheduled to be closed the preliminary divisional reports will be distributed by the previous Friday.
- b. DEs will present a draft of the final version of the DE report to the divisional chair at least two days prior to its submission to the dean of the college's office. The divisional chair will check to ensure that the revised report reflects and represents the divisional discussion. The DEs will submit the final divisional report to the dean's office that will send it to the divisional chair and to the evaluatee by the 10th Monday of the fall semester and the 8th Monday of the spring semester. Should the divisional chair or the evaluatee feel that the final report, as submitted by the DEs, is problematic, they may submit to the FERC or CEC a letter explaining the problems they find in the report. The evaluatee and the chair have one week to respond to the final divisional report.

f). Faculty Evaluation Review Committee and College Evaluation Committee

1. Composition of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee and the College Evaluation Committee
 - a. The Faculty Evaluation Review Committee (FERC) and the College Evaluation Committee (CEC) will each have five members, one from each division and one at-large member, serving staggered two-year terms. Each committee will have an alternate member, serving a two-year term.
 - b. All members of the FERC will be tenured, half-time or more.
 - c. Two of the five members of the CEC will be either a senior non-tenure-track faculty member, or a non-tenure-track faculty member who has had at least one CEC review and has held an appointment for at least five years. The remaining three members will be tenured, half-time or more.
 - d. The divisional members of the FERC will be elected by their respective divisions. The at-large member and the alternate member of the FERC will be elected college-wide at a faculty meeting. The slate of candidates for the at-large position will consist of a list nominated by the Faculty Executive Committee (with at least two names), as well as nominations from the floor of the faculty meeting. Each faculty member will vote for two candidates. The candidates receiving the highest number of votes will be elected to the FERC, with the next candidate serving as the alternate. The elections will be held no later than the midterm of the spring semester prior to the academic year during which the appointments commence.
 - e. The members of the CEC, including the alternate member, are appointed by the Executive Committee, with the intention of distributing committee service fairly among the members of the faculty. The appointments will be made by the Executive Committee no later than the midterm of the spring semester prior to the academic year during which the appointments commence.
 - f. The FERC and CEC will each elect a chair.
 - g. Should any member of the FERC resign, a permanent replacement will be selected by the following procedure. First, the Faculty Executive Committee, in consultation with the FERC chair, will determine whether a division or full faculty meeting (as needed) can be held prior to the date by which the permanent replacement is needed. If it is determined that such a meeting can take place, then the permanent replacement will be chosen at such a meeting; if it is determined that there is not sufficient time for such a meeting, then the Faculty Senate will appoint the permanent replacement from the appropriate division or full faculty.
 - h. Should any member of the CEC resign, the Executive Committee will appoint a replacement and ensure that the committee will have at least one member per division.
 - i. The dean of the college serves as *ex officio* member of the FERC, and the dean of the college or the dean's decanal designee serves as *ex officio* member of the CEC, in order to provide

the committees with information relevant to their discussions and to apprise the dean of the college of the committee's deliberations. *Ex officio* membership in the FERC and CEC entails participation in the committee's discussions, but not voting.

2. The work of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee and the College Evaluation Committee

- a. The FERC will review the evaluation of each rehiring, tenure, and promotion case for tenure-line faculty members, and will make a recommendation concerning each case.
- b. The CEC will conduct evaluations of non-tenure track faculty pertaining to the following three categories of review:
 - (i) A regular review for renewal, with no change in contract upon completion. This entails a performance review and a divisional discussion with a vote on renewal. The CEC will assess the materials of the file and vote on the renewal. While a CEC review is not required for every renewal that does not entail a change in contract type, faculty members half-time and above new to the college should undergo a CEC review after teaching for 3 years at the college, if not before.
 - (ii) A 2- or 3-year contract conversion to a 5-year (or other long-term) contract. This entails a performance review and a divisional discussion with a vote on contract type change. The CEC review will entail successful work in all three categories of evaluation. The CEC will assess the materials of the file and vote on the contract type change. This type of review does not require a request to the PAC. It will be conducted at the request of the evaluatee or the program director according to the Faculty Handbook section C. Policy on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Tenure pertaining to non-tenure-track faculty appointments. Faculty hired before 2005 who so desired were grandfathered into the previous process that did not require a conversion to a longer contract and therefore no CEC review. A request made by the program in consultation with the evaluatee for a second CEC review will entail promotion to regular senior non-tenure-track if successful.
 - (iii) Non-tenure-track contract conversion to tenure-track contract (preceding or concurrently with PAC request for conversion).
- c. At the start of each academic year, there will be a joint meeting of the FERC and CEC, at which the dean of the college will review the evaluation process for that year.
- d. The FERC and CEC will conduct a preliminary discussion and straw vote on each case it considers.
- e. If, during a straw vote on a case, a majority of the FERC or CEC votes in disagreement with the divisional recommendation, the committee will meet with the DEs to discuss the case prior to the final committee vote on the case.
- f. In the course of discussing a case, the FERC or CEC may seek clarification regarding the evaluatee's file by consulting with members of the Bard community.

- g. After concluding its deliberations on each case, the FERC or CEC has a final vote on any recommendations resulting from the review. Each committee member will vote yes or no according to their conscience. There will be no abstentions in voting. For each case, each committee member will state their vote, will give a brief explanation of the vote to the rest of the committee, and may, at their discretion, submit a written version of that explanation. Committee members may do the same where the conclusion of the review does not result in a vote on rehiring, tenure or conversion.
- h. The FERC or CEC will write a transmittal letter regarding each evaluation case. This letter will contain the vote, where applicable, and an individual explanation of each committee member, and any other comments that the committee as a whole wishes to convey. For rehiring evaluations of tenure-track and regular non-tenure-track faculty members the transmittal letter will, in consultation with the DEs and/or members of the evaluatee's program, make clear what the expectations are for the evaluatee's successful subsequent rehiring or tenure evaluation, if the DE report has not already done so.
- i. Discussions in the FERC and CEC are confidential, and no part of these discussions may be reported outside the committees.
- j. Should any member of the FERC or CEC have a conflict of interest as defined in the AAUP contract section xviii regarding an evaluation case, as decided upon by the committee, then they will be replaced by an alternate for all discussion and voting on that case.

3. Recommendation of the dean of the college and the dean's decanal designee

After the FERC or CEC vote on an evaluation case, but prior to the meeting of the FERC or CEC with the president, the dean of the college or the dean's decanal designee will convey in writing to the committee their intended recommendation to the president on the case. Copies of this letter will be placed in the evaluatee's file, and will be given to the evaluatee, the divisional chair, program director(s) and DEs.

4. Communication by the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee and the College Evaluation Committee

- a. For each rehiring or conversion case, the FERC and CEC will submit its transmittal letter, together with the DE report, to the president. A version of the letter with individual attribution of votes and explanations removed will be submitted to the closed file, and from there forwarded, together with the DE report, to the evaluatee, DEs, divisional chair, and program director(s) by the 13th Wednesday of each semester. The chair of the EPC will be invited to read the letter and report in the dean's office. The evaluatee, DEs, divisional chairs, program directors(s), and EPC chair will have one week to submit letters of response to be placed in the closed file of the evaluatee. Before the 15th Wednesday of the fall semester and the 16th Wednesday of the spring semester, the FERC and CEC will each meet and discuss each case with the president, who will, at this time, express any reservations or points of disagreement.

- b. For each tenure or promotion to full professor case, the FERC will submit its transmittal letter, together with the DE report, to the president. A version of the letter with individual attribution of votes and explanations removed will be submitted to the closed file, and from there forwarded, together with the DE report, to the evaluatee, DEs, divisional chair, and program director(s) by the 13th Wednesday of the spring semester. The chair of the EPC will be invited to read the letter and report in the dean's office. The evaluatee, DEs, divisional chairs, program director(s), and EPC chair will have one week to submit letters of response to be placed in the closed file of the evaluatee. By the 15th Wednesday of the fall semester and the 16th Wednesday of the spring semester the FERC will meet and discuss each case with the president, who will, at this time, express any reservations or points of disagreement.

g). Evaluations of Adjunct and Short-term Non-tenure-track Faculty Members

1. Adjunct and short-term non-tenure-track faculty members are evaluated in the context of proposals for renewals of appointments in the adjunct or short-term non-tenure-track status.
2. Evaluations that accompany proposals for renewals of appointments in the adjunct or short-term non-tenure-track status are conducted by the program director in consultation with the division chair (only the program director when the position is non-divisional). Such evaluations refer to SOTC/CAFE forms, and to any other material deemed relevant.
3. The program director will forward a brief written evaluation to the dean of the college prior to the dean of the college's decision on rehiring.

h). Senior Evaluations of Tenured Professors Not Being Evaluated for Promotion and of Senior Regular Non-tenure-track Faculty Members

1. Before the end of the semester of evaluation, the dean of the college, the program director and the divisional chair will review the file, which includes the material submitted by the evaluatee, SOTC/CAFE forms and letters from faculty and students, and will then meet together with the evaluatee to discuss the file, and any relevant issues raised by the participants in the discussion. The divisional chair will write a brief summary of the discussion, to be placed in the file and sent to the evaluatee by the end of the semester.
2. If the program director is untenured, or is the evaluatee, the divisional chair will appoint for this evaluation a substitute for the program director who is tenured and in a related field; if the divisional chair is the program director or the evaluatee, the Executive Committee will appoint for this evaluation a substitute for the divisional chair who is tenured and in a related field.

i). Schedule of Evaluations

1. Evaluations of tenure-track faculty members

The schedule of rehiring and tenure evaluations is stated in Item C.5 of this Handbook.

2. Evaluations of tenured faculty members

After receiving tenure, each faculty member will have a regularly scheduled evaluation every 14th semester; such an evaluation will be either a promotion evaluation or a senior evaluation. If a tenured faculty member is evaluated for promotion prior to the 14th semester after the previous evaluation, the regularly scheduled evaluations from then on will commence with the 14th semester after the promotion evaluation.

3. Evaluation of tenure-track faculty members for promotion to associate professor

- a. The granting of tenure should normally entail promotion to associate professor if the evaluatee is not already at that rank. A divisional vote in support of tenure is considered a vote in favor of promotion to associate professor.
- b. If the president grants a faculty member tenure without promotion to associate professor, such a decision should be accompanied by a written statement by the president explaining the reasons for the denial of promotion and specifying criteria that would lead to promotion if satisfied.
- c. If a faculty member is granted tenure but not promoted to associate professor, there will be no additional faculty evaluation for promotion, the decision being that of the president. If the faculty member feels that he or she has subsequently met the stated criteria for promotion, he or she can request a promotion from the president, who will then review the case, consult as needed, and render a decision.

4. Evaluations of tenured faculty members for promotion to full professor

Each tenured faculty member who is an associate professor at the time of a regularly scheduled post-tenure evaluation will automatically be evaluated for promotion to full professor during that evaluation. A faculty member may decline to be evaluated for promotion, in which case he or she will have a senior evaluation at the scheduled time. A faculty member may also request an evaluation for promotion not at the time of a regularly scheduled evaluation. Both types of requests must be submitted in writing to the dean of the college and the divisional chair no later than the start of the spring semester prior to the scheduled/proposed evaluation year. It is recommended that, as a matter of course, faculty members not be promoted to full professor prior to the 14th semester following promotion to associate professor.

5. Evaluations of non-tenure-track faculty members

Evaluations of non-tenure-track faculty members will occur in the context of proposals for rehiring, conversion to regular non-tenure-track faculty, promotion to senior regular non-tenure-track faculty, and conversion to tenure-track in accordance with the Faculty Handbook I.C. "Policy on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Tenure" as further detailed below.

- a. In general, a faculty member can be a short-term visitor for no more than 8 semesters, and in no case can a faculty member be in this status more than 14 semesters. Conversion of short-term non-tenure-track faculty members to regular non-tenure-track faculty will occur when a program requests a CEC evaluation at the end of the penultimate year of a three-

year contract. The evaluation makes a recommendation about suitability for rehiring. Regular non-tenure-track faculty member appointments are for five years, and are renewable.

- b. Promotion from regular non-tenure-track faculty to senior regular non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty will be promoted to the rank of senior regular non-tenure-track after being rehired twice after successful evaluations by the CEC. The title of a senior regular non-tenure-track faculty member is normally “term associate professor,” “continuing associate professor,” “term professor,” “continuing professor,” “senior artist in residence,” “senior writer in residence” or “senior scholar in residence.” The only promotion decision for non-tenure-track faculty members occurs when a regular non-tenure-track faculty member is promoted to senior regular non-tenure-track faculty member as stated in the faculty handbook.
- c. A program may request that a non-tenure-track faculty member be considered for conversion to tenure-track. In a two-part process, each proposal for conversion will be accompanied by an evaluation by the CEC. The program’s request, once endorsed by a vote in the division, shall be submitted in the spring semester to the PAC for recommendations to the president concerning conversion to tenure-track.

(i) In cases when the CEC evaluation is conducted concurrently with the program’s request for conversion to tenure-track, the divisional discussion shall pertain to the evaluatee’s performance up to the present as well as an assessment of the person’s eligibility to enter the tenure-track. The division will vote on the issue of conversion. The DE report submitted to the CEC will indicate the divisional votes and summarize the divisional discussion. The CEC will assess the file both in terms of a performance review and a potential change in contract type. The committee shall vote on the proposed conversion to tenure-track informed by the evaluatee’s performance—in accordance with the expectations of their non-tenure-track position—as evidenced in the file, and by the potential for future engagement in all three categories of tenure-track evaluations. The CEC vote will be transmitted with the committee’s recommendations to the president.

(ii) In cases when the CEC evaluation is conducted in semesters shortly prior to the program’s request for conversion, the divisional discussion shall be about performance review and there will be no vote. The division will vote on the issue of conversion at a future date when the program submits its request to the division, and then to the PAC. If a program anticipates requesting conversion at a later date, as opposed to concurrently with the CEC review, they should state as much and come prepared to the divisional discussion explaining why this person is a good candidate for conversion to tenure-track. The DE report may indicate explicitly that the present evaluation is also forward looking to a request for a change in contract type, and the CEC should have that in mind when they deliberate. If the program does not provide a formal request for conversion at the time of the CEC review, but has expressed their intent to do so, the CEC shall conduct an informal vote on the matter of conversion to tenure-track as the committee will not have the opportunity to weigh in later in the conversion process and their careful consideration of the file can provide

valuable faculty input alongside the subsequent divisional vote and PAC recommendations to the president.

j). The Role of the President

It is agreed that faculty evaluation is primarily a faculty responsibility. The ultimate tenure decision is the president's responsibility. He has the right to solicit necessary input. The president's decisions are to be communicated to the faculty member by the 16th Wednesday of the fall semester for fall semester evaluations, and, whenever possible, by June 15, but in no event later than June 30, for spring semester evaluations and for tenure and promotion evaluations. At the time of their decision, the president will inform the faculty member of their right of appeal. Any appeal from the decision of the president will be made to the board of trustees. If the board of trustees, or its delegates, agrees to hear the appeal, the president will forward all documents concerning the case to the Board. This appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days of the receipt of the president's decision. The faculty member may also use the grievance procedure that is under the auspices of the AAUP. In any instances where the president's decision does not concur with the recommendation of the FERC or CEC, the president will meet with the appropriate committee at the start of the fall semester following the decision to convey the reasons for the disagreement.

k). The Role of the Students

To help achieve the most thorough possible input of student assessment of the success of faculty members being evaluated, there will be a parallel student process. The following process has been used in the past, and meets the needs of the faculty evaluation process. Before the end of the spring semester, the Student Forum will elect two divisional evaluation representatives from each division. Divisional representatives must be moderated Upper College students in good academic standing. Term of office is two semesters. Student divisional evaluation representatives will solicit signed letters of testimony from the students in their divisions regarding faculty being evaluated each semester to be submitted to the Office of the Dean of the College for inclusion in the closed portion of the evaluation file. The student divisional evaluation representatives review the open part of the file of each evaluatee and draft a summary. The EPC report will be due by the 13th Wednesday of the fall semester for tenure and promotion evaluations, and the 4th Wednesday of each semester for rehiring evaluations of tenure-track and regular non-tenure-track faculty members and change or status evaluations. The EPC chair, and the student divisional evaluation representatives as needed, may meet with sets of DEs during the evaluation process if either the EPC chair or the DEs request such a meeting.

l). Evaluation in Good Faith

The Evaluation Procedures for Faculty Members are designed to evaluate each faculty member fairly and in good faith. For each evaluation, a significant amount of input is required, including evaluations from persons both within and without the Bard community. Despite the best efforts of every participant to the evaluation procedure, an evaluation might deviate from the detailed procedures set forth above. By way of example, an outside evaluator may fail to submit a report, a visitor to a classroom may fail to submit their observations in a timely fashion, or the EPC may not be duly constituted in time to participate in the faculty evaluation process. In all cases where the actual evaluation process deviates from the evaluation procedures, the FERC or CEC reserves the right to determine whether the deviation is materially harmful to the evaluation at issue.

m). Life of the Document

The life of this document will be for five years beginning with the new contract year (2023-2028) following its adoption. All faculty evaluations at the college conducted during the life of this document will be according to this document. At the beginning of the fall semester in the year of its expiration (fall 2027), the Faculty Senate will appoint a study committee responsible to the Faculty Senate, to review the document and make suggestions for revision. Amendment by normal procedures may be made before that time.

By Faculty Action: 1999
Amended: 5/24/00
5/22/02
5/21/03
Revised by Faculty Action: 5/4/05
Amended by Faculty Action: 9/21/05
By Faculty Action: 4/15/06
Revised by the Faculty Executive Committee: 2/13/07
3/6/07
Amended by Faculty Action: 11/14/07
By Faculty Action: 4/20/11
Revised by Faculty Action: 5/18/11
Amended by Faculty Action: 12/14/11
Revised by Senate Vote: 10/2/12
Revised by Faculty Action: 4/12/17
Revised by Faculty Action 3/13/19
Revised by the Faculty Executive Committee: 2/20/20
Revised by Faculty Action/Faculty Senate/Faculty Executive Committee: May 2023

Attachment A

**Appendix on Conversion and Tenure Evaluation for Faculty Appointed
in both Graduate and Undergraduate Programs at Bard**

This document aims to establish a clear and consistent process for evaluating faculty who are jointly appointed to graduate programs and undergraduate programs at Bard. As this proposal is generated by faculty from the undergraduate college, the process described below shall apply to those faculty who (1) hold an appointment that specifies their teaching and advising commitment to an undergraduate program at Bard, which should not be less than a 1-1 teaching load; or (2) are undergoing conversion to a contract of that nature. (Should the director of a graduate program wish to use the undergraduate evaluation system for a faculty member with a lower teaching load than specified above, they may bring this request to the dean of graduate studies, the dean of the college, and the relevant divisional chair for review.) Further, in order to ensure that faculty undergo a process that is supported consistently by both undergraduate and graduate administration, the procedures described here apply only to faculty whose graduate program directors have signed off on this document and/or indicated that this document applies to the faculty member in question, either at the time of faculty hire or at the time of faculty conversion to a tenure-track appointment.

1. Conversion to Tenure-Track: A faculty member jointly appointed in a graduate program and an undergraduate program can undergo an evaluation followed by a proposal for conversion to a tenure-track position as follows:

- a. The evaluation will follow established CEC review procedures, with the following changes:

- (i) One of the faculty member's two DEs should be affiliated with the graduate program in which they are appointed, if feasible.

- (ii) There will be two class visits in the file. When feasible, based on the location and scheduling of the graduate program, one of the class visits will be to a graduate class, the other to an undergraduate class. Otherwise, both class visits will have taken place by the fourth week of the semester of evaluation in courses conducted at the undergraduate conducted the semester prior to evaluation if undergraduate teaching spans both semesters. Class visit reports shall be submitted by the 5th Wednesday of the semester.

- b. The evaluation may be followed by a proposal to the PAC for tenure-track conversion, which should be jointly submitted by the undergraduate and graduate program leadership.

- (i) Should a tenure-track contract be subsequently approved, this contract should specify the faculty member's teaching commitment to the undergraduate college, which should not be less than 1-1; the faculty member's advising commitment to the undergraduate college, which should not be less than $\frac{1}{3}$ of a standard full-time undergraduate faculty member's advising load; and the expectations of service to the undergraduate college.

2. Tenure Evaluation: A faculty member may be hired into a tenure-track joint appointment between the undergraduate college and a graduate program. In this case, the following should apply:

- a. The faculty member's appointment letter should specify, at the time of hire, a teaching and advising commitment to the undergraduate college, which should not be less than 1-1, with an accompanying advising load equivalent to $\frac{1}{3}$ of a standard full-time undergraduate faculty member's advising load.

- b. The faculty member's appointment letter should specify, at the time of hire or conversion, the expectations of service to the undergraduate college.

- c. The faculty member may then undergo a pre-tenure and tenure evaluation as described in the FED, with the following adjustments:

- (i) During each of these evaluations, one of the two DEs should be affiliated with the graduate program in which the evaluatee is appointed, if feasible. If this is not possible, the DEs will be selected with an eye towards faculty most appropriate in their fields of expertise or experience teaching at the college.

- (ii) During each of these evaluations, one class visit should take place in a graduate class, and the other in an undergraduate class, if feasible.

- (iii) The DE report should strive to reflect the evaluatee's work in all three categories of evaluation, across both the undergraduate college and graduate program, with careful regard for the expectations

established at the time of hire. The DEs should share their draft DE report with the relevant divisional chair and with the director of the relevant graduate program, and should meet with them on a schedule consistent with the tenure process for undergraduate faculty.

(iv) Calls for testimony should include graduate students from the relevant program and faculty affiliated with the relevant graduate program, even if those faculty members are not affiliated with the undergraduate college.

(v) Faculty who are affiliated with the relevant graduate program on an appointment of $\frac{2}{3}$ time or above may attend the undergraduate divisional discussion and may vote, even if they are not affiliated with the undergraduate college.

Attachment B

Appendix on Tenure Evaluation for Faculty on a Fast Track (supplement to existing Category A, B, C Tenure-Track Appointments 1. C. 5)

1. Tenure Evaluation for Faculty on a Fast-Track: A faculty member may be hired who is advanced in the tenure clock at another institution, who is already tenured elsewhere, and/or who is accomplished in their field, and who is set to be evaluated on an expedited clock after their arrival at Bard. The process outlined below is meant to provide as much familiarity with the evaluatee's work as possible and allow for them to have a better understanding of Bard's tenure review process. For evaluatees in this category, a decision will be made with the understanding that certain materials that are usually available over the course of a slower evaluation clock will not be available at the time of review.

- a. If hired with an expedited clock, at the end of the first year at Bard the evaluatee has the option to extend the time of review for another year by notifying the dean of the college by the last week of the spring semester.
- b. If the evaluation will not follow the standard schedule, the dean of the college should specify the dates for the major milestones in the evaluation process (e.g., Divisional vote, FERC transmittal, recommendation of the dean, and decision of the president).
- c. Inclusion of Work Done Before Arrival to Bard in Evaluation File:

(i) Gathering Additional Materials for the Open File:

(1) Category II: At the discretion of the evaluatee, professional work completed before their time at Bard can be submitted to the file to provide a broader sense of their trajectory. DEs may also request that the evaluatee add materials to the file to provide a fuller picture of the work done in this category, which the evaluatee may respond to at their discretion.

(ii) Gathering Additional Materials for the Closed File:

(1) Category I: If the evaluatee chooses to submit teaching evaluations and/or sample teaching materials from before their time at Bard, they may do so at their own discretion. DEs may make their own determination about the relevance of referencing this material and justify their decision to the chair of the division. DEs may also request that the evaluatee add materials to the file to provide a fuller picture of the work done in this category, which the evaluatee may respond to at their discretion.

(2) If an evaluatee has undergone tenure review at another institution, an attempt will be made by the dean of the college to access relevant materials from the previous review with the understanding that access may vary depending on the institution. This inquiry will be conducted only at the discretion of the evaluatee.

d. Evaluating Category III, service to the community, in an expedited time frame:

(i) Considerations at the time of hire: Both the dean of the college and the primary program director shall discuss and, at the time of hire, provide a clear understanding to the faculty member of the scope of expectations in terms of service commensurate with the timeframe for tenure review. A redacted version of the appointment letter should be included in the closed file by the dean of the college for the DEs to reference so that the division can compare the work conducted to established expectations.

(ii) Upon tenure review, DEs shall be given access to the expectations for service and engagement with the college community previously communicated at the time of hire to inform the framing of their representation of the file as pertains to Category III. The DEs should include any such expectations (or their absence) in their report.

e. At all stages of the evaluation process, it must be clear that an accelerated review is not to be taken as an opportunity to re-adjudicate opinions about hiring decisions for the position now occupied by the person being evaluated. The evaluatee shall be considered for their own work independently from any lingering framing of the position itself at the time of hire.