

**PRINCIPLES AND CUSTOMS GOVERNING
UNIVERSITY-WIDE TENURE REVIEWS
FOR BARNARD COLLEGE**

Columbia University
August 2014

INTRODUCTION

Columbia employs a standing committee system to conduct a final University-wide evaluation whenever a school or department, including Barnard College but excepting the Faculty of Law and Teachers College, recommends a candidate for tenure. This evaluation is the culmination of a process of review involving multiple considerations of the nomination within the department and school. Its purpose is to confirm that the earlier reviews were rigorous and substantive and to ensure that all candidates for tenure meet the same high standards, regardless of the school or department originating the nomination. By examining both the process by which candidates are nominated and their qualifications, the standing committee seeks to ensure a University-wide consistency in the evaluation of nominations to tenure and thereby to promote the appointment of faculty of exceptional quality and distinction throughout the institution.

The standing committee – the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC) – serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost who determines whether the candidate should be recommended to the President and Trustees for tenure. The University’s standing committee system of tenure review is administered on behalf of the Provost by the Vice Provost for Academic Administration.

This document governs TRAC’s review of tenure nominations originating in Barnard College. While the criteria and standards of judgment for all tenure nominations in the University are the same, the procedures by which Barnard nominations are reviewed differ in some respects, according to the provisions contained in the Amended Agreement between the University and Barnard. In the case of inconsistencies between this document and the Amended Agreement, the provisions of the Agreement govern.

Part I of this document sets forth the general policies and procedures that guide the work of TRAC. Part II provides guidelines for Barnard departments to follow in preparing their nominations. A separate document sets forth the policies and procedures which govern the tenure review of candidates from other parts of the University.

PART I: GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This part of the document begins with a discussion of the criteria by which TRAC evaluates nominations to tenure from Barnard College. These are the same as the criteria used for the rest of the University, with the exception that TRAC does not consider academic need. The College obtains the advice of the University on that subject through a separate consultative process. Therefore, Part I continues by separately describing the consultative arrangements mandated by the Amended Agreement. It then discusses the evidence TRAC considers, and how it conducts its evaluations. A final section discusses the confidentiality expected of all those who contribute to its deliberations.

CRITERIA FOR AN APPOINTMENT TO TENURE

An appointment to tenure is made in the University only when an individual of widely recognized excellence is found to fill a scholarly need that is demonstrably vital to a discipline central to the College's and the University's purposes. The process of tenure review, therefore, is concerned with both the qualities of the nominee and the potential impact of the proposed appointment on the nominating department. The review of TRAC is confined to the first of these considerations, using the criteria described below. The second is evaluated through the consultative process described in the next section of this document, with Barnard making the final decision on academic need.

In every instance, a candidate for tenure must be an outstanding scholar, a person who has demonstrated the capacity for imaginative, original work and who shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to research. Excellence as a teacher is also necessary, and service to the University and discipline is important. Neither, however, individually or taken together, is a sufficient basis for tenure. The essential requirement for the appointment of any nominee is scholarly achievement testifying to an unusually original and creative mind.

Regardless of academic age, every candidate should have produced work of truly outstanding quality. Quantity is of lesser concern, although the number of publications may be one of the measures used in assessing the contributions of a candidate's work to his or her field. Tenure, moreover, is not simply a reward for past accomplishments. It is also a vote of confidence that the candidate will continue to be an important and productive scholar. Thus, a candidate must continue to have an active scholarly agenda that shows strong promise of yielding answers to fundamental questions in his or her discipline.

Peer esteem is a valuable measure of scholarly ability. Established scholars must be widely recognized as among the leaders in their disciplines. Younger scholars must have achieved a level of scholarly accomplishment which demonstrates extraordinary promise. Serious consideration should be given only to those younger scholars who can be expected, with a high degree of confidence, to become leaders in their disciplines.

A comparable standard is applied when the candidate is in a professional or artistic discipline. The customary academic measure provided by publications and papers may be augmented or replaced by other considerations, such as journalistic achievements, built architectural projects or creative works of arts. However, in every case, candidates must have a record of highly original accomplishments, exhibit the potential for continuing to make influential professional or artistic contributions and be regarded by their peers as among the very best in their fields.

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to take into account the differing disciplines of the candidates. Since the scholarship they pursue can vary, the measures used to evaluate the quality of their work will appropriately vary as well. Nonetheless, there is a common University-wide expectation that all candidates must meet. Regardless of the type of scholarly or other work in which they are engaged, all must be or have the potential of becoming leading figures in a field that is intellectually vital and important to Barnard College and the University. The burden of demonstrating that a candidate meets that standard rests with the nominating department. TRAC will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department has provided a compelling affirmative case for the nomination.

BARNARD-UNIVERSITY CONSULTATIONS PRECEDING THE TRAC REVIEW

When a department at Barnard College decides to consider a tenure nomination, its chair formally notifies the chair of the counterpart department at Columbia. The Columbia chair designates one or more departmental representatives to work with the Barnard department in evaluating the nomination. In the case of an external candidate, the consultations begin with the participation of the representatives of the counterpart department in the search and selection process. The precise manner and extent of the consultations between the two departments are at the discretion of their chairs, subject to the review of the University's Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College.

The Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences works with the representatives of the counterpart department in an advisory capacity in evaluating the current state and objectives of the Barnard department and judging whether the nomination fills an appropriate academic need. If the counterpart department wishes to state its views formally on these matters, it does so in writing to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College through the Executive Vice President. Following these consultations, Barnard makes the final decision on the subject of academic need.

If the Barnard department votes to proceed with a nomination, a complete tenure dossier is forwarded to the Columbia department for the review of its members. The Barnard chair then presents the case for the candidate to the counterpart Columbia department which discusses the nomination and votes on the qualifications of the candidate either by an open vote or signed ballots. The results of this vote are communicated to the Barnard department, the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences, and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College. A record of the vote on the nominee's qualifications and a written assessment of his or her qualifications accompany the case as it moves through the Barnard review process and are included in the dossier given to TRAC.

Following the receipt of the vote and the accompanying evaluation, the Barnard department makes its final recommendation on whether or not to forward the candidate to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College for consideration by the College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion and a possible nomination to the Provost of the University for a TRAC review.

NOMINATION TO TENURE

Every nomination requires a positive vote by the tenured faculty in the department, as determined by Barnard's Code of Academic Freedom and Tenure. At a minimum, a majority of the eligible tenured faculty must vote in favor of forwarding it for review by the College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion. With the approval of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, departments may establish a higher percentage of positive votes as the requirement for making a nomination.

In the case of joint nominations to tenure, there must be positive votes from all of the departments in which the candidate will serve.

The decision on whether to nominate is made by an open vote or by signed ballots. Faculty who vote in the negative or abstain may be asked to provide TRAC with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention.

Before a nomination can be forwarded to the Provost of the University, it must receive a favorable review by the Barnard's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion, the endorsement of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, and the approval of the President of the College. Following the submission of a nomination, the President of the College retains the right to withdraw it at any point prior to its approval by the Trustees of the University.

When either a department or the College's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion has voted not to nominate a candidate, a new review may only be initiated with the prior permission of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College and the Provost of the University. This is true regardless of whether the same department believes that a new evaluation is justified or another department wishes to consider the candidate for a possible nomination to tenure. For candidates who already hold full-time instructional appointments at the College, the new evaluation must also be permitted by the provisions of the Statutes of the College governing the limits on nontenured service.

The only acceptable grounds for a second review by the same department are that material improvements in the quality of the candidate's work have occurred since the first, such that the original negative decision is no longer valid. Similar rules apply when a different department considers the candidate, except that the nominating unit may also consider whether the work completed before the first review meets the standards of excellence expected of candidates in its own discipline.

The final decision on whether to forward a nomination to the Provost for University-wide review is made by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, with the approval of the President of the College.

EVIDENCE CONSIDERED BY TRAC

Every nomination to tenure is accompanied by the same types of supporting materials. The department originating the nomination may take the lead in preparing these materials, but the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College reviews them for completeness and accuracy and sees that they are submitted in a timely fashion after a positive recommendation by Barnard's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion and the approval of the Barnard President. The University's Office of the Provost places a nomination on the TRAC agenda once a complete set of the materials described in these Guidelines has been received. At a minimum, the members of TRAC require three weeks to review a completed dossier before they discuss the nomination. It is, therefore, in the interest of the nominating department to submit the candidate's dossier for review by Barnard's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion according to the schedule established by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College. The contents of a dossier may be updated at any time prior to the meeting at which TRAC evaluates the candidate.

In judging a nomination, TRAC relies primarily on the candidate's dossier, which includes statements prepared by the nominating department and candidate, other supporting documents, and letters of evaluation solicited from recognized scholars in the nominee's discipline. Each of these types of information is briefly described below. Part II of this document contains more detailed guidelines for the preparation of the candidate's dossier. TRAC may also ask witnesses to appear before it to discuss the candidate's qualifications and may collect additional information from other sources within and outside the University.

Supporting Statements: The case statement forms the core of the candidate's dossier and should consist of the following parts:

- 1) *Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives:* While the decision on academic need is handled through the separate consultative process discussed earlier in these guidelines, the nominating department is nonetheless expected to describe its current state and future plans in the case statement. Therefore, this section of the case statement discusses both the composition of its faculty and its educational and research programs. It also describes the scholarly and curricular roles the candidate will have in the department and explains how he or she will further the department's vision for its future.
- 2) *Report on the Selection Process:* As part of the case statement, the department describes how the nominee was selected and evaluated. If the candidate was chosen through a search, this section discusses whom the department considered and why the candidate was preferred. It is not necessary to conduct a formal search before nominating junior faculty for promotion to tenure.

Whenever a department nominates a candidate after a previous negative vote on his or her candidacy, the case statement must describe the earlier evaluation, the reasons why the original decision was negative and why the nominating unit no longer considers those reasons to be valid. When a second department nominates a candidate previously denied tenure by another unit, it obtains a description of the first review and the reasons for the original negative decision from the department that conducted the first review. The new nominating unit's own statement describes the new review and why it does not accept the negative assessment of the candidate's original department.

- 3) *Report on the Vote:* This part of the case statement discusses the formal vote by which the nomination was made, and includes the vote of the counterpart department at Columbia. It provides information on the number of faculty eligible to participate in the decision and reports the results of any votes taken on the nomination. If any of the eligible faculty did not participate in the decision, it explains the reasons for their absence.

Whenever members of a nominating department or its University counterpart oppose a nomination or abstain, the case statement includes an explanation of the reasons for their votes. TRAC may also ask dissenting faculty to prepare written assessments of the candidate. If more than one member of the nominating department or school votes negatively or abstains, those who did so may write separately or prepare a collective explanation of their views on the nomination.

- 4) *Assessment of the Nominee's Qualifications:* The nominating department uses the case statement to inform TRAC about its assessment of the quality of the nominee's scholarship, teaching and service. Since the expectations for tenure may vary among the departments and schools of the University, this section of the case statement also provides a description of how the candidate's discipline or field defines and determines the presence of scholarly excellence. It discusses both the candidate's past scholarly achievements and potential for future growth, describes the importance of the candidate's work for his or field and compares the candidate with other leading scholars in his or her area of specialization. It also discusses the quality of the candidate's teaching, and includes information on his or her service to the College, University and discipline.

In support of its own case statement, the department and College include the following additional written materials:

- The candidate prepares a statement that discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects. In exceptional circumstances, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty may waive this requirement for senior external recruits.
- In some departments, an appointment or reading committee assesses the work of the candidate and prepares a report on his or her qualifications for the full faculty. Any such report is included as part of the dossier.

- A report from the College's Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion that describes its assessment of the candidate and documents its vote on his or her nomination.
- The counterpart department in Columbia's Arts and Sciences provides a written assessment of the candidate's qualifications.
- The candidate prepares a current *curriculum vitae* supplemented, if necessary, with sufficient information to provide a complete record of the nominee's academic and professional training, achievements, and previous employment.
- The nominating department submits a small, but representative, sample of the nominee's most important written work, published and unpublished, for review by TRAC.
- The department supports its assessment of the candidate's expected contribution to its educational programming with course syllabi and other forms of written evidence appropriate to its field. In addition, it supplements its assessment of the nominee's teaching with evidence of his or her abilities as a teacher, such as a statistical summary of course evaluations either at Barnard or from the candidate's previous institution, the results of classroom observations, information on the candidate's former students and teaching awards.
- Finally, the department may provide any additional information about the nominee's qualifications and proposed appointment to tenure that it wishes TRAC to consider, such as reviews of publications.

Referee Letters: Written evaluations of the proposed appointment by recognized authorities form a critical source of information for TRAC. These evaluations are solicited by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College and are used by the nominating department, its University counterpart, and Barnard's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion as well as TRAC in their reviews of the candidate. As part of its work of evaluation, described below, TRAC may request that the Provost of the University solicit further referee letters on its behalf.

A copy of the standard letter which is sent to referees for Barnard nominations is shown as Exhibit A. This letter may only be modified by agreement between the Provost of the University and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College. A sample copy of the letter of request and copies of all replies received, as well as a complete list of persons solicited, are included in the nominee's dossier. Any additional letters solicited by the Provost of the University are shared with the chair of the nominating department and its University counterpart, and with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, unless specifically restricted to the Provost and TRAC by the referee.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College determines how many scholars should be contacted for evaluations as well as their identities. In compiling the list of referees, the Provost consults with the nominating department and may seek additional advice from scholars in other departments of the College, at Columbia or at other universities. Suggestions are not obtained from the nominee, nor is he or she informed of who is being considered for the role of a referee.

While a dossier will typically contain 12-15 referee letters, their number matters less than the scholars who provide them. Referees should consist primarily of the leading individuals in the nominee's field of specialization. Some candidates work in more than one specialization within their discipline or in more than one discipline. In those cases, the referees include prominent scholars in each of the areas in which the candidate works. The referees may include scholarly collaborators or former mentors of the candidate, but a preponderance of the evaluations should be provided by individuals who have not worked with the nominee. They may include scholars from abroad as well as from other institutions in the United States but may not be members of the faculty of Barnard or Columbia. If a majority of the members of TRAC feel that an adequate representation of the best scholars in a candidate's field has not written or that the number of collaborators of the candidate's is too high, they may ask for additional external evaluations, which will delay the completion of their review.

Each referee is asked to compare the candidate with other scholars in his or her field. In selecting the comparison scholars, care should be taken to define the field of specialization in which the appointment is being proposed in a manner which is appropriate but not so narrow that the referees find it difficult to make meaningful comparisons between the nominee and other scholars.

The comparison list consists of scholars whose qualifications would merit an appointment to tenure at the University. It always contains leading figures in the nominee's specialization, even when the nominee is a younger scholar. In those cases, the referees are asked to give their assessment of whether the nominee has the potential of reaching the level of achievement of the more senior comparison scholars. The comparison list should not include nontenured scholars at other institutions even when the candidate is a junior member of the faculty. Exceptions may be made only in the unusual instance of exceptionally strong nontenured faculty who are likely to be tenured at their home institutions in the immediate future. A weak comparison list may also prompt TRAC to ask for additional external assessments of the candidate.

Since the comparison scholars are chosen on the basis of their academic distinction, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College may also ask them for evaluations of the nominee. While they should not be excluded from the list of referees simply because they are peers of the nominee, there may be other reasons why they should not be asked for evaluations. For example, a comparison scholar may hold a nontenured appointment at another university or have applied for the position for which the candidate is being considered. The comparison list sent to each referee who is also a comparison scholar is modified to exclude the individual's name.

The dossier includes all written responses from the referees, even from those who decline to evaluate the candidate. As part of the search for an external candidate, a department may, with the special prior permission of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, collect a few preliminary written evaluations before deciding whether to engage in negotiations with the nominee. Copies of any such evaluations are included as well, along with a sample of the letter soliciting them.

The external evaluations are accompanied by biographical information that briefly explains why the department or school chose to write to each of the referees. These descriptions inform TRAC of the referees' areas of specialization, standing in the field and any prior or current relationship with the candidate. The dossier includes similar biographical information for each of the comparison scholars. Finally, the department provides a list of the leading scholarly institutions in the candidate's area of specialization, with a brief explanation of the reasons for their inclusion on the list. As a matter of courtesy, potential referees may be contacted prior to being sent a request for an evaluation to determine if they are willing to undertake the work involved. The potential referees must be contacted in writing, and a list of those who declined to write should be included in the candidate's dossier along with their responses explaining the reasons why.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College collects the referee evaluations before the department decides whether to nominate the candidate for tenure. Typically the external letters are solicited at the start of the unit's internal deliberations but may be obtained at another point in the process. Regardless of when the letters are collected, they are shared with the department and its University counterpart before they vote on the nomination, unless a referee states that the letter should be shown only to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard, the Provost of the University and TRAC.

To assist the referees, they are provided with the nominee's *curriculum vitae*, personal statement and, at the discretion of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, samples of his or her written work.

Witnesses: TRAC normally does not hear from witnesses as part of its deliberations. When, however, it finds that it cannot reach a decision based on its initial review of the case, the committee will arrange for an individual who can present information on the nominee's qualifications to appear as a witness at subsequent hearings of the nomination.

TRAC invites the department chair to appear whenever it requires a witness to conclude its evaluation. The chair may delegate that responsibility to another member of the department who is closer to the candidate's field. Whenever TRAC asks for a chair or designee to appear as a witness, the Columbia University Provost's Office will inform the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College. TRAC will provide the witness, in advance of the meeting, with a list of the topics that its members wish to discuss. The committee's members may ask additional questions at the meeting itself.

TRAC may, at its discretion, ask other witnesses to appear. These may be other members of the department, faculty from other parts of the University or scholars from other universities.

They may be asked to appear in person or testify by phone or teleconferencing.

THE COMPOSITION OF TRAC

The Tenure Review Advisory Committee consists of 13 members chosen by the Provost from among the tenured faculty of Columbia's schools, including Barnard College. The Provost informs the University community of the membership of TRAC at the beginning of the fall term.

The members of TRAC serve staggered terms, normally three years in duration, although the Provost of the University may ask faculty to participate for shorter periods as replacements for regular members who are on a leave of absence, have ceased to hold a full-time appointment at the University or otherwise are unable to participate in the committee's deliberations. The Provost designates one of the committee's members, typically in his or her third year on the committee, to serve as its chair.

While the members of TRAC are broadly representative of the disciplines covered by the University's faculty, no school, department or discipline is guaranteed a seat on the committee, with the following exception. The Amended Agreement between Columbia and Barnard specifies that two faculty from the College participate in the University-wide reviews of its candidates. Therefore, if TRAC does not include at least two members from the College, the Provost of the University, in consultation with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, will select up to three additional faculty at the start of the academic year, one or two of whom will, as needed, be asked to serve on the reviews of its candidates. These additional Barnard members play no part in the evaluations of candidates from other parts of the University.

SCHEDULE FOR SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS TO TRAC

Planning for the reviews of nominations begins in the spring prior to the academic year in which they will occur. By April 15th of the preceding spring, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College submits a list of every junior faculty member the College intends to evaluate in the following year, no matter how remote the likelihood of a nomination, and the names of scholars at other institutions they have already identified as potential candidates for tenure. For each candidate on the list, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College provides an initial assessment of the likelihood of the nomination and a brief description of his or his area of specialization. In addition, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College informs the Provost of the University of all senior searches the College expects to conduct that may result in further nominations to tenure.

By May 15th of the preceding spring, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College sends the Office of the Provost of the University confirmation that the College has sent out the requests for the external letters for its known candidates. For each candidate, the confirmation includes the referee and comparison lists, and the date on which the letters requesting the evaluations were mailed. If a Barnard department misses the May 15th deadline for asking for the referee evaluations for any internal candidates, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College is expected to write to the Provost of the University explaining the

reasons for the delay and how the College will insure that the December 15th deadline for submitting the nomination and supporting documentation for any such individual will be met.

Some candidates for tenure will not be known by that date. External searches may not be completed by then or it may subsequently become necessary to organize a tenure review for a junior faculty member who is being recruited by another university. As additional candidates are identified, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College informs the Office of the Provost of the University of them as soon as possible. For each such individual, the College includes the referee and comparison lists and the date on which the requests for the referee evaluations were sent.

All parts of the University, including Barnard College, are expected to complete their internal evaluation of junior faculty, with the exception of those being recruited by other universities, by December 15th. The Provost of the University will also permit exceptions to that deadline when the size of a school's case load and its schedule for its internal evaluations of its junior faculty do not allow it to complete all of its reviews before the winter break. If these circumstances exist at Barnard, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College will request an exception and negotiate in advance of the start of the academic year a separate schedule for the submission of the nominations and dossiers for the College's internal candidates. If the College misses the December 15th date for nominating internal candidates without the prior permission of the Provost, TRAC may defer its consideration of the nominee until it has finished the reviews of other junior faculty who were nominated on time, even if that means postponing its evaluation until the following academic year.

While there is no final deadline for asking for the review of external candidates, the departments should make every effort to identify external candidates as early as possible in the academic year. The University, along with most other major universities, endorses the AAUP policy guideline that sets May 15th as the last date that an offer can be made to a faculty member at another institution for appointment the following fall. The offer cannot be contingent upon a favorable outcome of a tenure review. To meet the AAUP deadline and ensure the completion of the TRAC evaluation before the end of the academic year, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College should send the Provost of the University the nominations and dossiers for their external candidates by March 31st.

Recognizing that negotiations with faculty at other universities can be protracted and delicate, TRAC will attempt to conduct evaluations of external candidates nominated after that date, but it cannot guarantee that it will finish its evaluation before the end of the academic year. Moreover, if the review cannot be held by May 15th, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of the College will have to obtain a waiver of the AAUP's deadline from the candidate's institution before the review can occur.

THE TRAC REVIEW

TRAC meets at regular intervals from September through May but not during the summer months. The committee meets at least twice a month and more often when its faculty chair and the Provost of the University deem it necessary to evaluate the nominations it receives.

Early in the fall, TRAC discusses the membership of the review panels that will lead the evaluations of the potential nominations. Following that discussion, the TRAC chair assigns five of its members to serve as a review panel for each candidate, designates one of them as the primary reviewer and selects another as the secondary reviewer. Throughout the year, the chair establishes further review panels as the deans and executive vice presidents at Columbia and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College inform the Provost of the University of additional nominations. The chair may change the membership of the review panels at any time. While the membership of TRAC is public information, the composition of the review panels is confidential.

In assigning members of TRAC to a review panel for a candidate from Barnard, its faculty chair always selects two faculty from the College. Care is also taken to ensure that the panel includes an appropriate breadth of knowledge, especially when the candidate's work is interdisciplinary in nature. So far as possible, a review panel includes some members who are close in discipline to the candidate. However, knowledge of the candidate's specialization is not a requirement, and generally at least one member of each panel is always distant from the candidate's field.

Since the purpose of the standing committee system is to provide a second, independent review of every nomination, members of TRAC do not participate in a review if they have jointly published with the candidate, jointly worked on externally funded grants and contracts, helped to train the candidate, served on a search committee which selected the nominee for a tenure appointment, voted on the nomination at either the level of the department or the school or, in the case of members from the Arts and Sciences and Barnard, belong to the cognate department of the candidate at the other institution. They also recuse themselves when they believe that they have a conflict of interest for other reasons.

Whenever a conflict of interest arises, members are neither present during the committee's discussion of the nomination nor do they have access to the candidate's dossier. However, if they voted against the nomination or abstained at the level of the department, they may be asked for a letter explaining their reasons in the manner of any other faculty member who did not favor awarding the candidate tenure.

The Office of the Provost sets the agenda of the TRAC committee in consultation with its faculty chair. Nominations are normally reviewed in the order in which they are received but may be accelerated in the case of key recruitments and retentions.

TRAC considers every nomination at least once. While the committee normally completes its initial review in one meeting, its discussion of a nomination may be carried over to a second due to scheduling constraints. At the conclusion of its initial assessment, the committee decides whether to recommend the award of tenure or to hold the nomination over to a future meeting for further discussion. Whenever a nomination requires more than one hearing, the Provost of the University informs the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College.

If TRAC decides that more than one hearing is necessary, it may ask the Provost of the University to collect further information before it reconsiders the nomination, including additional external letters of evaluation and additional written statements from the nominating department. In all cases, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty at Barnard will be informed if additional information is requested. With the approval of the committee's faculty chair, members of TRAC may obtain additional information on their own. They are expected to coordinate any such efforts with the faculty chair and to act with the greatest discretion to ensure the confidentiality of the tenure review.

TRAC does not hear from witnesses at the first hearing for a nomination. Whenever there is more than one hearing, the appropriate department chair or chair's designee is invited to provide TRAC with testimony on the quality of the nominee's work. If the candidate will have appointments in more than one department, only the chair of the primary department is normally asked to appear, but TRAC may also invite the heads of the other units in which the candidate will serve if it feels that they can contribute to its evaluation. Chairs may delegate the responsibility of serving as a witness to other tenured faculty who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications. At the discretion of TRAC, additional witnesses may be asked to testify to the quality of the candidate's scholarship and teaching. These may include faculty from the nominating unit, from other parts of the University or from other institutions.

To help witnesses prepare to meet with TRAC, the Provost's Office provides them with a list of topics its members wish to discuss. The list is intended as a guide to the primary areas the committee wishes the witnesses to address. Other questions may arise at the meeting itself. While it is not required, witnesses may prepare written responses to the questions and other materials to distribute to the members of TRAC. Any such materials become part of the confidential nomination dossier.

While the members of the review panel are primarily responsible for the evaluation of the nomination to which they have been assigned, the other members of TRAC participate actively in the discussions about the candidate's qualifications. At the end of the discussion, all members of TRAC vote on whether to recommend the candidate for tenure, with the exception of any who are recused owing to a conflict of interest.

TRAC considers all aspects of a candidate's record – scholarship, teaching and service – in evaluating whether he or she meets the University's expectations described earlier in this document for its tenured faculty. In discussing a candidate's scholarship, TRAC uses various measures that necessarily vary from one discipline to another but may include any of the following:

- The candidate's productivity as measured against the expectations of his or her field;
- Growth in the quality as well as the quantity of the candidate's published work over the course of his or her scholarly career;
- In the case of a candidate who regularly co-publishes with others, his or her contributions to the scholarship;

- For a candidate early in his or her career, the level of independence from his or her doctoral and post-doctoral mentors;
- The opinion of the best scholars in the candidate's field on the originality and impact of his or her scholarship;
- Whether the candidate is publishing in the leading refereed journals or the best presses in the field;
- The frequency with which the candidate's scholarship is cited by other scholars, taking into account the typical citation rates in his or her field;
- Sources and quantity of external funding;
- Awards received for scholarly publications;
- Other honors and prizes;
- The frequency with which a candidate is invited to give talks about his or her research;
- And, other indicators of the field's esteem for the candidate's scholarship, such as editorial service and leadership positions in inter-institutional consortia and disciplinary associations.

No single one of these measures is the determinative factor in the committee's deliberations. TRAC uses them instead to arrive at an overall assessment of the candidate's scholarly creativity, scholarly influence and future trajectory.

Similarly, in evaluating a candidate's teaching record, TRAC considers:

- The quality of classroom teaching, as measured by student and peer evaluations;
- Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students and post-doctoral students, as shown by their number and their careers after completing their studies with the candidate;
- Awards for teaching;
- Contributions to the development of curricular programming at the institution at which the candidate serves;
- And, other indicators of a candidate's educational commitment and excellence such as work with pre-doctoral students and participation in disciplinary initiatives in curricular development.

Finally, the committee looks for evidence of service, including:

- Service to both the candidate's university and discipline;
- Appointments in public positions and consultancies that utilize the candidate's scholarly expertise;
- And, public outreach.

The Provost of the University, or a representative, attends all TRAC meetings and may actively participate in the discussion about a nomination. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College or his or her representative is present at the evaluations of all candidates from the College to provide context and background if necessary. The University's Vice Provost for Academic Administration and Director of Academic Affairs also attend to support the committee's work. Other than witnesses who are asked to provide testimony, no other individuals who are not members of TRAC are present at any of its meetings.

TRAC serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost of the University who depends heavily upon its evaluation of a candidate but who is not bound by its recommendation. In particular, a split vote in favor of a candidate is not a strong endorsement. In addition to the final vote, the Provost of the University weighs the evidence presented to TRAC and the discussion of its members at their meeting. The Provost may send the nomination back to TRAC for further advice. Alternatively, the Provost of the University may obtain additional information after TRAC has completed its evaluation before reaching a decision on the nomination. That information can, for example, include clarifications or additional materials from the nominating department or take the form of additional written or verbal evaluations from experts at other institutions. This additional information is normally not shared with the chair of the nominating department.

Following the completion of his or her review, the Provost of the University submits a recommendation to the President of the University on whether the candidate should be awarded tenure. If the Provost's recommendation is negative, he or she first informs the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College. In such cases, or if the Barnard Provost determines that the TRAC review revealed materially new information that would have affected the College's own evaluation, the Provost of the University gives the President of Barnard the opportunity to comment upon the nomination or to withdraw it before sending the case to the President of the University for review.

A nomination is forwarded to the Trustees of the University for their approval only if the University Provost and President are satisfied that the candidate deserves tenure. Upon approval by the President, and with the concurrence of the Trustees of Barnard, it is presented to the Trustees of the University, who make the final decision on all appointments to tenure.

After the University President has reached his or her own decision on a nomination, the Provost of the University informs the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College of the outcome of the review who, in turn, informs the chair of the candidate's department. In those unusual cases where the University Provost or President, the Barnard Trustees, or the Trustees of the University do not accept TRAC's formal recommendation, the Provost of the University informs its members of the reasons. A candidate who is denied tenure is invited to meet with the Provost of the University to discuss the decision.

A second review may be conducted for a candidate after a negative decision but only if it can be held within the period permitted by the provisions of the Barnard Statutes governing the limits on nontenured service. The Provost of the University may authorize a new review if he or she determines that the first was marked by procedural irregularities of a magnitude that materially affected its outcome. In the absence of procedural irregularities, a candidate is reconsidered only in rare instances when the Provost of the University is satisfied that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision.

It is incumbent upon the school or department to obtain the prior approval of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College who will forward it to the Provost of the University to conduct a new evaluation of a candidate who has been denied tenure. Requests for a second review require an affirmative vote by the tenured faculty of the department and the endorsement of Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College before they are forwarded to the Provost. To assist the tenured faculty in deciding whether to request a new evaluation, the chair may establish a reading committee to do an in-depth evaluation of the candidate's new work. In support of a request for permission to start a new review, the department submits a statement that explains why it believes the new work meets the standard for a second review. That statement should deal only with the new materials and not with the work considered during the first review. The Provost of the University may seek the advice of selected scholars in the candidate's field before reaching a decision on whether to reopen consideration of the nomination.

If the University Provost accepts the request from the College for permission to reconsider the candidate, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College asks for additional external evaluations using a standard letter provided by the University Provost's office. The external reviewers include referees who expressed reservations about the candidate's work during his or her first evaluation and individuals who did not write for the initial review. They may also include some referees who supported the candidate's nomination during the first review, but these should be a minority of those approached for evaluations. Once the new referee letters have been collected, the tenured faculty of the department or school conducts a final evaluation of the candidate's work and votes on whether to renominate the candidate. The decision may be taken by an open vote or signed ballot but not by a secret ballot.

In support of a second nomination, the department prepares a new dossier that includes an explanation of why it believes that the candidate's work since the first review merits a reversal of the original, negative decision. There should also be a full description of the earlier evaluation as well as all of the materials that were submitted for the initial review. These materials are submitted to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College for his or her

review. If the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College endorses the new nomination, the Provost will ask TRAC to reconsider the case. In conducting a new hearing, TRAC does not reassess the quality of the materials submitted in support of the original nomination. Instead, the new evaluation focuses on the scholarship completed after the first review and on whether it is of sufficient quality to overcome the reservations that led to the initial negative decision on the candidate's nomination.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All aspects of TRAC's proceedings, other than the membership of the committee, are conducted with strict confidentiality. The membership of the review panel and the date(s) when TRAC evaluates a nomination are made known only to individuals who need to participate in its deliberations. The content of the committee's discussion about a nomination and the actual vote are similarly restricted to the members of the committee and to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, the President of Barnard College, and the University Provost and President or their representatives. Committee members, witnesses, and any others who are involved with the tenure review process in any way are expected to maintain confidentiality at all times.

Because of the need for confidentiality, members of TRAC and anyone appearing before it who wishes to discuss the proceedings should do so by communicating with the Office of the Provost of the University. Similarly, other members of the University community seeking information about the University's tenure policies, the procedures of TRAC or individual cases under review should contact the Provost or Vice Provost for Academic Administration. They should not approach any member of TRAC with their questions and concerns.

While candidates are not given confidential information about their reviews, the Vice Provost for Academic Administration does inform them of the process. Following the receipt of a nomination, the Vice Provost sends the candidate a copy of this policy statement and invites the individual to call with any questions about how the evaluation will be conducted. The candidate may also ask to meet with the Vice Provost at any point during the process to discuss procedural questions. Further information should be obtained from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College and department chairs who have a special responsibility, subject to the limits imposed by the requirement of confidentiality, for advising their candidates on how their tenure reviews are conducted.

PART II: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING A TENURE NOMINATION

Part II of this document provides detailed guidance on the materials that are included in a tenure dossier. It should be read with reference to Part I of this document, particularly the section which describes the criteria TRAC uses to evaluate candidates. Instructions on submitting the dossier and a checklist of the required materials are included at the end of this section.

It is the responsibility of the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College to see that the dossier is complete, accurate and submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration on schedule after it is prepared by the department.

Each dossier should consist of the documents described below.

DOSSIER COVER SHEET

Every dossier should include the completed cover sheet that follows the template included as Exhibit D.

CURRICULUM VITAE

A current *curriculum vitae*, with its date of preparation, provides TRAC with an essential summary of the candidate's career and accomplishments. It should include information on the following:

- A. Field of specialization;
- B. Education –
 - 1. Colleges and universities attended,
 - 2. Degrees and the years awarded, and,
 - 3. Dissertation title, whether published, and name of sponsor/advisor;
- C. All academic and non-academic positions held since the bachelor's degree was conferred, including any appointments in a postdoctoral rank;
- D. Teaching experience –
 - 1. Courses taught, and,
 - 2. Experience as thesis sponsor, first or second reader, and committee member for undergraduate, masters, and doctoral candidates. (When possible, include the number of students in each category and titles of theses and dissertations and where appropriate, first position after graduation.);

E. Publications (in bibliographic form) –

1. All published work (in the case of articles, include the volume and issue number of the journal, date of publication and page numbers),
2. All unpublished work completed or in progress, together with information on the expected publisher and publication dates when they are known, and,
3. Other work in progress, such as art shows and installations;

(If any of the published or unpublished work was co-authored, the entry should be annotated to indicate if the candidate was the first author, or where appropriate, the corresponding author; author lists must include all authors as published.

The *curriculum vitae* should also be annotated to describe authorship conventions in the candidate's field; e.g., that authorship is always in alphabetical order or that the senior author is always listed last.)

F. All grants and contracts awarded, current and past, and all grant applications still under review with the following information for each –

1. Full name of the granting agency (abbreviations should be explained),
2. Period of the award,
3. Amount of the award, and,
4. If the grant was awarded to more than one individual, the names of the co-investigator(s) and indication of who was the principal investigator;

G. Patents received and patent applications under review;

H. Honors, prizes and fellowships, including those received as a student;

I. Invited talks at other university and research organizations and at the meetings of disciplinary associations;

J. Conferences or workshops organized;

K. Service –

1. University service, including positions held and major committee assignments;

2. Service to the discipline, including positions held in scholarly associations, editorial positions on journals or membership on grant review panels and juries; and,
3. Public outreach involving the use of the candidate's scholarly expertise.

CASE STATEMENT

The case statement consists of several sections, each of which is described below.

Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives

This portion of the case statement describes the current state and objectives of the department and how the proposed appointment relates to them. It covers the following topics:

- A. The overall curricular, scholarly, and research goals of the department(s) in which the candidate will serve.
- B. The current size, field distribution, and strengths and weaknesses of the faculty in the department(s). If appropriate, include similar information on related units of the College.

Note: This description is accompanied by a list of the faculty in the appropriate department by title, rank, and discipline/research area. In addition, the nominating department should complete the statistical table attached to this document as Exhibit E.

- C. The curricular program(s) in the field(s) of the proposed appointment, including total enrollments, students by degree category and recent trends in graduation rates.
- D. The intended role of the nominee in the scholarly and instructional programs of the department(s) and, where appropriate, other units within the College.

Report on the Selection Process

For candidates recruited from other institutions, the nominating department describes the search, includes the names of others considered and explains the reasons for selecting the nominee.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College may authorize a department to proceed with the evaluation of a member of the junior faculty for a possible promotion to tenure without a search. In that case the department explains how it evaluated the qualifications of the nominee in comparison to other scholars in the field and decided that he or she should be proposed for tenure.

If the candidate will have a joint appointment, the case statement includes a description of the contributions of all of the nominating departments to the process of selecting the candidate.

Some departments establish internal committees to conduct a preliminary evaluation before their full tenured faculty decide on whether to nominate potential candidates. In those cases, they describe the process used in evaluating the candidate and append the written evaluations prepared by the internal committee.

The case statement also documents the process the College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion used and includes a report on its assessment of the credentials of the candidate.

If the department is nominating a candidate it previously decided not to propose for tenure, it includes a full description of the earlier evaluation, including the vote or votes taken. This description is accompanied by all of the materials it collected as part of the earlier evaluations, including all letters of evaluation obtained as part of that review. Similar information is required if the candidate was previously considered by a different department.

Report on the Vote

This portion of the case statement provides information on the number of faculty with the right to vote on the nomination, states the date and method of voting, and gives the results. It also describes the reasons why absent members did not participate in the review. Voting on tenure cases cannot be by secret ballot. It is conducted by an open vote or by signed ballots.

If any faculty voted against the nomination or abstained, the report explains the reasons why. TRAC may ask those who opposed the nomination or abstained to prepare a statement describing the reasons for their vote. If more than one member of the nominating department votes negatively or abstains, those who did so may write separately or prepare a collective explanation of their views on the nomination. At the discretion of the dissenting faculty, these statements may be included with the dossier or submitted directly to the Barnard Provost for the consideration of TRAC. Other members of the faculty of the College and University may also communicate their views on the nomination to the Provost in writing, regardless of whether they support or oppose the nomination.

For a proposed tenure appointment in a Barnard department with a counterpart in Columbia, the vote of the tenured faculty in the counterpart department on the academic qualifications of the nominee is part of the record given to TRAC. In addition, the nominating department obtains a written assessment of the candidate from the counterpart department. If any of the faculty in the counterpart department voted against the nomination, the assessment discusses the contending points of view. In addition, TRAC may ask faculty in the counterpart department who opposed the nomination or abstained to prepare a written explanation for their votes which may be submitted to the nominating department for inclusion in the dossier or sent directly to the Provost.

Assessment of the Nominee's Qualifications

The nominating department uses the case statement to discuss the qualifications, accomplishments, and future promise of the nominee.

A. Research and Scholarship

While the University has a single standard for tenure, TRAC applies that standard in a way that accounts for the variations among disciplines about what constitutes outstanding scholarship as well as any other difference related to the nature of Barnard College as a Liberal Arts institution. To assist TRAC with that task, the department includes a description of how it determines and discerns excellence and distinction in the relevant discipline or field.

The department then discusses why it believes that the candidate has met that standard. It evaluates the candidate's research, principal publications and other scholarly accomplishments, taking care to identify his or her most important contributions and their impact on his or her field of specialization. It also assesses the candidate's qualifications in comparison with other scholars in the field and discusses the candidate's potential for future scholarly development.

In support of its assessment of the candidate, the department:

1. Identifies the leading academic journals and presses in the candidate's area of specialization and discusses whether the candidate publishes in them;
2. Describes the metrics the discipline uses in defining excellence in scholarship and discusses the candidate's scholarly impact, using those metrics;
3. Discusses the candidate's visibility as measured by indicators relevant to the discipline, such as invited talks, participation in conferences, leadership in disciplinary associations and editorial positions;
4. Discusses the candidate's grant support if scholars in the field regularly obtain external funding;
5. Explains whether the field uses citation rates as a measure of scholarly impact and, if so, how the frequency of citations to the candidate measures against the expected norms of the field; and
6. Describes the significance of any prizes or awards the candidate has won.

If the department turned down the candidate in an earlier evaluation for tenure and the Provost and Dean of Barnard College and the Provost of the University have authorized a new review, it explains the reasons for the original negative decision and discusses why the scholarship completed since the first review prompted it to reverse its earlier judgment of the quality of his or her work. If another department of the College has already decided against nominating the candidate, the department explains why it has nonetheless chosen to proceed with

a nomination to tenure. In addition, it obtains a statement from the other department or school on its evaluation of the candidate and the reasons for its negative decision.

B. Teaching Qualifications

As part of the case statement, the department discusses the nominee's qualities as a teacher. It includes information on courses taught, students (both graduate and undergraduate) and postdocs advised, and, where appropriate, participation in curricular development. It also assesses the nominee's effectiveness in the classroom and as a mentor.

Evidence of the nominee's educational contributions, such as course syllabi, may be included in support of this section of the statement.

The discussion of teaching effectiveness should be accompanied by documentation, such as the results of surveys of student opinion, letters from current and former students or reports on classroom observations. If the nominating department uses student evaluations for that purpose, it should include a statistical summary of the results for two or three of the key questions asked (such as the overall quality of the candidate's teaching or the quality of the course) using the table appended to the statement as Exhibit F. The department may also append the statistical results for other questions but should not include individual student forms.

The discussion of the candidate's role as a mentor should be accompanied by a list of the students and postdocs advised and their current positions when that information is known.

C. Service

This section of the assessment discusses the nominee's contribution beyond teaching and scholarship to the College, University and his or her discipline. It also describes any future service expected of the nominee. Types of service of relevance to the review include, for example, administrative positions within the College and University, positions in disciplinary associations, editorial positions on journals, and membership on grant review panels or juries in addition to unusual outreach activities relevant to the candidate's scholarship.

STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE

The nominee should prepare a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages on his or her current and future plans with regard to research (or artistic or professional activities when relevant) and teaching. The purpose of the statement is to provide TRAC with information about projects that are underway but have not been completed and those that are still in the planning stage rather than about research that has already been completed. The candidate also uses the statement to discuss his or her teaching philosophy.

This statement is required of all junior faculty being considered for promotion to tenure. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College may waive the requirement for external candidates recruited by Barnard departments.

REFEREE LETTERS

Every nomination to tenure must be supported by evaluations obtained from outside scholars using the "referee letter" appended to this document as Exhibit A. Evaluations of candidates from Barnard College are sought by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College. These letters are obtained sufficiently early in the internal deliberations of the department that the members of its executive committee may review them before they vote on whether to nominate the candidate.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College compiles the lists of referees and comparison scholars, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department and its University counterpart. The candidate is not consulted in constructing those lists. When adequate assistance cannot be obtained from Barnard's or the University's tenured faculty, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, or a designee, may seek the advice of scholars at other institutions.

Normally, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College collects no more than 12-15 letters. The number of letters matters less than the scholars who are asked to provide them. Care should be taken to include letters from the most prominent individuals in the candidate's area of specialization. When the candidate's work is interdisciplinary in nature or contributes to more than one field, all areas of specialization should be adequately represented among the referees. In the event that TRAC feels that the College has not obtained the views of a sufficient number of key scholars in the field, or in related fields, it may ask the Provost of the University for additional letters which will delay the completion of its review.

Referees may not be Barnard or Columbia faculty and should not include nontenured faculty at other universities. While scholars who have trained or collaborated with the candidate may be asked for evaluations, a large majority of the referees should consist of individuals who have not worked with the nominee.

As part of their evaluations, the referees are asked to compare the qualifications of the candidate to those of other scholars in his or her field. The comparison list for well-established scholars includes the leading figures in his or her area of expertise. For younger nominees, it includes some scholars who are significantly senior in their careers. It is appropriate in such a case to include the following paragraph at the bottom of the list:

Note that some of the persons listed above are very senior and well-established. By including these names in seeking a comparison with _____, we are not suggesting that [he/she] is now comparable to them; rather, we are requesting your best estimate of [his/her] potential to reach their standing.

A weak comparison list weakens the case for the candidate and may prompt TRAC to seek additional outside information about his or her scholarly standing, thereby delaying the completion of its review. Comparison scholars should only include individuals with credentials that would make them worthy of tenure at the University. With the exception of individuals of extraordinary achievement who are on the verge of being tenured, they should not include

nontenured faculty.

At the discretion of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty at Barnard College, samples of the candidate's publications may be included with the request for evaluations.

The comparison list sent to each referee who is also a comparison scholar is modified to exclude the referee's name. The letter to referees who previously had given their opinion of the candidate (for example, during a search) is appropriately modified to refer to the earlier correspondence (see Exhibit B).

As a matter of courtesy, potential referees may be asked if they will review the candidate's work before they receive the formal request for evaluation. All preliminary inquiries should be made by letter or e-mail and should ask the potential referee to respond in writing so that there will be a written record of who has declined to evaluate the candidate and their reasons (see Exhibit C). Individuals who fail to respond or decline to write in response to such an inquiry are included on the annotated list of referees described below.

Follow-up letters or e-mails should be sent after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request. It may also be necessary to contact them by phone or email. The timing and form of these reminders is determined by the urgency of the tenure review.

The dossier includes all responses from the scholars asked to write, even from those who declined to provide evaluations of the candidate. The following documentation about the referees and comparison scholars is also a required part of the candidate's dossier:

- A. A complete list of the potential referees who were approached for evaluations of the candidate, accompanied by a brief description of the credentials of each, including complete title, area of specialization, standing in the discipline, and prior association with the candidate, if any. The list also indicates which referees evaluated the candidate, declined to provide a letter or simply did not respond. A separate list, with the same types of information includes any scholars approached for a preliminary assessment of a potential external candidate.
- B. The list of scholars with whom referees were asked to compare the candidate, accompanied with a brief description of the credentials of each comparison scholar, including complete title, institution, tenure status, area of specialization and standing in the discipline.
- C. A list of the leading institutions in the candidate's area of specialization with a brief description of the reasons for their inclusion. TRAC ordinarily expects the referees to include some scholars at the institutions the nominating department considers the strongest in the candidate's field. If those institutions are not well-represented among the referees, the department or school should include an explanation of the reasons why.

- D. A sample of the referee letter(s) formally requesting an evaluation, including the date or dates the request was made, and of the comparison list enclosed.
- E. A sample of any follow-up letter sent to referees, indicating the date the request was made, and a list of the people who received it.

The College normally collects only one round of evaluations. There may, however, be unusual circumstances under which the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College may ask for a few preliminary letters of evaluation. For example, a department may need a small number of evaluations to help it determine if it wants to open negotiations with a potential external candidate about moving to the College. Copies of all such letters are included in the dossier in a manner that clearly demarcates them from the referee letters, along with the following information:

- A. A complete list of the persons from whom the department or school solicited these assessments. Individuals who did not respond should be included with an indication that they did not write and an explanation of the reasons why, if that information is available.
- B. For each person, a brief description of his or her credentials, including institutional affiliation and title, area of specialization, standing in the discipline and prior association with the candidate, if any.
- C. A sample of the letter(s) requesting the evaluation, including the date or dates the request was made.
- D. A copy of any comparison list included with the request for the evaluation.
- E. Copies of all responses received.

PUBLICATIONS

The nominating department or school provides electronic copies of a small, selected set of the nominee's published and other written works, with a cover sheet listing the materials submitted. They should include the publications sent to the external reviewers but do not need to be limited to them. These materials consist of the most important of the candidate's work and should be representative of the breadth and quality of the candidate's scholarship. They may include forthcoming publications and manuscripts, conference papers and grant proposals as well as published work. If any of the papers or publications were written in collaboration with others, they are annotated to indicate who the principal author was. If important publications are in a language other than English, a brief synopsis in English of their contents should be included.

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

The nominating department may include in the candidate's dossier additional information it wishes TRAC to consider (e.g., teaching citations, reviews of publications, grant applications, etc).

WITNESSES TO APPEAR BEFORE TRAC

As described in Part I of these guidelines, TRAC does not hear from witnesses when it completes its evaluation of a nomination in a single hearing. If it needs more than one meeting to reach a decision, it asks the Provost to arrange for at least one witness to appear before it. To prepare for that possibility, the nominating department indicates in the dossier whom it recommends as a witness if TRAC finds it necessary to ask someone to appear. The department chair usually serves in that role, but may delegate the responsibility to another tenured faculty member who is closer to the field of the nominee. When a candidate is nominated by more than one department, the list of recommended witnesses should include representatives from each of the departments and/or programs.

SUBMISSION OF THE DOSSIER

The dossier, including the candidate's articles and manuscripts, is submitted electronically on a CD-ROM or flash drive to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration with the exception of published books. Eight copies of published books should be submitted in hard copy along with the CD-ROM or flash drive.

The materials submitted electronically should be put into a ".pdf" format with no protection or security restrictions. In preparing the electronic version of the dossier a CD-ROM or flash drive, the nominating unit should follow the checklist below for the contents and name of each file and for the order in which they should be included.

The maximum size for a .pdf file is 200 MB. If the file is larger, first use the PDF Optimizer. If the PDF Optimizer does not reduce the size below 200 MB, please separate the file into two documents and name appropriately, i.e., Lastname_F_supp-mats1.doc and Lastname_F_supp-mats2.doc. If the size of the dossier is too large to fit on a single CD, articles, manuscripts and, if necessary, the supplemental materials should be put on additional disks. (Note: "F" identifies the first initial of the candidate.)

File Contents	File Name
1. Dossier Cover Sheet [Exhibit D]	Lastname_F_coversheet.pdf
2. Table of Contents	Lastname_F_toc.pdf
3. Candidate's <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	Lastname_F_cv.pdf
4. Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter/report from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College recommending the candidate for tenure • Letter/report from the school-level review committee recommending the candidate for tenure 	Lastname_F_reports.pdf
5. Case Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the department or school <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of faculty - Statistical table [Exhibit E] • Report on the selection process • Report on the vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of candidate by internal committee(s), - Assessment of Columbia counterpart department • Assessment of the nominee's qualifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research and scholarship - Teaching qualifications, including statistical summary of evaluations [Exhibit F] - Service 	Lastname_F_casestatement.pdf
6. Statement of the Nominee	Lastname_F_nominee.pdf
7. Supplemental Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course syllabi • Articles and unpublished manuscripts • Reviews of works 	Lastname_F_supp-mat.pdf
8. Referee Evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of top institutions in the candidate's field • Annotated list of referees [Exhibit G] • Annotated list of comparison scholars • Sample of letter sent to referees and sample of any follow-up letters sent • All responses from referees 9. Preliminary Evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotated list of reviewers • Sample of letter sent to reviewers and sample of any follow-up letters sent • All responses received 	Lastname_F_referee.pdf
10. Recommendation for Witnesses	Lastname_F_witness.pdf
11. All materials collected for any previous review for tenure	Lastname_F_previous-review.pdf

EXHIBIT A
STANDARD LETTERS TO REFEREES FOR NOMINATIONS
FROM BARNARD COLLEGE
SAMPLE LETTER ACCOMPANYING DOSSIER

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address

Dear _____,

Thank you for agreeing to review the tenure dossier of Assistant Professor _____ in the Department of _____ at Barnard College, Columbia University. Professor _____'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed, as are copies of selected publications and other material most relevant to your review.

Barnard College is an elite liberal arts college for women affiliated with Columbia University in New York City. Barnard is unique in that its senior faculty are tenured at both Barnard College and Columbia University, yet the College is independent from the University and has its own President, Administration, Trustees, Faculty, Endowment and Campus.

Like every nomination to tenure at Barnard College, that of Professor _____ is subject to a rigorous review, first by the tenured faculty of the nominating department(s), then by Barnard College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion, and, in the case of a positive review and a decision to grant tenure by the President of Barnard College, by the Columbia University standing committee. Barnard College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) evaluates the quality of the nominee's scholarship and standing in their respective field, teaching abilities, and service to the College, University, and profession. As an undergraduate institution whose faculty often carry a heavier teaching load than their peers at Columbia and other major research universities, Barnard College accords special significance to demonstrated excellence in teaching among its faculty of distinguished scholar-teachers.

In evaluating Professor _____, please use the following questions as a guide and write your review in such a way as to be accessible to both experts and non-experts in the candidate's field:

1. How well and in what capacity do you know Professor _____?
2. What is your overall assessment of the originality, quality, and impact of Professor _____'s scholarship?
3. What is your overall appraisal of _____'s record of achievement and productivity, and how does it compare to the standards for tenure in your discipline or field?
4. How does the originality, quality, and impact of Professor _____'s work compare to that of leading scholars in [his/her] field? I have attached a list of individuals to whom Professor

_____ might be compared. In the case of the scholars who are more senior than Professor _____ on this list, what is your assessment of [his/her] chances of attaining the same level of distinction? Please feel free to augment the list.

5. What is your assessment of _____'s future trajectory? Is Professor _____ likely to be a future leader in [his/her] field?
6. If Professor _____ were under consideration for a tenured appointment at your institution, how likely is it that he/she would receive a tenured position and would you support [his/her] nomination?

Please feel free to comment on any aspect of Professor _____'s teaching and/or mentorship, leadership, or service.

I will, of course, hold your review in confidence to the extent permitted by law and show it only to members of the Barnard ATP and University Standing Committee, the Barnard Department's Chair and Executive Committee, the Columbia Department's Chair and Executive Committee, the President and Provost of Barnard College, and the President and Provost of Columbia University. In the event that you wish to address certain comments confidentially to the Provosts and Presidents of Barnard College and Columbia University, you should feel free to do so, indicating clearly the specially restricted nature of the communication.

I realize that this request is a significant imposition on your time, but assessments by outside experts such as yourself are essential to ensure thorough and rigorous tenure reviews. Your candid and professional judgment will play an important part in our deliberations. It would be most helpful to receive your response by July 1, 20___. Let me express in advance Barnard College's and Columbia University's appreciation for your thoughtful assistance.

Sincerely,

Linda A. Bell
Provost and Dean of the Faculty
PHONE: (212) 854-2708
FAX: (212) 854-6947
E-MAIL: labell@barnard.edu

Enclosures: Comparison list
Candidate's curriculum vitae
Candidate's personal statement(s)
Barnard mission statement
Department context statement
Selected publications
Works-in-progress
Course syllabi

EXHIBIT B
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES WHO WERE SENT
THE DEPARTMENTAL SEARCH LETTER

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address

Dear _____:

Associate Professor <> in <Department> is being considered for a tenured position at Barnard College, Columbia University. On <> you wrote a letter of recommendation supporting the appointment of Professor <>. Your recommendation was greatly appreciated. I ask now if you would like to add to the comments on Professor <>'s qualifications in your previous letter. It has been suggested that your views be solicited as part of the evaluation to be made first by the Barnard Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) and, should the committee's recommendation be in the affirmative, by the University's standing committee on tenure. Letters from external referees, both those working closely in the candidate's sub-field and those with a broad perspective of the discipline, are key elements in our decision-making process. I do hope that you will agree to serve as a referee of Professor <>'s dossier for tenure.

We would also appreciate your views on how [he/she] compares with other scholars currently in the field of X, such as those on the enclosed list, and whether [he/she] is likely to be among the leaders in that field in the future. The list that we have provided is meant only as a guide. Please feel free to adjust it as you see fit. Not everyone on the list is at the same age and level of experience, and this, of course, needs to be considered in comparing them.

If you are able, we will forward a packet with a formal letter of invitation containing information about the criteria, along with Professor <>'s *curriculum vitae*, teaching and research statement, and a representative sample of [his/her] scholarly work. It would be most helpful if your letter could reach me by <>. If your schedule cannot accommodate this date, please let me know. We may be able to adjust the committee's schedule for this case if we know in advance that your letter will reach us after that date.

Please let me know as soon as possible of your availability by whatever means is the easiest for you: email to [\(name\)@barnard.edu](mailto:(name)@barnard.edu), phone at 212-854-2708 or fax at 212-854-6947.

On behalf of Barnard and Columbia, I want to express our great appreciation for your serious consideration of this request. We are mindful of the time commitment involved, but can assure you that your review will be influential in helping us reach the right decision.

Sincerely,

Provost and Dean of the Faculty

PHONE: (212) 854-2708

FAX: (212) 854-6947

E-MAIL: XXX

Exhibit C
SAMPLE OF INITIAL E-MAIL

Dear Professor <>:

Assistant Professor <> of the Department of <> at Barnard College, Columbia University is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the fall of 20___. It has been suggested that your views be solicited as part of the evaluation that includes first a consideration by the Barnard Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) and, second, pending an affirmative review, consideration by a University-wide standing committee on tenure. Letters from external referees, both those working closely in the candidate's sub-field and those with a broader perspective of the discipline, are key elements in our decision-making process. As such, I would appreciate your candid assessment of the candidate.

I do hope that you will agree to serve as a referee of Professor <>'s dossier for tenure and promotion. If you agree, we will forward Professor <>'s *curriculum vitae*, research and teaching statement and a representative sample of [his/her] scholarly work.

It would be most helpful if your letter could reach me by <>. If your schedule cannot accommodate this date, we may be able to adjust our internal timeline in anticipation of receiving your letter at a later time. Please let me know as soon as possible of your availability by whatever means is the easiest for you: e-mail to [\(name\)@barnard.edu](mailto:(name)@barnard.edu) or phone at 212-854-2708.

On behalf of Barnard and Columbia, I want to express our sincere appreciation for your serious consideration of this request. We greatly value your input and would appreciate your participation in our process.

Sincerely,

Provost and Dean of the Faculty

EXHIBIT D
Dossier Cover Sheet

[Date]

John H. Coatsworth, Provost
Columbia University in the City of New York
205 Low Memorial Library
Mail Code 4313
535 West 116th Street
New York, NY 10027

Dear Provost Coatsworth:

I have approved the enclosed nomination for appointment with tenure and request that you forward it to TRAC for review:

Candidate's name

Current title: [For internal candidates please list their current title and department]

[For external candidates please list their current title, institution, department, and full-time/part-time status, if applicable]

Proposed title: [Internal/external candidate's proposed title and department]

Sincerely,

Provost and Dean of the Faculty

PHONE: (212) 854-2708
FAX: (212) 854-6947
E-MAIL: XXX

EXHIBIT E

Table on the Composition of the Faculty of the Nominating Department/School/Division

	<u>Full-Time</u>			<u>Part-Time</u>
	Tenured	Nontenured	Off-Track	
(Example: Assoc. Professor	10	4	0	0)
Professor				
Associate Professor				
Assistant Professor				
Instructor				
Special Instructional Faculty				
Total				

Notes:

- 1) Special Instructional Faculty = Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Associate, Assistant
- 2) Off-Track
- 3) Part-Time = compensated only

EXHIBIT F

Summary of Teaching Evaluations

Description of the scale used to evaluate the course and instructor.

Course & Questions	Semester Taught	Enrollments	Responses Received	Average Rating	Standard Deviation
-----------------------	--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

Course 1

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

EXHIBIT G

Annotated List of Referees for [Candidate's name]

Name	Response to request
Complete Address	(Responded, Declined, or No response)
Telephone	
Email	

Please provide a description of referee's/comparison scholar's area of specialization and standing in the field and identify if they have collaborated with the candidate on any research, published work, art, or production, etc.

Name	Response to request
Complete Address	(Responded, Declined, or No response)
Telephone	
Email	

Please provide a description of referee's/comparison scholar's area of specialization and standing in the field and identify if they have collaborated with the candidate on any research, published work, art, or production, etc.