

**PRINCIPLES AND CUSTOMS GOVERNING
UNIVERSITY-WIDE TENURE REVIEWS**

Columbia University
July 2018

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. The purpose of the final review is to confirm that the earlier reviews were rigorous and substantive and that all candidates 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 Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

This document governs TRAC’s review of all tenure nominations with the exception of those originating in Barnard College. The procedures followed in evaluating candidates from Barnard College differ in some respects, as provided for in the inter-institutional agreement between the College and the University. Therefore, the process by which Barnard nominations are reviewed is described in a separate document.

Part I of this document sets forth the general policies and procedures that guide the work of TRAC. Part II provides guidelines for schools and departments to follow in preparing nominations.

PART I: GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This part of the document discusses the criteria by which TRAC evaluates nominations to tenure, the evidence it 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 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/division and school.

Nomination to tenure is the occasion for a department/division and school to consider its current condition and its future direction. Because of the financial implications of tenure, it may not fill a tenure position without prior budgetary authorization from the appropriate dean or executive vice president. Budgetary authorization will generally specify the field or set of fields within which the appointment will be made, thereby implying a decision on academic priorities. But this authorization is not in itself a substitute for the case the nominating unit must make that the appointment will contribute materially to strengthening the quality of its scholarly and educational programs.

The qualifications of the individual proposed to fill the position are even more critical. In every instance, the nominee must be an outstanding scholar who has demonstrated the capacity for imaginative, original work and who shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to scholarship, teaching and service. Excellence as a teacher is 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 true outstanding quality. Quantity is of lesser concern, although the number of publications, or other materials, 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 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 achievement. Established scholars must be widely recognized as among the leaders in their disciplines. Junior scholars must have achieved a level of scholarly accomplishment that demonstrates extraordinary promise and who can be expected, with a high degree of confidence, to become leaders in their disciplines.

A comparable standard applies when the candidate is in a professional or artistic discipline. The customary academic measures 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 areas of endeavor.

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to accommodate the differing disciplines of the candidates and the missions of their schools. Because the scholarship candidates pursue can vary, measures used to evaluate the quality of work will appropriately vary as well. Nonetheless, all candidates must meet a common University-wide expectation. 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 the University. The burden of demonstrating that a candidate meets that standard rests with the nominating department/division and school. TRAC will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department/division and school has provided a compelling affirmative case for the nomination.

NOMINATION TO TENURE

While the various parts of the University have the authority to use different methods for evaluating potential candidates for tenure, every nomination requires a positive vote by the tenured faculty in the relevant department/division and school and the endorsement of the dean or executive vice president. At a minimum, a majority of the eligible tenured faculty must vote in favor of forwarding the nomination for review by TRAC. With the approval of the appropriate dean or executive vice president, department/division and schools may establish a higher percentage of positive votes as the requirement for making a nomination.

In the case of joint nominations to tenure, positive votes are required from all of the departments/divisions and schools in which the candidate will serve.

The decision on whether to nominate is made by an open vote or by signed ballots. Faculty who do not vote affirmatively will be asked to provide the Office of the Vice Provost with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention.

If a department/division and school has voted not to nominate a candidate for tenure, then a new review may be initiated only with the prior permission of the appropriate dean or executive vice president and the Provost. This is true regardless of whether the same department/division and school believes that a new evaluation is justified or whether another department/division and school wishes to consider the candidate for a possible nomination to tenure. For candidates who already hold full-time instructional appointments at the University, the new evaluation must also be permitted by the provisions of the University Statutes governing limits on nontenured service.

The only acceptable grounds for a second review by the same department/division and school are material improvements in the quality of the candidate's work that have occurred since the first review, such that the original negative decision is no longer valid. Similar rules apply when a different department/division and school 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 dean or executive vice president of the school in which the candidate will be appointed.

EVIDENCE CONSIDERED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE

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 dean or executive vice president has the responsibility to review them for completeness and accuracy and to see that they are submitted in a timely fashion. The Office of the Vice Provost places a nomination on the TRAC agenda once a complete set of the materials described in these Guidelines has been received. 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 dean or executive vice president to send the candidate's dossier to the Office as early as possible. The contents of a dossier may be updated to reflect new materials and documents.

In judging a nomination, TRAC relies primarily on the candidate's dossier, which includes statements prepared by the nominating department/division and school and the 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 sources within and outside the University.

Case Statement: The case statement forms the core of the candidate's dossier. It should consist of the following parts:

- 1) *Analysis of the Department/Division and School and Its Objectives:* This section of the case statement establishes the importance of the proposed appointment for the nominating unit. This section discusses the current state of the nominating department/division and school, the scholarly and curricular needs the proposed appointment is expected to fill, and how the candidate will further the nominating unit's vision for its future.

2) *Report on the Nomination Process:* As part of the case statement, the department/division and school describes how the nominee was selected and evaluated. If the candidate was chosen through a search, this section discusses whom the department/division and school considered and why the candidate was preferred. If the candidate was selected through the assistance of an Affirmative Action Waiver Request, the department/division and school provides the grounds for the exception and provides a copy of the waiver request and approval from the Recruitment of Academic Personnel System (RAPS). It is not necessary to conduct a formal search before nominating junior faculty for promotion to tenure.

Whenever a department/division and school 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/division and school 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/division and school 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/division and school.

- 3) *Report on the Vote:* The case statement discusses the formal vote by which the nomination was made and, for nominations in the Arts and Sciences, includes the vote of the counterpart department at Barnard College. The statement provides information on the department/division and school voting procedures, 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, the nominating unit is expected to explain the reasons for their absence.

Whenever members of a nominating department/division and school oppose a nomination or abstain, the case statement includes an explanation of the reasons for their votes. The Office of the Vice Provost will also ask dissenting faculty to prepare written assessments of the candidate. If more than one member of the nominating department/division and 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/division and school 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 first provides a description of how the candidate's discipline or field defines and determines the presence of scholarly excellence. The department/division and school next discusses the quality of the candidate's past scholarly achievements and potential for future growth, describes the importance of the candidate's work for his or her field and compares the candidate with other leading scholars in his or her area of specialization. The department/division and

school also discusses the quality of the candidate's teaching, and includes information on his or her service to both the University and discipline.

In support of the case statement, the department/division and school includes the following additional written materials, as applicable:

- The candidate prepares a statement that discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects.
- In some departments and schools, an appointments or reading committee assesses the work of the candidate and prepares a written report on his or her qualifications for the full faculty. Any such report is included as part of the dossier.
- Some schools conduct more than one evaluation of a candidate, first at the level of the department or division and then by a school-wide committee. In those cases, the department or division normally prepares the case statement, but the dossier must also include a report from the school-level committee that describes its assessment of the candidate and documents its vote on the nomination.
- Barnard departments conduct their own reviews of candidates under consideration by their counterparts in the Arts and Sciences. In such cases, the Barnard department sends its counterpart a separate written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications that is included in the dossier.
- The candidate prepares a current *curriculum vitae* supplemented, if necessary, with sufficient information to provide a complete record of academic and professional training, previous employment, distinctions, achievements, and scholarly and professional activities.
- The nominating department/division and school submits a small, but representative, sample of the nominee's most important scholarly work, published and unpublished, for the review of TRAC. In professional or artistic fields, it may be appropriate to supplement or replace the sample of written scholarship with examples of the candidate's creative work.
- The department/division and school 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, the department/division and school 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 Columbia or from the candidate's previous institution, the results of classroom observations, a representative sample of student course evaluations, information on the candidate's former students, and teaching awards.

- Finally, the department/division and school 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. Evaluations of candidates are solicited by the nominating executive vice president or dean. As part of its work of evaluation, described below, TRAC may request that the Provost solicit additional referee letters on its behalf.

Copies of the standard letters that are sent to referees for nominations in all Faculties are appended to this document as exhibits. These letters may be modified only with the consent of the Provost. Referees also are provided with the nominee's *curriculum vitae*, personal statement and samples of his or her written work.

The dean or executive vice president responsible for obtaining the evaluations selects the scholars who will be asked for referee letters, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department, division, or school. Scholars at other universities may also be consulted in compiling the list of referees, but not the nominee. Consultants should not themselves serve as referees.

While a dossier will contain at least 10 referee letters, their number matters less than the scholars who provide them and the quality of their assessments. Referees should consist of the leading figures in the nominee's area 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 a few scholarly collaborators or former mentors of the candidate, but letters from direct graduate or postdoctoral mentors should not be counted in the minimum of 10 letters. 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 within the United States, but may not be members of Columbia's faculty. If the members of TRAC feel that an adequate representation of the best scholars in a candidate's field have not written or that the number of collaborators of the candidates is too high, TRAC may ask for additional external evaluations.

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/division and school may, with the special prior permission of the dean or executive vice president, collect a few preliminary written evaluations before deciding whether to engage in negotiations with the nominee. Copies of any such evaluations are included in the dossier as well, along with a sample of the letter soliciting them.

The external evaluations are accompanied by biographical information that briefly explains why the 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/division and school 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 rather than by phone, and a list of those who declined to write should be included in the candidate's dossier along with their responses explaining the reasons for declining to write.

While the dean or executive vice president solicits the external letters before the start of the internal deliberations of the department/division and school, the evaluations received are shared with the tenured members of the department/division and school before they vote on the nomination, unless a referee states that the letter should be shown only to the Provost and TRAC.

Comparison Scholars: 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 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 Columbia. It always contains leading figures in the nominee's area of specialization, even when the nominee is a junior 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 even when the candidate is a junior member of Columbia's 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. An unsatisfactory comparison list may prompt TRAC to ask for additional external assessments of the candidate.

Because the comparison scholars are chosen on the basis of their academic distinction, the dean or executive vice president may 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 non-tenured appointment 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 that individual's name.

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 Office of the Vice Provost 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. The School should provide the name or names of recommended witnesses in the dossier. Please see page 12 for more information.

EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

In exceptional cases of external recruits of extraordinary scholars, who have already achieved the highest level of recognition in their fields, such as memberships in National Academies, who are being recruited to high-level academic positions, such as Directorships of major institutes, some reduction in the scope of nominating materials may be warranted. The dean or executive may waive the requirement for a statement from the nominee. Other requests for modifications to the nominating materials must be approved in advance by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. To the extent possible, TRAC maintains space in its schedule of meeting to allow prompt review of such cases.

THE COMPOSITION OF TRAC

TRAC consists of thirteen 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 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 their 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. As stipulated in the inter-institutional agreement with Barnard, the membership of TRAC is augmented by one or two additional faculty from the College when a Barnard candidate is to be considered. These additional members only participate in the evaluation of Barnard candidates, as described in the tenure guidelines governing the evaluation of nominations from the College.

SCHEDULE FOR SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS TO TRAC

Planning for the reviews of nominations begins in the spring prior to the academic year in which the evaluations will occur. By **April 15th** of the preceding spring, the deans and executive vice presidents submit a list of junior faculty they intend to evaluate and the names of scholars at other institutions they have already identified as potential candidates for tenure no matter how remote the likelihood of a nomination. For each candidate on the list, the dean or executive vice president provides an initial assessment of the likelihood of the nomination and a brief description of his or his area of specialization. In addition, the deans and executive vice presidents inform the Office of the Vice Provost of all external searches that may result in further nominations to tenure.

By **May 15th** of the preceding spring, the dean or executive vice president sends the Office of the Vice Provost confirmation that they have sent out the requests for the external letters of evaluation for their 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. The dean or executive vice president of a school or department that misses the deadline for asking for the referee evaluations for internal candidates is expected to write to the Provost explaining the reasons for the delay and how the school will insure that subsequent deadlines for submitting the nominations and supporting documentation will be met for those candidates.

Some candidates for tenure will not be known May 15th. External searches may not be completed by then or it may become necessary to organize a tenure review for a junior faculty member who is being recruited by another university. Deans and executive vice presidents inform the Office of the Vice Provost as soon as additional candidates are identified. For each such individual, the deans and executive vice presidents provide the referee and comparison lists and the date on which the request for the referee evaluations was sent.

The departments and schools are expected to complete their internal evaluations' of junior faculty, with the exception of those being recruited by other universities, by **December 15th** of the academic year of nomination. The Provost will permit exceptions to that deadline when the size of a school's case load does not allow it to complete all of its reviews by this date. In those cases, it is the responsibility of the dean or executive vice president to negotiate with the Office of the Vice Provost a separate schedule for the submission of the nominations and dossiers for the school's internal candidates. This is done in advance of the academic year. If a school 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 and schools 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, the deans and executive vice presidents should send the Provost the nominations and dossiers for their external candidates by **February 1st**.

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 completed by May 15th, the nominating dean or executive vice president 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 deem it necessary to evaluate the nominations it receives.

Early in the fall semester, the Chair of TRAC and the Vice Provost discuss 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 the 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 inform the Office of the Vice Provost 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, care is taken to ensure that it 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 a candidate's specialization is not a requirement, and generally at least one member of each panel is distant from the candidate's field.

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 that 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/division and school, they may be asked for a letter explaining their reasons in the manner of any other faculty member who did not favor awarding tenure.

Each member of a review panel independently prepares a report on the candidate's qualifications which they submit to the Office of the Vice Provost. Once all of the reports are received, the Office distributes them to the full committee.

The Office of the Vice Provost sets the agenda of TRAC in consultation with the TRAC 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, 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 future meetings for further discussion. Whenever a nomination requires more than one hearing, the Office of the Vice Provost informs the nominating dean or executive vice president.

If TRAC decides that more than one hearing is necessary, it may ask the Provost to collect further information before it reconsiders the nomination, including additional external letters of evaluations and additional written statements from the nominating department/division and school.

TRAC does not hear from witnesses at the first hearing for a nomination. If a second hearing is necessary, the appropriate department chair or dean is invited to provide TRAC with testimony on the quality of the candidate's work and the significance of the appointment for the nominating unit. If the candidate will have appointments in more than one department, the chair or dean of the primary department/division and school is asked to appear. TRAC may also invite the heads of the other units in which the candidate will serve if the committee feels that they can contribute to its evaluation. Department chairs and deans may delegate the responsibility of serving as witnesses to other tenured faculty who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications and his or her proposed role in the department/division and school. 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 and they may be asked to appear in person or teleconference.

The Office of the Vice Provost provides witnesses with a list of questions TRAC members wish to discuss. The list is intended as a guide to the areas the committee primarily wishes the witnesses to address. Other questions may arise at the meeting itself. While it is not required, witnesses may prepare written 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 case as presented in the dossier or evidence provided by witness. 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 opinion of leading scholars in the candidate's field(s) on the originality and impact of his or her scholarship;
- 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 extent to which 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 scholarship, achievement, creativity, impact and future trajectory.

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

- The quality of classroom teaching, as measured by student evaluations;
- Mentoring of doctoral students and post-docs, 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, or a representative, attends all TRAC meetings and may actively participate in the discussion about a nomination. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Provost’s Manager of Tenure Reviews 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 participate in any of its meetings, except when a Barnard candidate is under review in which case the University’s inter-institutional agreement with the College specifies that its Provost and Dean of Faculty may observe the deliberations.

TRAC serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost, who depends heavily upon its evaluation of a candidate but is not bound by its recommendation. In addition to the final vote, the Provost 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 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 normally is not shared with the chair, dean or executive vice president of the nominating department/division and school.

The Provost submits a recommendation to the President on whether the candidate should be awarded tenure. A nomination is forwarded to the Trustees for their approval only if the Provost and President are satisfied that the candidate deserves tenure.

After the President has reached his or her own decision on a nomination, the Provost informs the appropriate executive vice president or dean of the outcome of the review who, in turn, informs the candidate. A candidate who is denied tenure is invited to meet with the Provost to discuss the decision. In those unusual cases where the Provost, President, or Trustees do not accept TRAC’s formal recommendation, the Provost informs its members of the reasons.

Second Review

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 in the University Statutes governing

the limits on nontenured service. The Provost 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 the rare instance where the Provost is satisfied that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision.

It is incumbent upon the school to obtain the prior approval of the Provost 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/division and school and the endorsement of the dean or executive vice president before they are forwarded to the Provost. To assist the tenured faculty in deciding whether to request a new evaluation, the chair or dean 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 school or department submits a statement that explains why it believes the new work meets the standard for a second review. That statement should address only the new materials and not the work considered during the first review. The Provost 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 Provost accepts the request from the school for permission to reconsider the candidate, the responsible dean or executive vice president asks for additional external evaluations using a standard letter provided by the 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/division and 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/division and school 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 dean or vice president for his or her review. If the dean or vice president 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. In a second review of a candidate, the Provost determines whether the case requires one or more meetings of TRAC or whether additional witnesses are required.

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 President and Provost 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 Provost or Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. 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 Faculty Affairs. 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 Faculty Affairs 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 deans or 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 sections that discuss 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 dean or executive vice president of the school making the nomination to see that the dossier is complete, accurate and submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on schedule even when it is prepared by a department or division.

The Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences submits the nominations and supporting materials for the departments in the Arts and Sciences. The Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences transmits them for the Faculties of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Nursing and Public Health. Nominations and supporting materials from the other professional schools are submitted by their deans.

Each dossier should consist of the documents described below.

DOSSIER COVER SHEET

Every dossier should have a completed cover sheet that follows the template included as Exhibit D. In addition, the executive vice president or dean should include a statement that explains why he or she has chosen to accept the recommendation from the department/division and school in favor of nominating the candidate for tenure.

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 students. (When possible, include the names of students in each category, the titles of their 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 inclusive page numbers), and impact factor of publication and citation rate, if applicable;
2. All conference papers;
3. All unpublished work completed or in progress, together with information on the expected publisher and publication date when they are known; and
4. 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 be presented in the same order and 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. Title of the proposal;
2. Full name of granting agency (abbreviations should be explained);
3. Period of the award;
4. Amount of the award (identifying direct and indirect costs, as applicable); and
5. If the grant was awarded to more than one individual, the names of the co-investigator(s) and an 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. 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.
 - 3. Conferences or workshops organized.
 - 4. 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/Division and School and Its Objectives

This portion of the case statement describes the current state and objectives of the department/division and school and how the proposed appointment relates to them. In the case of a joint or interdisciplinary appointment, the relevant Departments or Schools may submit separate statements or a joint statement. In either case, though, each of the academic units where the nominee will hold an appointment provides information on how the candidate will advance their respective programs. It covers the following topics:

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

This description is accompanied by a list of the faculty in the appropriate department/division and school by title, rank, and discipline/research area. If the candidate will serve in a particular division the list may be confined to its faculty. In addition, the nominating department/division and school should complete the statistical table attached to this document as Exhibit E. For candidates serving in a division, two versions of the table should be included, one for the division and the other for the school as a whole.

- C. The curricular program(s) in the field(s) of the proposed appointment(s), 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), school(s) and, where appropriate, other units within the University.

Report on the Nomination Process

For candidates recruited from other institutions, the nominating department/division and school describes the search, includes the names of others considered and explains the reasons for selecting the nominee. Include a printout from Recruitment of Academic Personnel System (RAPS) detailing the recruitment advertisement or waiver request and approvals.

For internal candidates, the appropriate dean or executive vice president authorizes a department/division and school to proceed with the evaluation of a member of the junior faculty for a possible promotion to tenure and in that case the department/division and school 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 and/or interdisciplinary appointment, the case statement includes a description of the contributions of all of the nominating departments or schools to the process of selecting the candidate.

Some departments and schools 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 report(s) prepared by the internal committee.

Some schools conduct reviews at both the departmental/divisional level and the school. The case statement documents the process used and includes a report from the department/divisional and school-level committees on its assessment of the credentials of the candidate.

Prior Reviews: If the department/division and school is nominating a candidate it previously decided not to propose for tenure or turned down the candidate in an earlier evaluation for tenure, the case statement must describe the earlier evaluation, the reasons for the original negative decision, why the scholarship completed since the first review prompted it to reverse its earlier judgment of the quality of the candidate's work and why the nominating unit no longer considers those reasons to be valid. The dossier also includes a full description of the earlier evaluation, including the vote or votes taken. This description is accompanied by all of the materials 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/division and school. If another part of the University has already decided against nominating the candidate, the department/division and school explains why it has nonetheless chosen to proceed with a nomination to tenure. In addition, it obtains a statement from the other department/division and school on its evaluation of the candidate and the reasons for its negative decision.

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. If nontenured faculty are permitted to vote on tenure cases then the department/division and school needs to provide an explanation of its practices to contextualize this information. 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.

The report explains the reasons for any negative votes or abstentions. The Office of the Vice Provost may also ask faculty 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, division or school votes negatively or abstains, those who did so may write separately or prepare a collective explanation of their views on the nomination. Other members of the University's faculty 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 Columbia department with a counterpart in Barnard, 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.

Assessment of the Nominee's Qualifications

The nominating department/division and school uses the case statement to discuss the qualifications, accomplishments, and future promise of the nominee, particularly in relation to the objectives outlined in the "Analysis of the Department/Division and School and Its Objectives." If the candidate switched to the tenure track from an off-track appointment at the university, then the process and considerations that led to the switch should be clearly explained.

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. To assist TRAC with that task, the department/division and school includes a description of how it determines and discerns excellence and distinction in the relevant discipline or field.

The department/division and school 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/division and school:

1. Describes how the discipline determines excellence in scholarship and how the candidate fares by those standards;
2. Identifies the leading academic journals and presses in the candidate's area of specialization and discusses the extent to which the candidate publishes in them;
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; and
4. Discusses the candidate's grant support if scholars in the field regularly obtain external funding;
5. Describes the significance of any prizes or awards the candidate has won; and
6. 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;

B. Teaching Qualifications

As part of the case statement, the department/division and school discusses the nominee's qualities as a teacher. It explains what the teaching expectations are in the department and/or school and 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 substantiated 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/division and school 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. If the department/division and school uses letters from current or former students, it should provide the criteria used in selecting those students and a list of who was solicited. The department/division and school may also include the statistical results for other questions but should not include individual student forms. Those forms may be included, instead, as an appendix to this section.

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 both the 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 University, positions in professional associations, editorial positions on journals, and membership on grant review panels or juries in addition to public outreach and governmental service relevant to the candidate's scholarship.

STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE

The nominee prepares 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 faculty being considered for promotion to tenure. The dean or executive vice president submitting the nomination may waive the requirement for external senior candidates.

REFEREE LETTERS

Every nomination to tenure must be supported by evaluations from outside scholars using the "referee letter templates" appended to this document. Deans and executive vice presidents may not modify the standard letters without first obtaining permission from the Office of the Vice Provost. Evaluations of candidates in the Arts and Sciences departments are obtained by the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences; those for candidates in the basic and clinical departments at CUMC by the Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences and in the other schools by their respective deans. These letters are collected early enough in the internal deliberations of the department/division and school that its tenured faculty may review them before voting on the nomination.

The individual responsible for collecting the evaluations compiles the lists of referees and comparison scholars, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department/division and school. The candidate is not consulted in constructing those lists. When adequate assistance cannot be obtained from members of the University's tenured faculty, the responsible person should seek the advice of scholars at other institutions. The consultants themselves should not become referees.

In tenure cases in which referee letters are solicited for prior school-level reviews, such as a promotion to Associate Professor without tenure, the names and institutions of those solicited are included in the dossier, along with the all of the letters received.

The dean or executive vice president collects at least 10 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 nominating unit has not obtained the views of a sufficient number of key scholars in the field of the candidate or in related fields, it may ask the Provost for additional letters which will delay the completion of its review.

Referees may not be 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. Letters from direct graduate or postdoctoral mentors should be in excess of the 10 required letters.

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. The dean or executive vice president who collects the referee letters may make that inquiry or delegate the responsibility to a representative, such as a department chair. However, all preliminary inquiries are made by letter or e-mail and 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. 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 emails 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, 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 and a list of the top scholars in the candidate's field at the institutions. 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/division and school should include an explanation of the reasons why.
- D. A sample of the referee letter(s) used to request the evaluations, 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.
- F. For internal candidates, the list of referees solicited for the promotion to Associate Professor without tenure, as appropriate, along with all the letters received.

Schools normally collect only one round of evaluations. There may, however, be unusual circumstances where, with the special permission of the dean or executive vice president and the Provost, schools may ask for a few preliminary letters of evaluation. For example, a department/division and school 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 Columbia. 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/division and 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.

Comparison Scholars: 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 junior nominees include the following paragraph at the bottom of the list:

Note that some of the persons listed above hold positions well established positions. By including these names 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 significantly 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 Columbia. With the exception of individuals of extraordinary achievement who are on the verge of being tenured, they should not include nontenured faculty.

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 appointment of the candidate is appropriately modified to refer to the earlier correspondence (see Exhibit C).

The candidate's *curriculum vitae* and personal statement should be included with the letter requesting the evaluation. A small set of the candidate's scholarly work should also be provided to assist the outsider reviewers in preparing their letters.

PUBLICATIONS

The nominating department/division and 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 his or her 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 the principal author. If important publications are in a language other than English, a brief synopsis in English of their contents should be included. Hard copies of book may also be delivered to the Office of the Vice Provost.

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

The nominating department/division and school may include in the candidate's dossier any additional information it wishes TRAC to consider (for example, teaching evaluations, letters from students or reviews of publications).

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 Office of the Vice Provost to arrange for at least one witness to appear before it. To prepare for that possibility, the department/division and school indicates in the dossier who it recommends as a witness if TRAC finds it necessary to ask someone to appear. The dean or department chair usually serves in that role but may delegate the responsibility to another faculty member who is closer to the field of the nominee. When a candidate is nominated by more than one department/division and school, the list of recommended witnesses should include representatives from each of the units.

SUBMISSION OF THE DOSSIER

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

The materials submitted electronically should be put into a “.pdf” format. Physical media should be encrypted and passwords provided separately to the Office of the Vice Provost. In general, scans of material are to be avoided; when necessary all scans of typeset material must be searchable. In preparing the 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. Please combine the elements of each section listed on the following checklist as one pdf and add pdf bookmarks to the supplementary materials section. For example: Combine “Letter/report from the EVP/Dean recommending the candidate for tenure” and “Letter/report from the school-level review committee recommending the candidate for tenure” and entitle it 4. (Candidate last name) REPORTS.pdf Please do this for each section of the checklist.

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 EVP/Dean 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/division and school <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of faculty Statistical table [Exhibit E] Report on the nomination process Report on the vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of candidate by internal committee(s), Assessment of Barnard/Columbia counterpart department, when appropriate 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 For external cases, a printout from RAPS detailing the recruitment advertisement or waiver request and approvals. 	Lastname_F_casestatement.pdf
6. Statement of the Nominee	Lastname_F_nominee.pdf
7. Supplemental Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching evaluations Course syllabi Student letters of support, list of those solicited, and the criteria used for their selection. 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 For internal candidates, the list of referees solicited for the promotion to Associate Professor, if appropriate, along with all letters received. 	Lastname_F_referee.pdf
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 	

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 LETTER TO REFEREES FOR EXTERNAL CANDIDATES

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address
City, state ZIP

Dear [Professor/Dr.] _____:

I write to ask for your help in evaluating the work of [Professor/Dr.] _____, currently at [name of institution], who is being considered for an appointment to tenure at Columbia. [Insert a sentence about the candidate's area(s) of specialization.]

Like every nomination to tenure at Columbia, that of [Professor/Dr.] _____ is subject to a rigorous review, first by the faculty of the department and school, [insert other levels of review as appropriate], and then by a University-wide standing committee. We value scholarship of the highest quality, whether within a single discipline or across disciplines. Therefore, we encourage you to consider the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work in your evaluation, if appropriate, in addition to his/her disciplinary contributions.

It would be especially helpful to us if you could include in your evaluation answers to the following questions, and particularly so if you could formulate your responses in a way that makes them accessible to both experts and non-experts in the candidate's field of research.

1. How well and in what capacity do you know [Professor/Dr.] _____?
2. What is your critical assessment (both strengths and weaknesses) of the originality, quality, and impact of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s scholarship? Since the most useful letters are those that assess the work in detail, I am enclosing some of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s publications as well as [his/her] CV and personal statement.
3. What is your overall appraisal of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s record of achievement and productivity, and how does it measure up to the standards for tenure in your discipline or field?
4. How do the originality, quality, and impact of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s work compare to that of the leading scholars in [his/her] field? I have attached a list of individuals to whom [Professor/Dr.] _____ might be compared. In the case of the scholars who are more senior than [Professor/Dr.] _____, what is your assessment of [his/her] chances of attaining the same level of distinction? Please feel free to augment the list as you see fit.
5. What is your assessment of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s trajectory? Is he/she likely to become one of the leading figures in [his/her] field.
6. If [Professor/Dr.] _____ 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?

7. Do you have any other comments that would be relevant to our deliberations, including observations about [Professor/Dr.] _____'s teaching and/or mentorship, leadership, or service?

I will, of course, hold your response in confidence to the extent permitted by law and show it only to the Provost, members of the standing committee, [insert other levels of review as appropriate], and the executive committee of _____. If you wish, however, you may restrict some or all of your comments to the Provost or to the standing committee.

I realize that this request imposes significantly upon your time, but as you know, 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 _____.

With thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

Dean _____

Enclosures: *Curriculum vitae*
Personal statement
Comparison list
Publications

EXHIBIT B
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES FOR INTERNAL CANDIDATES

CONFIDENTIAL

Date

Name

Address

City, state ZIP

Dear [Professor/Dr.] _____:

I write to ask for your help in evaluating the work of [Professor/Dr.] _____, who is being considered for promotion to tenure at Columbia. [Insert a sentence about the candidate's area(s) of specialization.]

Like every nomination to tenure at Columbia, that of [Professor/Dr.] _____ is subject to a rigorous review, first by the faculty of the department and school, [insert other levels of review as appropriate], and then by a University-wide standing committee. We value scholarship of the highest quality, whether within a single discipline or across disciplines. Therefore, we encourage you to consider the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work in your evaluation, if appropriate, in addition to his/her disciplinary contributions.

It would be especially helpful to us if you could include in your evaluation answers to the following questions, and particularly so if you could formulate your responses in a way that makes them accessible to both experts and non-experts in the candidate's field of research.

1. How well and in what capacity do you know [Professor/Dr.] _____?
2. What is your critical assessment (both strengths and weaknesses) of the originality, quality, and impact of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s scholarship? Since the most useful letters are those that assess the work in detail, I am enclosing some of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s publications as well as [his/her] CV and personal statement.
3. What is your overall appraisal of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s record of achievement and productivity, and how does it measure up to the standards for tenure in your discipline or field? (Please note that tenure clocks can differ for candidates for a number of reasons including, for example, family and sick leaves. Such leaves do not change our expectations of a tenure candidate, only the time it takes to achieve them.)
4. How do the originality, quality, and impact of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s work compare to that of the leading scholars in [his/her] field? I have attached a list of individuals to whom [Professor/Dr.] _____ might be compared. In the case of the scholars who are more senior than [Professor/Dr.] _____, what is your assessment of [his/her] chances of attaining the same level of distinction? Please feel free to augment the list as you see fit.

5. What is your assessment of [Professor/Dr.] _____'s trajectory? Is he/she likely to become one of the leading figures in [his/her] field?
6. If [Professor/Dr.] _____ 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?
7. Do you have any other comments that would be relevant to our deliberations, including observations about [Professor/Dr.] _____'s teaching and/or mentorship, leadership, or service?

I will, of course, hold your response in confidence to the extent permitted by law and show it only to the Provost, members of the standing committee, [insert other levels of review as appropriate], and the executive committee of _____. If you wish, however, you may restrict some or all of your comments to the Provost or to the standing committee.

I realize that this request imposes significantly upon your time, but as you know, 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 _____.

With thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

Dean/EVP: _____

Enclosures: *Curriculum vitae*
Personal statement
Comparison list
Publications

EXHIBIT C
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES WHO WERE ASKED FOR EVALUATIONS AS
PART OF THE SCHOOL'S INTERNAL DELIBERATIONS ON A NOMINATION

CONFIDENTIAL

Date

Name
Address

Dear _____:

On [date], [I/the Chair of the Department of X/the Dean of the School of X] wrote to ask for your help in an evaluation [we/the Department/the School] [was/were] conducting in connection with the possible nomination of [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] to tenure. Your response to [our/his/her] request was greatly appreciated. [We/the Department/the School] [has/have] decided to nominate [Dr./Professor] [Candidate], and we are now preparing for the review that our Provost will conduct with the assistance of a special, University-wide standing committee.

I am writing to ask if you would like to add to the comments on [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s qualifications in your previous letter, a copy of which is enclosed. In particular, we would 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.

I realize that my request imposes an added burden on your time. However, the opinions of outside referees play an important part in Columbia's process of tenure review. Therefore, we would be grateful for any additional information that you think we might find helpful in conducting [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s review. We will hold your response in confidence to the extent permitted by law and show it only to the Provost, members of the standing committee, and the [Department Chair/Executive Committee of the Department/School] [and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions of the Faculty of Dental Medicine/Medicine/Public Health and of the Faculty of Health Sciences].

With thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

[Dean/Executive Vice President]

Enclosures: Comparison list
Previous letter of evaluation

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 John:

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: [Title and department]

[The executive vice president or dean, should include a statement that explains why he or she has chosen to accept the recommendation from the department/division and school in favor of nominating the candidate for tenure]

Sincerely,

[Executive Vice President/Dean]

EXHIBIT E

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

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

Notes:

- 1) Special Instructional Faculty = Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Associate, Assistant
- 2) Off-Track = at CUMC, affiliated at Hospital/Institute, Clinical, of Clinical; of Professional Practice, in Discipline
- 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]

<p>Name Complete Address Telephone Email</p>	<p>Response to request (Responded, Declined, or No response)</p>
<p>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., and why they were selected as referee.</p>	
<p>Name Complete Address Telephone Email</p>	<p>Response to request (Responded, Declined, or No response)</p>
<p>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., and why they were selected as a referee.</p>	