

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

Table of Contents:

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Part I: General Policies and Procedures	2
	a. Criteria for an Appointment to Tenure	
	b. Barnard-University Consultations Preceding the TRAC Review	
	c. Nomination to Tenure	
	d. Evidence Considered by the Standing Committee	
	e. Expedited Consideration	
	f. Composition of TRAC	
	g. Schedule for Submitting Nominations to TRAC	
	h. The TRAC Review	
	i. Confidentiality	
3.	Part II: Guidelines for Preparing a Tenure Nomination	14
	a. Dossier Cover Sheet	
	b. Curriculum Vitae	
	c. Case Statement	
	d. Statement of the Nominee	
	e. Referee Letters	
	f. Publications	
	g. Supplementary Documentation	
	h. Witnesses to Appear Before TRAC	
	i. Submission of the Dossier	
4.	Appendix	26
	a. Checklist	
	b. Exhibit A: Standard Letter to Referees for External Candidates	
	c. Exhibit B: Standard Letter to Referees for Internal Candidates	
	d. Exhibit C: Standard Letter to Referees Who Were Asked for Evaluations as Part of the School's Internal Deliberations on a Nomination	
	e. Exhibit D: Dossier Cover Sheet	
	f. Exhibit E: Table on the Composition of the Faculty of the Nominating Department	
	g. Exhibit F: Summary of Teaching Evaluations	
	h. Exhibit G: Annotated list of referees	

INTRODUCTION

Columbia employs a standing committee system to conduct a final University-wide evaluation whenever a school or department/division, including Barnard College but not 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/division and/or 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 department/division or school 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 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.

PART I: GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This part of the document discusses 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. Part I describes the consultative arrangements mandated by the Amended Agreement, the evidence TRAC considers, and how TRAC 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 or interdisciplinary field. 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, for candidates appointed at Barnard, 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, 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 their 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 their 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 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 field.

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to accommodate the differing disciplines of the candidates and the missions of their departments. Because the scholarship they 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 their fields. 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 rare cases where there is no one clear counterpart University department, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College consults with the University Provost to identify a University unit to serve as the counterpart department. 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 Barnard department/program and the Columbia counterpart department are at the discretion of their chairs, subject to the review of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College and the University Provost.

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 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 their qualifications accompany the case as it moves through the Barnard review process and are included in the dossier given to TRAC. Faculty who do not vote affirmatively or choose not to vote will be asked to provide the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention, or nonparticipation, and this information will be shared with the College's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP), the Provost of the University, and the University's Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

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 ATP and a possible nomination to the Provost of the University for a TRAC review.

NOMINATION TO TENURE

Nominations normally begin with a recommendation from 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. The initial department nomination must take place before the mid-point of the candidate's sixth year of counted service (i.e., January 15). The department holds a second vote after receiving the referee letters; if the vote is affirmative, the nomination is forwarded to the College's ATP. An unresolved tie vote in the department, program, or tenure committee will be referred to the ATP for further consideration. In the case of joint nominations to tenure, there must be a majority of positive votes in each 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 in the Barnard nominating department who do not vote affirmatively or choose not to vote will be asked to provide the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention, or nonparticipation. This information will be shared with the ATP and, if the case is approved by Barnard College and submitted for TRAC review, with the Provost of the University. Where the departmental recommendation is negative, the candidate may appeal to the ATP to be considered for tenure review. There must be clear and pressing College interests for the Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion to agree to a tenure review over a negative recommendation by the department.

Before a nomination can be forwarded to the Provost of the University, it must be reviewed by Barnard's ATP, receive the endorsement of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, and be approved by the President of the College. Following the submission of a nomination, the President of the College retains the right to withdraw the nomination at any point prior to its approval by the Trustees of the University.

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 THE STANDING COMMITTEE

Every nomination to tenure should be accompanied by the materials detailed in Part II of this document. The department originating the nomination may take the lead in preparing these materials, but the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College has the responsibility to review them for completeness and accuracy and to see that they are submitted in a timely fashion after a positive recommendation by Barnard's ATP and the approval of the Barnard President. The University's Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 department to submit the candidate's dossier for review by Barnard's ATP according to the schedule established by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College so the candidate's dossier may

be sent to the University's Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, a report from the College and ATP review, a case statement which is prepared by the nominating department, the candidate's statement on their research, teaching and service, referee evaluations (see **Exhibit A-C** for template letters) and the other supporting documents such as teaching evaluations and example research products. Each of these is described in detail in Part II. 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. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College is informed if additional information is collected or witnesses are asked to appear before TRAC.

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 Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard may waive the requirement for a statement from the nominee. Other requests for modifications to the nominating materials should be discussed and agreed to in advance by the Office of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. To the extent possible, TRAC maintains space in its schedule of meetings to allow prompt review of such cases.

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 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 College or 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. The Amended Agreement between Columbia and Barnard specifies that two faculty from the College participate in the University-wide reviews of Barnard 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 Barnard 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 the evaluations will occur and all departments and schools are expected to adhere to the following deadlines:

April 1: The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College is expected to submit a list of internal junior faculty the College intends to evaluate the following year 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 their area of specialization, along with the candidate's *curriculum vitae*. In addition, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College informs the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs of the University of all external searches the College expects to conduct that may result in further nominations to tenure.

May 15: The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College sends the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 list of the top ten institutions in the field, the referee list, and comparison list, and the date on which the letters requesting the evaluations were mailed. For a Barnard department that misses the 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 ensure that subsequent deadlines for submitting the nomination and supporting documentation will be met for those candidates.

If there are candidates who are nominated after the May 15th deadline, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College should send the referee and comparison lists and the date on which the request for the referee evaluations was sent to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs as soon as these candidates are identified.

December 15: All materials for evaluations of internal junior faculty are expected to be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs by this date. The Provost of the University will 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 by this date. In those cases, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College must submit a separate schedule for the submission of the nominations to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs of the University. 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.

February 1: The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College is expected to send the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs the nominations and dossiers for their external

candidates by this date. This enables Columbia University to comply with the AAUP policy guideline that sets May 15th as the last date a faculty member may terminate their appointment in an academic year. The offer to a faculty member at another institution for appointment the following fall cannot be contingent upon a favorable outcome of a tenure review.

If a review by TRAC cannot be completed by April 30th, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard 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.

Every candidate is reviewed by a panel of five TRAC members with one serving as the primary reviewer and another as the secondary reviewer. 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 among the Barnard members of TRAC. 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. 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.

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 given access to the candidate's dossier.

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 for Faculty Affairs of the University. Once all of the reports are received, the Office distributes them to the full committee. 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 review in one meeting, discussion of a nomination may be carried over to a second due to

scheduling constraints. At the conclusion of its assessment, the committee decides whether to recommend the award of tenure or to hold the nomination over to future meetings for further discussion. Whenever it is determined a nomination requires more than one hearing, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs of the University informs the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College before notifying the chairs or witnesses.

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 consulted if additional information is requested.

TRAC does not hear from witnesses at the first hearing for a nomination. If a second hearing is necessary, the appropriate department chair or chair's designee will be 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, it is the chair of the primary department that is asked to appear. 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 witnesses to other tenured faculty who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications and their proposed role in the department. Whenever TRAC asks for a chair or designee to appear as a witness, the Columbia University Provost's Office will consult with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College on the selection. 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 for Faculty Affairs provides the witness with a list of questions TRAC members wish to discuss. The witness should prepare written materials in response to the questions to distribute to the members of TRAC. 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 and prohibited from participating in the review owing to a conflict of interest.

TRAC considers all aspects of a candidate's record – scholarship, teaching and service – in evaluating whether they meet 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 their scholarship;

- The candidate's productivity as measured against the expectations of their field;
- Growth in the quality as well as the quantity of the candidate's published work over the course of their scholarly career;
- In the case of a candidate who regularly co-publishes with others, their individual contributions to the scholarship;
- For a candidate early in their career, the level of independence from their 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 their field;
- Sources and quantity of external funding;
- Awards, honors and prizes received;
- The frequency with which a candidate is invited to give talks about their 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, peer review of teaching, course syllabi, solicited student letters, and related materials;
- 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 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 typically attends all TRAC meetings and actively participates in the discussion about a nomination. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College or their 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 Faculty Affairs, the Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the 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 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 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. In all cases, any additional information obtained subsequent to the review by TRAC is shared with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College.

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, they first inform 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 their 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. A candidate who is denied tenure will be invited to meet with the Provost of the University to discuss the decision. 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.

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 of the Barnard Statutes governing the limits on non-tenured service. The Provost of the University may authorize a new review if they determine that: (a) the first was marked by procedural irregularities of a magnitude that materially affected its outcome; or (b) in rare instances when the Provost of the University is satisfied that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision.

(a) Procedural Irregularities: In rare cases when the Provost of the University has determined that there were procedural irregularities that affected the outcome of the first review, after consultation with the Provost and Dean of Faculty of Barnard College, they may jointly authorize or require the department and College to conduct a second full review. In such cases, it is incumbent on the department and College to conduct the second review free of the noted procedural irregularities.

In support of a second nomination, the department prepares a new dossier that includes an explanation of the procedural irregularities in the first review. All materials from the first dossier must be included. These materials are submitted to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College for review by the College's ATP. If the Provost and Dean of the Faculty endorses the new nomination and it is approved by the President of the College, the Provost of the University will ask TRAC to reconsider the case and the new dossier should be submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for review following standard procedures.

(b) Substantial New Work: When the Provost of the University has determined that substantial scholarly growth reflected in new work since the initial review has occurred, they may authorize the College to conduct a second review based entirely on the new work. For this to occur, the department must submit a formal request to the Provost and Dean of Faculty of Barnard College. Requests for such a second review require affirmative vote by the tenured faculty of the department and College ATP and the endorsement of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and approval by the President of the College. Upon approval, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College forwards the request to the Provost of the University.

In cases where the Provost of the University agrees that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision, the chair or Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College may establish a reading committee to do an in-depth evaluation of the candidate's new work to assist the tenured faculty in deciding whether to request a new review.

In support of a request for permission to start a new review, the College or department must submit a statement that explains why it believes the new work meets the standard for a second review. That statement must only address the new materials and not 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 Provost of the University 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 Office for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs office. The external reviewers include referees who expressed reservations about the candidate's work during their 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 and College must prepare a new dossier that includes an explanation of why it believes that the candidate's new work merits a reversal of the original, negative decision. The new dossier includes 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 review by the College's ATP. If the nomination is endorsed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and approved by the President of the College, the Provost of the University 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 new work 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 or Office of the 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 Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 for Faculty Affairs 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 ensure that the dossier is complete, accurate and submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on schedule when 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:

- 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. The candidate has the option of including periods of leave time that impacted the tenure clock as appropriate.
- D. Honors, prizes and fellowships, including those received as a student.
- E. 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.

F. 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, only if deemed applicable by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College;
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 or 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. Additionally, if the work was co-authored, the entry should be annotated to include the key contributions of the nominee.

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.

G. Patents received and patent applications under review.

H. Teaching experience

1. Courses taught.
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 positions after graduation.)

I. Invited talks at other universities 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; and,
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 and Its Objectives

This portion of the case statement describes briefly the current state and objectives of the department and how the proposed appointment relates to them. In the case of a joint or interdisciplinary appointment, the relevant departments 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. This section should be limited to 2 pages (excluding the tables). It should cover the following topics:

- The overall curricular, scholarly, and research goals of the department(s) in which the candidate has served or will serve.
- 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.
- 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 must complete the statistical table attached to this document as Exhibit E.
- 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.
- 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 they should be proposed for tenure.

If the candidate will have a joint appointment and/or interdisciplinary appointment, the case statement must include 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 must describe the process used in evaluating the candidate and append the written report(s) prepared by the internal committee.

The College also submits a statement from the ATP documenting the committee's process and assessment of the candidate's credentials.

Prior Reviews: If the department and College 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 must also include 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 must obtain 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

The case statement must discuss the formal vote by which the nomination was made. The statement should provide information on the department and voting procedures, on the number of faculty eligible to participate in the decision, and must report the results of any votes taken on the nomination. If nontenured faculty are permitted to vote on tenure cases, then the department and/or College must provide an explanation of its practices to contextualize this information. If any of the eligible faculty did not participate in the decision or chose not to vote, the nominating unit should explain the reasons for their absence. Voting on tenure cases cannot be by secret ballot. It is conducted by an open vote or by signed ballots.

Whenever a member of a nominating department or College ATP opposes a nomination,

abstains, or chooses not to vote, the case statement must include an explanation of the reasons for their vote. The Barnard College Office of the Provost and Columbia University Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will also ask dissenting faculty and faculty who chose not to vote to prepare written assessments of the candidate if such a statement is not included in the dossier. 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 ATP and TRAC.

Other members of the University's faculty may also communicate their views on the nomination to the Provost of the University in writing, regardless of whether they support or oppose the nomination. Any additional information conveyed in writing to the Provost of the University should be shared with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College.

The vote of the tenured faculty in the counterpart department on the academic qualifications of the nominee must be part of the record given to TRAC. In addition, the nominating department must obtain 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 must discuss the contending points of view. In addition, whenever a faculty in the counterpart department chooses not to vote, votes against the nominee or abstains, the case statement must include an explanation of the reasons for their vote. The Barnard College Office of the Provost and Columbia University Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will also ask dissenting faculty and faculty who chose not to vote from the counterpart department at Columbia University to prepare written assessments of the candidate if such a statement is not included in the dossier. Any additional information conveyed in writing to the Provost of the University will be shared with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College.

Assessment of the Nominee's Qualifications

The case statement must provide information about the qualifications, accomplishments, and future promise of the nominee, particularly in relation to the objectives outlined in the "Analysis of the Department and Its Objectives." Since the expectations for tenure may vary among the departments and schools of the University, this section of the case statement must first provide a description of how the candidate's discipline or field defines and determines the presence of scholarly excellence. The quality of the candidate's past scholarly achievements and potential for future growth must also be described, highlighting the importance of the candidate's work compared with other leading scholars in their area of specialization. The department and the ATP also discuss the quality of the candidate's teaching, and include information on their service to both the University and discipline.

If the candidate switched to the tenure track from an off-track appointment at the College, then the process and considerations that led to the switch should be clearly explained.

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 regarding what constitutes outstanding scholarship as well as any other material difference related to Barnard College as a Liberal Arts institution. To assist TRAC with that task, the department should include a description of how it determines and discerns excellence and distinction in the relevant discipline or field. The department should explain why it believes that the candidate has met that standard. The candidate's research, principal publications and other scholarly accomplishments, must be evaluated taking care to identify their most important contributions and their impact on their field of specialization. The candidate's qualifications in comparison with other scholars in the field should be discussed, including the candidate's potential for future scholarly development. All of the referee letters will be read by TRAC, so the case statement should not reproduce large excerpts.

In its assessment of the candidate, the department should:

- describe how the discipline determines excellence in scholarship and how the candidate fares by those standards;
- identify the leading academic journals and presses in the candidate's area of specialization and discuss the extent to which the candidate publishes in them;
- discuss 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;
- discuss the candidate's grant support if scholars in the field regularly obtain external funding;
- describe the significance of any prizes or awards the candidate has won; and,
- explain whether the field uses citation rates as a measure of scholarly impact and, if so, how the candidate's citation rate compares with the expected norms of the field.

Teaching Qualifications

As part of the case statement, the department should discuss the nominee's qualities as a teacher. It must explain what the teaching expectations are in the department providing information on courses taught, students (both graduate and undergraduate) and postdocs advised, and, where appropriate, participation in curricular development. It must also assess 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 to support this section of the statement.

The discussion of teaching effectiveness should be substantiated by documentation, such as the results of surveys of student opinion, student evaluations, 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**. If the department or College 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 may also append 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.

Service

This section of the assessment discusses the nominee's contribution beyond teaching and scholarship to the College, University and their discipline. Types of service relevant to the review include, for example, administrative positions within the College and 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 must prepare a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages on their current and future plans (or artistic or professional plans, 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 can also use the statement to discuss their teaching philosophy.

This statement is required of all 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

Written evaluations of the proposed appointment by recognized authorities form a critical source of information for TRAC. Evaluations of candidates from Barnard College are sought by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College using the "referee letter templates" (**Exhibits A-C**). The standard letters may not be modified without first obtaining permission from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. These letters must be collected early enough in the internal deliberations of the department to allow its tenured faculty to review them before voting on the nomination.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College should compile the lists of referees and comparison scholars, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department and its University counterpart. The candidate should not be consulted in constructing these 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. Scholars at other universities, who do not have a conflict of interest with the candidate and are independent as defined below, may also be consulted in compiling the list of referees provided they are not a mentor, dissertation advisor, collaborator, or personal friend of the candidate. The consultants themselves should not become referees.

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

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College should collect at least 10 letters from independent referees as defined below.

Referees who are *not independent* include:

- dissertation advisor
- postdoctoral mentor
- personal mentor
- personal friend or family member
- principal or co-investigator on a grant with the nominee
- those who have coauthored work with the nominee
- current or former departmental colleagues, including colleagues who visited the candidate's department for sabbaticals or similar extended visits
- individuals who have served in an advisory capacity to the candidate, including those who were on the candidate's dissertation committee
- individuals who have funded the candidate

Care should be taken to include letters from the most prominent individuals in the candidate's area of specialization. If a letter from a referee who is not independent is included in the dossier, an explanation must be included in the case statement and referee list identifying the connection to the nominee, the importance of including this referee and explaining any overlap, for example, listing joint publications or products. Under unusual and field-specific circumstances, a letter from a referee who is not independent (as indicated by the list above) can be used as one of the 10 required letters if the department and College can clarify independence and if approval is obtained from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs prior to soliciting the letter. If a connection between a referee and the nominee is discovered after the letter is received (for example, statements in the letter may indicate a strong connection), an explanation should be provided in the case statement to help TRAC weigh the importance of this letter. In such a case, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College may solicit additional letters for the candidate.

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 candidate's field or in related fields, it may request that the Provost of the University consult with the Provost and Dean of Faculty of Barnard College regarding the solicitation of additional letters which will delay the completion of its review.

Referees may include scholars from abroad as well as from other institutions within the United States, but may not be members of the faculty of Barnard or Columbia and cannot include nontenured faculty at other universities. If the members of TRAC feel that the dossier does not include an adequate representation of letters from the best scholars in a candidate's field or that the number of collaborators of the candidates is too high, then TRAC may request that the Provost of the University consult with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College regarding the solicitation of additional letters, which will delay the completion of its review.

As a matter of courtesy, potential referees should be asked if they will review the candidate's work before they receive the formal request for evaluation. All preliminary inquiries and formal inquiries must be made by e-mail and the potential referee must 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. 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. 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.

While the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College solicits the external letters before the start of the internal deliberations of the department and College, the evaluations received are shared with the tenured members of the department and College 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 College, the Provost of the University, ATP, and TRAC.

The dossier must include *all* correspondence and 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 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, as well as a list of any co-authored publications with the candidate or projects in which they are/were co-PI. The list should also indicate which referees evaluated the candidate, declined to provide a letter or simply did not respond.
- 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.
- 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 or College should include an explanation for their choice.

- 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.
- For internal candidates, the list of referees solicited for the promotion to Associate Professor without tenure.

The College normally collects only one round of evaluations. There may, however, be unusual circumstances where, with special permission of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, the department 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 joining 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 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.
- For each person, a brief description of their credentials, including institutional affiliation and title, area of specialization, standing in the discipline and prior association with the candidate, if any.
- A sample of the letter(s) requesting the evaluation, including the date or dates the request was made.
- A copy of any comparison list included with the request for the evaluation.
- 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 their 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 should consist of, at least, five tenured scholars whose qualifications would merit an appointment to tenure at Barnard College and Columbia University. It should include leading figures in the nominee's area of specialization, even when the nominee is a junior scholar. In those cases, the referees should be 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 Barnard College's faculty.*

When the comparison list includes the leading figures in their 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 well-established positions. By including these names, we are not suggesting that the nominee is now comparable to them; rather, we are requesting your best estimate of the nominee’s 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 their scholarly standing, thereby delaying the completion of its review. Comparison scholars should only be individuals with credentials that would make them worthy of tenure at Barnard College and Columbia University.

Because the comparison scholars are chosen on the basis of their academic distinction, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College 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 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 must be modified to exclude the referee's name. The letter to referees who previously had given their opinion of the appointment of the candidate should be 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 should provide 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 should consist of the candidate’s most important work and should be representative of the breadth and quality of the candidate's scholarship. They may include forthcoming publications and manuscripts, conference papers, grant proposals as well as published work. If any of the papers or publications were written in collaboration with others, they should be annotated to indicate the principal author and should identify key contributions of the candidate. If important publications are in a language other than English, a brief synopsis of their contents in English should be included.

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

The nominating department includes, in electronic form, teaching evaluations for all internal candidates and recent teaching evaluations for external candidates. In addition, the nominating department may include in the candidate's dossier any additional information it wishes TRAC to consider (for example, course syllabi, 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, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will arrange for a witness to appear before it. To prepare for that possibility, the nominating department should indicate in the dossier whom it recommends as a witness, if necessary. The department chair usually serves as a witness but may delegate the responsibility to another tenured faculty member who is closer to the field of the candidate. 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, books, and manuscripts, should be submitted electronically to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. When submitting books as hard copies, please submit eight copies.

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 for Faculty Affairs. In general, scans of material are to be avoided; when necessary all scans of typeset material must be searchable. The elements of each section should be 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.

**APPENDIX
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 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. 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 	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 along with a cover sheet listing titles. • 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 without tenure, if appropriate 	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 • 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 LETTERS TO REFEREES FOR NOMINATIONS
FROM BARNARD COLLEGE

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address
City, State ZIP
e-mail address

Dear Professor _____:

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. We value scholarship of the highest quality, whether within a single discipline or across disciplines and recognize that your own area of focus may not entirely coincide with that of the candidate. Therefore, we encourage you to consider the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work in your evaluation, if appropriate, in addition to their disciplinary contributions and we understand that you may choose to address only those aspects of the dossier that pertain to your own research areas.

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 critical assessment (both strengths and weaknesses) of the originality, quality, and impact of Professor _____'s scholarship? Since the most useful letters are those that assess the work in detail, I am enclosing some of Professor _____'s publications as well as their CV and personal statement.
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 do the originality, quality, and impact of Professor _____'s work compare to that of leading scholars in their 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 their 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 their field?
6. If Professor _____ were under consideration for a tenured appointment at your institution, how likely is it that they would receive a tenured position and would you support their nomination?
7. Do you have any other comments relevant to our deliberations, including observations about Professor _____'s teaching and/or mentorship, leadership, or service?

We would appreciate if you could comment on how COVID-19 has affected scholarship in your area of expertise. We also ask you to bear in mind the potential impact of the pandemic on the pace of scholarly productivity by the candidate.

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
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
City, State ZIP
e-mail address

Dear Professor _____:

Associate Professor _____ in the Department of _____ is being considered for a tenured position at Barnard College, Columbia University. On [date] 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 they compare with other scholars currently in the field of _____, such as those on the enclosed list, and whether they are 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.

We would appreciate if you could comment on how COVID-19 has affected scholarship in your area of expertise. We also ask you to bear in mind the potential impact of the pandemic on the pace of scholarly productivity by the candidate.

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 their scholarly work. It would be most helpful if your letter could reach me by [date]. 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.

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,

Linda A. Bell
Provost and Dean of the Faculty
Phone: (212) 854-2708
e-mail: label@barnard.edu

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 their scholarly work.

It would be most helpful if your letter could reach me by [date]. 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,

Linda A. Bell
Provost and Dean of the Faculty
Phone: (212) 854-2708
e-mail: labell@barnard.edu

EXHIBIT D
Dossier Cover Sheet

[Date]

Mary C. Boyce, 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 Mary:

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,

Linda A. Bell
Provost and Dean of the Faculty
Phone: (212) 854-2708
e-mail: labell@barnard.edu

EXHIBIT E
Table on the Composition of the Faculty of the Nominating Department

Rank	Full-Time				Part-Time
	Tenured	Non-Tenured	Reviewed and Renewable	Term Appointments	
Professor					
Associate Professor					
Assistant Professor					
Instructor					
Special Instructional Faculty					
Professors of Professional Practice					
Total: Example: Associate Professor	10	4	0	0	14

Notes:

- 1) Special Instructional Faculty = Reviewed and Renewable faculty in the following ranks: Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Associate, Associate.
- 2) Professors of Professional Practice (POPP) = Reviewed and Renewable faculty in the following ranks: Assistant POPP, Associate POPP, Full POPP.
- 3) Off-Track ranks at Barnard College include Reviewed and Renewable faculty in the Lecturer, Associate, and Professor of Professional Practice ranks.
- 4) Part-Time includes only those who are compensated.

EXHIBIT F

Summary of Teaching Evaluations

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

Courses and 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 are independent or not independent as defined on page 19 of this document.*</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 are independent or not independent as defined on page 19 of this document.*</p>	

* Note: The referees may include scholars who are not independent but these may not count towards the minimum of 10 letters. If a referee who is not independent is included in the dossier, an explanation must be included identifying the connection to the nominee, the importance of including this referee and explaining any overlap, for example, listing joint publications or products.