

# FASTAP IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

23 JUNE 2017

Karen Anderson  
Jack Dovidio  
Alan Gerber (Committee Chair)  
Jacqueline Goldsby  
Amy Hungerford  
Kathryn Lofton  
Scott Miller  
Gregory McCarthy  
Thomas Near  
T. Kyle Vanderlick

Bethany Zemba (Staff)

## CONTENTS

CONTENTS .....	1
PART I: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	2
1. Committee Charge and Membership .....	2
A. FASTAP '16 Implementation Committee Charge .....	2
B. FASTAP '16 Implementation Committee Membership:.....	2
2. Reappointment Review.....	3
3. Implementation Recommendations Regarding Mentoring.....	6
4. Modifications to the Existing Reviews.....	8
A. Dossier.....	8
B. External Letters.....	8
i. Initial Promotion to Tenure .....	8
ii. Promotion from Tenured Associate Professor at Yale to Full Professor .....	9
5. Best Practices for the TAC .....	9
6. Learning and Adjustment.....	10
PART II: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS .....	11
1. Definition of Arms-Length.....	11
2. Examples of Language for Reappointment Review Letters, Adapted from Review Letters at Peer Institutions.....	11
A. Example: Research Paragraph.....	12
B. Example: Teaching Paragraph .....	13
C. Example: Service Paragraph.....	13
D. Edited Example of the Reappointment Letter Structure from a Peer Institution .....	14
3. Proposed Template Letters for Reappointment Review .....	15
A. Draft of Initial Letter of Inquiry: .....	16
B. Draft of Cover Letter for Those Agreeing to Write, to Accompany Scholar's Materials:.....	17
4. Example of Mentoring Resource from Peer Institution.....	19

## PART I: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. COMMITTEE CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP

#### A. FASTAP '16 IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE CHARGE

FASTAP '16, which was endorsed by a formal vote of the FAS faculty in September 2016, established a new review (the reappointment review), and modified some of the parameters of existing promotion reviews (the initial appointment to tenure, the promotion from associate professor with tenure at Yale to full professor). However, the specification of how those reviews were to be conducted was delegated to a successor committee, the *Implementation Advisory Committee*. As stated in the FASTAP '16 report:

*The charge of the committee will be to advise the FAS Dean on initial procedures for carrying out the new FASTAP '16 policies.*

#### B. FASTAP '16 IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

The membership of the FASTAP Implementation Committee was as follows:

*Karen Anderson: Associate Provost for Academic Resources and Faculty Development*

*Jack Dovidio: Dean of Academic Affairs of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; Carl I. Hovland Professor of Psychology and Professor in the Institute for Social and Policy Studies and of Epidemiology (Chronic Diseases)*

*Alan Gerber (Committee Chair): Dean of the Social Sciences; Charles C. and Dorathea S. Dilley Professor of Political Science and Professor in the Institute for Social and Policy Studies, of Economics and of Public Health (Health Policy)*

*Jacqueline Goldsby: Professor of English, of African American Studies and of American Studies*

*Amy Hungerford: Dean of the Humanities; Bird White Housum Professor of English and Professor of American Studies*

*Kathryn Lofton: Deputy Dean for Diversity and Faculty Development; Chair, Religious Studies; Professor of Religious Studies, of Divinity, of History, of American Studies and of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies*

*Scott Miller: Divisional Director, Sciences; Irénée du Pont Professor of Chemistry; Chair, Physical Sciences and Engineering Advisory Committee*

*Gregory McCarthy: Professor of Psychology*

*Thomas Near: Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology*

*T. Kyle Vanderlick: Dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science; Thomas E. Golden, Jr. Professor of Chemical and Environmental Engineering*

The committee was staffed by Bethany Zemba: *Chief of Staff and Senior Advisor to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.*

## 2. REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

FASTAP '16's most significant departure from current tenure and promotion practices is the consolidation of the current assistant professor renewal (typically performed in the 3rd year) and the current associate professor on term (AOPN) review (typically conducted in the 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> year) into a single assistant professor *reappointment review* (typically conducted in, and no later than, the 4<sup>th</sup> year).

Many aspects of the reappointment review are specified in the FASTAP '16 report and this language guided the work of the committee. The FASTAP '16 report specifies that:

- The standard for this reappointment is: *“Reappointment as assistant professor (advanced) requires that the candidate demonstrate measurable progress towards the criteria for tenure in research, teaching, and service.”*
- *“The reappointment review will conclude with detailed feedback for the candidate outlining strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for growth. This is not a pro forma review with expectations of an automatic pass; it is the occasion for substantive assessment of the candidate’s work to date.”*
- The review includes: *“a review and vote by the TAC.”*
- The review includes: *“professional appraisal of the candidate’s scholarship from arms’ length reviewers outside of Yale who work in the candidate’s area of research.”*
- *“At the conclusion of the review, candidates will receive feedback from both the department and the TAC regarding the substance of their scholarship and the degree to which they have demonstrated early signs of success in the three areas that will be evaluated in the tenure review. Feedback will take the form of candid assessments of candidates’ work and plans in these areas.”*

The members of the FASTAP '16 Implementation Committee were in general agreement about the reappointment review’s purpose. It should:

1. Provide the department and Tenure and Appointments Committee (TAC) with the information necessary for equitable and informed promotion decisions, including the possibility of denying promotion to a faculty member who has not satisfied the standard for reappointment.
2. Provide advice and post-review mentoring to help candidates become better researchers, teachers, and colleagues.
3. Provide candidates with information to engage in informed decision making and career planning. Without making any false promises or rushing to premature judgment, post-review feedback should convey a candid early impression of how the scholar is progressing in research, teaching, service, and overall.

The FASTAP '16 Implementation Committee's recommendations for the reappointment review are that:

- The review will typically begin in the spring semester of the candidate's third year, and the candidate's scholarship and other case material will be due in early August. The review will typically be concluded during the fall semester of the 4<sup>th</sup> year.
- The FASTAP '16 report requires that the reappointment review include arms-length, external evaluators. We recommend requiring a minimum of three external letters, at least two of which should be arms-length external letters. (Note that this minimum of three letters is higher than the zero letters for the current assistant professor renewal and lower than the minimum of six letters currently required for the untenured associate (AOPN) review.) There is no presumption that letters in excess of the minimum number are warranted, and the number of letters received should normally not exceed five. Proposed versions of the template letters for the initial letter of inquiry to a potential reviewer and the cover letter to those agreeing to write are items 3.A. and 3.B in the supplementary materials found at the end of this report. Our recommended letters soliciting reviewers request constructive feedback on the scholar's current work and research direction.
- For this review and other tenure and promotion reviews, the FASTAP '16 implementation committee defines arms-length referees using a definition adapted from the current FAS promotion handbook. This definition is item 1 in the supplementary materials that accompany this report. As with current practice, the Committee recommends that for all reappointment and promotion reviews, candidates be permitted to request that the department avoid one or two referees whom they believe would not be able to provide an unbiased review. Candidates may also suggest arms-length reviewers whom they believe could provide particularly informed assessments. However, the final set of reviewers is determined by the department and the FAS dean's office. Such information will be noted on the materials provided to the department and TAC.
- The dossier for this review will largely follow the existing department and divisional conventions applied to the associate-on-term review, with some changes (enumerated below). In addition, the current *department case summary form*, which is prepared by the department and submitted to the TAC along with the other case materials following the positive department vote for promotion to AOPN, will be revised. The current form requires a 250-500 word description of the scholar's performance in research and in teaching and a 150-250 word assessment of the candidate's service. The revised form will ask the department to provide 250-500 word assessments of the scholar's performance in each of these three areas: research, teaching, and service. Rather than a general account of performance, however, the revised department case summary will request a clear description of the strengths, weaknesses, and an overall evaluation for each of these three areas.

- Prior to FASTAP '16, the assistant professor reappointment review did not involve any participation by the TAC, whereas the AOPN review required a full TAC vote. In recognition of the distinct status of the new reappointment review, the FASTAP '16 report specifies that the reappointment review should include a vote by the TAC and feedback from the TAC regarding the scholar's progress, but allows that this might take a novel form. One way to ensure this is accomplished in a thorough and conscientious manner without imposing unnecessary burdens on department chairs and members of the TAC is that, for each case, a subcommittee of the TAC, normally three members, be appointed by the divisional dean to complete an initial evaluation of the case. In the event the subcommittee is unanimous in support of the case, then the subcommittee would report on the case to the full committee for abbreviated discussion before a formal vote. In the event the subcommittee is not unanimous in support of the case, then the case would be fully reviewed by the entire TAC. For scholars with an interdivisional joint appointment, we recommend that the relevant divisional deans, in consultation with the department or program chairs, prepare an MOU specifying that a blended TAC would be formed to evaluate the reappointment.
- Following the review, the candidate will receive a letter. The post-review letter (PRL) will be approximately two pages long, and it will summarize the findings of the review. This letter will typically draw on the department case summary. The PRL will evaluate the candidate's current body of work and professional accomplishment and will report on the strengths, weaknesses, and overall sense of the candidate's research, teaching, and service record. The letter will also draw on the external assessments where relevant and while preserving the confidentiality of those assessments. The letter might also discuss the candidate's research proposals. The divisional dean will work with the chair so that the letter accurately reflects both the department's and the divisional committee's assessment of the case. These letters will make use of graded language to ensure that assessments are understood by both the department and the candidate. For example, in each area (research, teaching, and service) the assessment may be summarized as exceptionally favorable, highly favorable, somewhat/generally favorable, or unfavorable. Once the chair, divisional dean (or area director), and FAS dean reach agreement on its content, this letter will be sent to the candidate, co-signed by the chair and divisional dean (or area director). Although the PRL will not be sent to other members of the department, the department chair will be encouraged to share the basic sentiments expressed in the letter with the tenured faculty. The letter will become part of candidate's permanent file, and will be included in the tenure promotion file when the time comes for that review.
- For cases involving joint appointments, the shared responsibilities for the reappointment review will be described in an MOU agreed to by both department chairs and provided to the candidate at the time of hire. A general principle is that the reappointment review should be performed by the department or departments and the TAC that is anticipated to evaluate the candidate for subsequent promotions.

- Candidates will have the opportunity to correct factual errors in the PRL. These corrections will be appended to the letter, and will become part of the candidate’s personnel file. Per CT state law, a candidate has the right, should they disagree with any of the information contained in the PRL, to submit a written statement explaining their position. This statement will also be appended to the letter and will be maintained as part of the candidate’s personnel file.
- During subsequent promotion reviews the PRL, along with any corrections and any written statement supplied by the candidate, will be included as part of the dossier that is presented to the relevant department faculty members and the TAC, but the PRL will not be provided to external reviewers.

### 3. IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING MENTORING

The FASTAP ’16 Implementation Committee was charged to consider mentoring expectations for departments before and after each of the reviews. The committee affirms the importance of mentoring as articulated in the FAS Ladder Faculty Promotion Handbook, June 2016:

*Mentoring is an important part of the reappointment and promotion process for non-tenured ladder faculty. It is the expectation within the FAS that departments’ mentoring policies should be working in concert with the review and promotion process as each tenure-track faculty member moves through the ladder ranks toward their tenure review. All departments are expected to have a formal mentoring process on file in the department and in the FAS Dean’s office, and proactively follow their mentoring plan as a component of the review and promotion process, as well as during the years between each review.*

To improve the quality and consistency of mentoring across the FAS, the FASTAP ’16 Implementation Committee recommends:

- The minimum expectations for mentorship are that the mentor (or mentoring committee) should meet with the untenured faculty member at least once a year, and preferably once each semester, to engage in a substantive discussion of any questions the untenured faculty member has regarding their research, teaching, and service. It is also expected that the department chair will meet with each untenured faculty member at least once each year to discuss the faculty member’s research, teaching, and service. During this meeting the chair should answer questions about reappointment and promotion including questions about the procedures that are used and the criteria outlined in the FASTAP report for each review. (In large departments with more than five untenured ladder faculty members this responsibility might be deputized to another senior faculty member.)
- The mentor (or mentoring committee) should make a special effort to be available for consultation before and after any reviews.

- To encourage and recognize strong mentoring, we recommend that the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) be amended to include an item which requests faculty to report annually on their mentoring activities.
- During the divisional dean’s annual meeting with the department chair, time should be set aside to discuss the past year’s mentoring activities and to confirm that all untenured ladder faculty members and tenured associate professors in the chair’s department received appropriate mentoring. There are many ways in which chairs can stay well-apprised of the mentoring activity in their department. Among the ideas discussed in the Implementation Committee were holding a yearly meeting of the tenured faculty in which each faculty member with mentoring responsibilities reports on their mentoring activities and updates the department generally on the untenured faculty member’s progress. Other universities have developed forms that both serve to confirm mentoring activity and assist the mentor in covering relevant areas. A form used at a peer institution includes an item which resembles a checklist and assists mentors by reminding them of the range of issues that it might be useful to discuss. If a form like this is employed during a mentoring meeting or filled in after the meeting, the form can also serve as a record of the mentoring that did take place (a copy of the form is included as item 4 in the supplementary materials section of this report).
- The committee felt it would be useful for the department and the FAS to get direct and regular confirmation from the untenured faculty and tenured associates that mentoring is being provided, and that this confirmation of mentoring be available well in advance of the reappointment and other reviews. One idea is to develop a “check in” email sent to faculty each spring to provide untenured and tenured associate professors an opportunity to confirm they have received appropriate mentoring during the year. Although the precise form that this check-in might take requires additional reflection, there was a sense that something is needed to be put into place to ensure intended mentoring was in fact taking place.
- The FAS has recently begun to provide funds for all assistant professors to convene a pre-publication book colloquium, a small conference, host research collaborators, or attend an event where the scholar/scientist would receive in-depth engagement with their research. We encourage untenured ladder faculty and mentors to discuss how to take full advantage of this opportunity for professional growth.
- Chairs and divisional deans should consider whether existing FAS practices are sufficient to ensure that qualified faculty members are nominated for appropriate awards and honors.



## 4. MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING REVIEWS

The FASTAP '16 report also makes some modest alterations to two existing reviews that will continue under the new tenure and promotion system: the initial promotion to tenure, and the promotion from tenured associate to full professor. However, the FASTAP '16 report leaves open certain details about the conduct of these reviews.

---

### A. DOSSIER

For both the initial appointment to tenure and the promotion from associate with tenure to full professor, we recommend that the preparation of the candidate's dossier largely follow the current department and divisional conventions for these promotion reviews, with the addition of the PRL as part of the case file available for voting members of the department and forwarded to the TAC for the tenure review (Additional possibilities for modification are addressed in Section 5 below). In addition, the FASTAP Implementation Committee recommends that the department case summary form be revised to reflect the changes proposed for the reappointment review (see the discussion of the reappointment review for a description of the revised department case summary).

---

### B. EXTERNAL LETTERS

FASTAP '16 leaves some of the details of external review to be determined by the Implementation Committee, most notably policies for the number and attributes of required external review letters. In our recommendations regarding external letters for these two reviews, the Implementation Committee aimed to balance practicality, expertise, and impartiality.

---

#### i. INITIAL PROMOTION TO TENURE

In recognition of the significance of a tenured appointment, regarding external letters for the initial promotion to tenure, the FASTAP '16 report states that:

*Review for tenure will require a dossier of at least ten outside letters to ensure a fair and thorough appraisal of the candidate's scholarly record.*

This requirement can be compared to our existing practices for the initial review to tenure. Currently, the initial appointment to tenure requires at least seven arms-length letters, four of which are “fresh” (e.g. the reviewer must not have written previously for a Yale appointment or review for the candidate in question). In contrast, the FASTAP '16 report specifies a minimum of ten letters, but does not specify whether these letters need to be from arms-length or fresh reviewers.

The FASTAP Implementation Committee’s recommendations for the initial appointment to tenure at Yale are that:

- This review should require a minimum of ten arms-length letters, at least seven of which are from fresh reviewers, but that the number of letters received should normally not exceed 12 or 13.
- In rare cases, there will be an acute trade-off between the requirement that reviewers be arms-length and the need for reviewers who are among the foremost experts in the relevant areas. In these cases, the divisional dean, in consultation with colleagues in the dean’s office, may adopt a looser interpretation of arms-length and/or may grant that up to four of the letters are from reviewers who wrote for the reappointment review.

---

## ii. PROMOTION FROM TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AT YALE TO FULL PROFESSOR

Regarding external review, the relevant language from the FASTAP ’16 report states that:

*The review for this promotion will include professional appraisal of the candidate’s scholarship from arms’ length reviewers outside of Yale who work in the candidate’s area of research.*

Currently, the promotion from tenured associate at Yale to full professor requires a minimum of seven arms-length letters, four of which are “fresh” (e.g. the reviewer must not have not written previously for a Yale appointment or review). Although the FASTAP report requires arms-length reviewers, there is no minimum number of letters specified.

The FASTAP ’16 Implementation Committee’s recommendations for the promotion from tenured associate to full professor at Yale are that:

- This review should require a minimum of three arms-length letters from eminent scholars with appropriate expertise, but the number of letters received should normally not exceed five. There is no specific requirement regarding whether the reviewers have written for the candidate previously, though it is typically expected that at least two of the letters will come from scholars who have not written for the candidate in previous Yale reviews.

## 5. BEST PRACTICES FOR THE TAC

We recommend that the FAS Dean take this moment of change in the promotion system to consider the TAC’s general operational practices and see if improvement can be made in the committees’ functioning, both to ensure fairness of decisions and to address the intense work load for the committees and for the FAS Dean, who currently sits on all TACs in all FAS divisions for all cases. This might include longer terms for TAC members with course release for service to build committee experience and equity among cases decided across years; apprenticeship terms for new

members; guideline sheets listing questions to be focused on to ensure consistent reading across cases; an exploration of how best to evaluate effective teaching; revised “lead reader” practices, where used; and the release of the FAS Dean from the reappointment review cases, but not from any cases involving granting tenure. Further, the FAS Dean might want to consider other issues regarding the standards for cases presented to the TAC, including the possibility that a case might proceed to the TAC only if a sufficient proportion of those eligible to vote on a case participated in the vote.

## 6. LEARNING AND ADJUSTMENT

FASTAP ’16 requires many small and large adjustments to our previous practices. Just as the reform of FASTAP ’07 was in part a response to concerns about aspects of the prior system, so as we learn from our experiences with FASTAP ’16 and the rules that the Dean’s office adopts to implement it, we will observe points of friction, inefficiency, and incomplete realization of the potential of the reform. The Implementation Committee recommends that the Dean be alert to opportunities to improve the rules for implementation of FASTAP ’16 and after some time has passed, consider ways to improve upon our recommendations.

## PART II: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

### 1. DEFINITION OF ARMS-LENGTH

**Adapted from the FAS promotion handbook:**

**Arms-length Referees** refers to scholars asked to evaluate a candidate for promotion or tenure who have not served as the candidate’s teacher, mentor, or research collaborator, and have no other conflict of interest. Normally co-authoring a paper, sharing a grant, or having an on-going collaboration constitutes a non-arms-length relationship. However, in some cases in which a paper is a large collaborative project involving a substantial number of authors, a letter from one of the co-authors might be considered arms-length. Also, although the candidate’s teachers are normally considered non-arms-length, in some cases the relationship between the teacher and the candidate may be sufficiently distant to be acceptable as an arms-length relationship – again with the approval of the appropriate area committee chair or divisional dean.

### 2. EXAMPLES OF LANGUAGE FOR REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW LETTERS, ADAPTED FROM REVIEW LETTERS AT PEER INSTITUTIONS.

The letters that serve as models for the Post Review Letter (PRL) are typically 1-2 pages. The letters begin and conclude with some standard language, and the body of the letter is about three paragraphs or so; these central paragraphs report the assessment of the scholar’s record in research, teaching, and service respectively. The examples presented here are included to provide concrete examples of what a letter might look like and how “graded language” might be used in the assessment. These paragraphs are not suggested as model text for Yale letters. Rather, it is envisioned that each department and division will evolve a communications style adapted to the departmental and divisional culture. However, we do recommend the use of graded language (as illustrated below) to ensure clear and accurate communication of the review’s assessments.

---

## A. EXAMPLE: RESEARCH PARAGRAPH

Example 1: (one paragraph on research)

Our assessment of your research is highly favorable. You already have a cluster of articles both related and tangential to your book project in peer reviewed journals, edited volumes, and conference proceedings. Your book manuscript, XXX, is under contract with XXXX University Press in the highly regarded series XXX. The department admired your extensive archival work and effort to address fundamental questions about XXXX. Your several strong articles on XXX augment the impact of your scholarship in this area and represent a strong contribution to the debate on XXX. Overall, your colleagues find your research productivity, as seen in both the number of peer reviewed journal articles and the quality, originality and significance of the published work, to be outstanding.

Example 2: (two paragraphs on research)

Our assessment of your research is in generally/somewhat favorable. XXXXXX [a concise but detailed assessment of quality and quantity of the current research output goes here].

We emphasize that it is the quality of the work – its originality, significance, and impact, not its quantity alone—that ultimately determines whether the standard for tenure has been met in the area of scholarship. Nonetheless, it is only with sufficient work realized and published, demonstrating quality and originality, that the work’s significance and contribution to the field can be assessed and we can have confidence in future promise and impact.

Example 3: (one or two paragraphs explaining a negative assessment)

Our assessment of your research is not favorable. Since arrival at Yale, you have submitted a single essay for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, resulting in the recommendation to revise and resubmit. While we respect your decision to depart from your dissertation work, the new project is not yet sufficiently advanced for us to assess its full promise, though outside reviewers and members of the department expressed interest in XXX approach to YYY.

---

## B. EXAMPLE: TEACHING PARAGRAPH

Your contributions and performance in teaching are generally/somewhat favorable. Your colleagues in the Department note that your feedback to students at all levels is comprehensive and respectful. Your undergraduate and graduate courses draw steady, though comparatively small, enrollments, and students express their admiration for your knowledge, expertise, and enthusiasm. There is room for improvement in the organization of the classes, however, especially as noted in the student evaluations of the undergraduate and graduate introductory courses. I ask that you reach out to XXX, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, to arrange for a visit to your classes. The center's staff can provide confidential feedback and resources. We hope that this will be helpful to the further development of your strong pedagogical skills.

---

## C. EXAMPLE: SERVICE PARAGRAPH

Your contribution to service and to the intellectual life of the social sciences more broadly is highly favorable. The amount of service and the specific duties are appropriate for a colleague on the tenure-track, and we find that you undertake your responsibilities with seriousness, creativity and energy. You have been involved in the creation of XX new courses in XX, and have served on the XXX committee. For the department, you've served on the XXX and XXX committee.

---

#### D. EDITED EXAMPLE OF THE REAPPOINTMENT LETTER STRUCTURE FROM A PEER INSTITUTION

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

This letter summarizes the evaluation of your work that we received during your reappointment review. That you are receiving it now means that your file has been approved at all review levels, and your reappointment as Assistant Professor of \_\_\_\_\_ is effective for the period [date] through [date].

*[paragraph offering congratulations]*

The position of Assistant Professor is a demanding one that, at XXXX, carries high expectations of outstanding achievements in research and teaching.

*[paragraph addressing scholarship]*

*[paragraph addressing teaching, including addressing any concerns raised by referees, trainees, evaluations, or from review committees]*

*[paragraph addressing any criticisms/suggestions from referees or from review committees]*

*[if applicable, paragraph addressing clinical, administrative, creative and/or service activities]*

*[concluding paragraph modeled on the following]:*

The tenure review will involve the solicitation of confidential evaluations from 8-12 [in Yale's case: at least ten] distinguished scholars outside of XXXX. The decision will turn on the judgment as to whether you have achieved true distinction in scholarship and a record of high quality teaching. Service beyond what is routinely required in conjunction with your research and teaching responsibilities is of minimal consequence to the tenure review. You should be careful to balance any service requests with your scholarly and teaching commitments, which are of foremost consequence to your tenure case.

Please bear in mind that at the time of your tenure review, referees will be asked whether your scholarship clearly reveals that you are not only among the best scholars in your cohort in a broadly defined field, but that you are also likely to become one of the very best in the field. In short, their judgments will be both comparative and predictive. The decision to confer tenure is a prediction, rather than a matter of calibrating a certain quality and quantity of output against some minimal standard by which a candidate can be said to have met the expectations for tenure. It involves a complex judgment as to the quality of future achievement promised by the candidate's scholarly output and teaching record to date when viewed within the overall intellectual trajectory of the discipline. Positive decisions can only be predicated upon the prediction that in both scholarship and teaching the candidate has shown himself or herself likely to become one of the very best in a broadly defined field.

For this and other reasons, please understand that the advice offered in this letter is not a prescription for achieving promotion. Rather, the advice here is my best judgment of things to work on based on the reappointment review, to be accepted or rejected as you see fit. It bears emphasizing that you will have to decide for yourself the best strategy, from the knowledge you have of your particular field and of the criteria for promotion, and that the ultimate responsibility for career trajectory and success lies with each faculty member. At the same time, please do take advantage of the mentoring capabilities of senior faculty in the department. We stand prepared to offer assistance and advising as you approach this evaluation, and urge you to seek counsel broadly from among your colleagues at XXXXX and elsewhere. You should work closely with your faculty mentor [name] as you approach the tenure evaluation and feel free to communicate with me if you feel your mentoring relationship is in any way lacking. We stand ready to help you in whatever way we can. Please schedule a meeting with me to discuss this feedback.

For your reference, attached is a summary of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor in the University Tenure Line.

### 3. PROPOSED TEMPLATE LETTERS FOR REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW



---

## A. DRAFT OF INITIAL LETTER OF INQUIRY:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

We are about to undertake a reappointment review for our colleague Prof. [Name], who is currently an assistant professor in [his/her/their] [third] year on the tenure clock. [His/Her/Their] CV is attached. At this important point in our colleague's career, we seek the input of a few eminent experts in their field as we evaluate their work and progress towards tenure; we are writing to you in this capacity.

The assistant professor reappointment review in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is a key element in a newly revised tenure system that the university adopted as of July 1, 2017. The review provides early-career scholars with timely and substantive feedback on their work and progress towards tenure, and gives the department a clear occasion for mentorship.

We are writing to ask whether you would be willing to assist us with this review. We think your expertise and insights would be particularly useful to us and to Prof. [name]. Referees are asked to review the candidate's work to date, evaluating its substance, range, method, and value to the field, noting strengths and areas for improvement.

Your confidentiality will be our highest priority as we conduct the review. Your letter will become part of the candidate's dossier, which is read only by members of the department, by divisional committee members qualified to vote on the case, and by the relevant deans in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

If you are willing to undertake this review, we will send you the Prof. [name]'s materials by mid-August, along with questions to frame your reading. We would need your letter by October 1, [year].

These efforts are a great service to the future of the field, and we appreciate the time and energy that they entail. Thank you for generously considering our request.

Sincerely yours,

[Chair]

Chair, [Department/Program]

---

**B. DRAFT OF COVER LETTER FOR THOSE AGREEING TO WRITE, TO ACCOMPANY SCHOLAR'S MATERIALS:**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Thank you for agreeing to act as a reviewer for the reappointment of Prof. [name] in the Department of [Dept]. The materials for the review are available at [link]; please let us know if you would like any of these sent to you in hard copy.

Our goal in conducting this review is to give guidance to candidates on their research, teaching, and service, and to help them assess their professional and intellectual direction as they look towards tenure review. Prof. [name] is in year [clock year] of [his/her/their] appointment as assistant professor. Please note that this may or may not correspond to calendar years since appointment or since the candidate's PhD.

The standard and process for this reappointment is described as follows in our official policy:

- *“Reappointment as assistant professor (advanced) requires that the candidate demonstrate measurable progress towards the criteria for tenure in research, teaching, and service.”*
- *“The reappointment review will conclude with detailed feedback for the candidate outlining strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for growth. This is not a pro forma review with expectations of an automatic pass; it is the occasion for substantive assessment of the candidate's work to date.”*

To remind you, the evaluation we are requesting is different from a tenure review. However, we ask you to bear in mind the long-term goals set out by the tenure standard, which we include below for your reference. As you assess the candidate's progress, we would appreciate your thoughts on the following questions:

1. What are the candidate's most creative and promising research questions and lines of inquiry, and how do these contribute to the field?
2. In what areas should the candidate seek to expand or develop their expertise or methods in the coming years?
3. Are there any significant flaws or limitations in the work that the candidate should address?

Please send us your letter by October 1, [year], in a PDF file, by email to [chair's assistant's email address].

Thank you again for your willingness to provide your expertise at this important point in Prof. [Name]'s career.

Sincerely yours,

[Chair]

## **Tenure standard:**

Under the revised tenure system in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, review for promotion to associate professor with tenure is typically conducted in the 7th year of a faculty member's tenure-track appointment. The standard is described as follows:

*“Tenure at Yale is awarded to scholars who stand among the foremost leaders in the world in a broad field of knowledge. It is reserved for candidates whose published work significantly extends the horizons of their discipline(s). A tenure appointment is a permanent, forward-looking commitment, and therefore requires evidence of an ongoing and ambitious research agenda.*

*“An assessment of candidates’ leadership is based on the impact, at the very highest levels, of their research and peer-reviewed scholarship. Excellent teaching and engaged University and professional citizenship within and beyond a department or program are also expected. Tenure at Yale may be awarded at the associate or full professor rank.*

*“Associate professors are expected to build upon the accomplishments that earned them their permanent appointments, so that within a reasonable period of time their body of work will merit their consideration for full professor.*

*“The title of full professor is earned by those individuals who have a body of distinguished achievements in their record of research, with a commensurate national and international reputation, and who (continue to) display the excellence in teaching and service that is expected of all tenured professors at Yale.”*

#### 4. EXAMPLE OF MENTORING RESOURCE FROM PEER INSTITUTION

### ANNUAL COUNSELING MEETING DOCUMENTATION FOR UNTENURED FACULTY

The University's Faculty Handbook states that "Deans, department chairs, or their delegates should confer annually with each untenured faculty member in their department or school to review his or her performance in light of the criteria for reappointment or promotion. Similarly, H&S policy states: "Every untenured professor should have an annual counseling session with the department chair or his or her designee from the senior faculty. This is a joint responsibility. In other words, it is the responsibility of the department chair annually to offer to confer with the assistant professor, and it is the responsibility of the assistant professor annually to follow up with the department chair to arrange for such an annual conference."

This form may be used to document the counseling meeting(s); it is optional. If used, it should be completed annually (except in the year when the faculty member is being reappointed or promoted) by the department chair or his/her designate for faculty in the following ranks: assistant professors, untenured associate professors, and non-tenure line (parenthetical) faculty whose appointments are for a term of years. The form should be signed and dated by the department chair or his/her designate and by the faculty member after the annual counseling meeting and forwarded to the cognizant Senior Associate Dean. A copy should be maintained in the faculty member's departmental file.

*Note: The ultimate responsibility for career trajectory and success lies with each faculty member himself or herself. Each untenured faculty member should understand that a chair's or a faculty member's strategic advice is not a prescription for reappointment or achieving tenure, but rather is a senior colleague's best judgment, to be accepted or rejected as the untenured faculty member chooses.*

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Meeting: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Faculty Member Receiving Counseling: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Department Chair or Senior Faculty Providing Counseling and Completing this Form:

1. I confirm that the following topics were discussed (place a checkmark):
- \_\_\_\_\_ a. the faculty member's Annual Report Form
  - \_\_\_\_\_ b. scholarship
  - \_\_\_\_\_ c. classroom teaching
  - \_\_\_\_\_ d. student advising and/or mentoring
  - \_\_\_\_\_ e. criteria for reappointment or promotion

