

PRINCIPLES AND CUSTOMS GOVERNING UNIVERSITY-WIDE TENURE REVIEWS

Table of Contents:

1. Introduction	1
2. Part I: General Policies and Procedures	2
a. Criteria for an Appointment to Tenure	
b. Nomination to Tenure	
c. Evidence Considered by the Standing Committee	
d. Expedited Consideration	
e. Composition of TRAC	
f. Schedule for Submitting Nominations to TRAC	
g. The TRAC Review	
h. Confidentiality	
3. Part II: Guidelines for Preparing a Tenure Nomination	12
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	24
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/Division/School	
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 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/divisions 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/or school.

Nomination to tenure is the occasion for a department/division and/or 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.

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 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 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 field.

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to accommodate the differing disciplines of the candidates and the missions of their departments/divisions and/or 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/or school. TRAC will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department/division or 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/or 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, departments/divisions and/or 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 should be made by an open vote or by signed ballots.

If a department/division and/or 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 or school believes that a new evaluation is justified or whether another department/division or 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/or 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 or 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 to forward a nomination to the Provost for University-wide review should be made by the dean or executive vice president of the department/division or school in which the candidate will be appointed.

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/division or school 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 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 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 complete dossier, which includes the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, a report from an executive vice president/dean and a school-level review, a case statement which is prepared by the nominating department/division or school, the candidate's statement on their research, teaching and service, referee evaluations (see **Exhibit A-C** for template letters) and other supporting documents, such as teaching evaluations and examples of 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 sources within and outside the University.

EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

In exceptional cases of external recruits of extraordinary scholarship who have already achieved the highest level of recognition in their fields, such as memberships in National Academies, or who are being recruited to high-level academic administrative positions, such as Directorships of major institutes, some reduction in the scope of nominating materials may be warranted. The dean or executive vice president 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 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 departments and 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 who are otherwise 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 review of a Barnard candidate requires a panel that includes two Barnard faculty members. One member of TRAC is, therefore, chosen from Barnard to serve on the standing committee. A second faculty member from Barnard supplements TRAC when Barnard candidates are evaluated, as described in the tenure guidelines governing the evaluation of nominations from Barnard.

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/divisions and schools are expected to adhere to the following deadlines:

April 1: The deans and executive vice presidents are expected to submit a list of junior faculty they intend 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 dean or executive vice president provides an initial assessment of the likelihood of the nomination and a brief description of their area of specialization. In addition, the deans and executive vice presidents inform the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs of all external searches that may result in further nominations to tenure.

May 15: The deans and executive vice presidents send the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 list of top ten institutions in the field, the referee list, the comparison list, and the date on which the letters requesting the evaluations were mailed. The dean or executive vice president of a school or department/division that misses the deadline for asking for the referee evaluations for internal candidates should write to the Provost explaining the reasons for the delay and explain how the school or department/division will ensure that subsequent deadlines for submitting the nominations and supporting documentation will be met for those candidates.

If there are candidates who are nominated after the May 15th deadline, the dean or executive vice president should send the referee and comparison lists and the date on which the request for the referee evaluations was made to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs as soon as these candidates are identified.

December 15: All materials for the 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 will permit exceptions to this deadline when the size of the case load of a department/division or a school does not allow it to complete all of its reviews by this date. In those cases, the dean or executive vice president must submit a separate schedule for the submission of the nominations to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If a department/division and/or 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.

February 1: The deans and executive vice presidents are 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 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.

If a review by TRAC 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.

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, care is taken to ensure that it 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 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/division and/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. 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 meeting 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 a nomination requires more than one hearing, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 evaluation and additional written statements from the nominating department/division and/or school.

TRAC does not hear from witnesses at the first hearing for a nomination. If a second hearing is necessary, the appropriate department/division chair or dean 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/division or school, it is the chair or dean of the primary department/division or school that 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/division 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 their proposed role in the department/ division and/or 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 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 the 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 have been recused 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 postdoctoral 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;
- Mentoring of doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers, 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 typically attends all TRAC meetings and actively participates in the discussion about a nomination. The 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 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/division or school or take the form of additional written or verbal evaluations from experts at other institutions. This additional information is not normally shared with the chair, dean or executive vice president of the nominating department/division or 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 their 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 as well as the chair of the department/division. A candidate who is denied tenure will be invited to meet with the Provost to discuss the decision. In those unusual cases where the Provost, President, or the Trustees do not accept TRAC's formal recommendation, the Provost informs TRAC of the reasons.

Second Review

A second review may be conducted for a candidate after a negative decision 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 they determine that:(a) the first was marked by procedural irregularities of a magnitude that materially affected its outcome; or (b) in the rare instance where the Provost is satisfied that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision.

(a) Procedural Irregularities: In rare cases when the Provost has determined that there were procedural irregularities that affected the outcome of the first review, they may authorize or require the department/division and school to conduct a second full review. In such cases, it is incumbent on the department/division and/or school to conduct the second review free of the noted procedural irregularities.

In support of a second nomination, the department/division and/or school prepares a new dossier that includes an explanation of the procedural irregularities in the first review. They must also include the entire first dossier used for the initial review. These materials are submitted to the dean or executive vice president for their review. If the dean or executive vice president endorses the new nomination, the new dossier should be submitted to the Office of the Provost for review following standard procedures.

(b) Substantial New Work: When the Provost has determined that substantial scholarly growth reflected in new work since the initial review has occurred, they may authorize the department/division and/or school to conduct a second review based entirely on the new work. For this to occur, the department/division and/or school must submit a formal request. Requests for such a second review require affirmative vote by the tenured faculty of the department/division and/or school and the endorsement of the dean and/or executive vice president before they are forwarded to the Provost.

In cases where the Provost agrees that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision, the chair or dean 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 department/division or school 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 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 department/division or 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 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/division and/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/division or school 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. 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 executive vice president for their review. If the dean or executive 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 must focus 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 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 for Faculty Affairs sends the candidate a copy of this policy statement and invites the individual to contact them 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 deans or department/division 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 department/division or school making the nomination to ensure 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 should submit the nominations and supporting materials for the departments in the Arts and Sciences. The Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences should also transmit 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 must 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 they have chosen to accept the recommendation from the department/division or 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:

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. Also, include 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, 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. 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/Division and School and Its Objectives

This portion of the case statement describes briefly the current state and objectives of the department/division or school and how the proposed appointment relates to them. In the case of a joint or interdisciplinary appointment, the relevant departments/divisions, schools, institutes, and/or centers may submit separate statements or a joint statement. In either case, though, each of the academic units where the nominee will hold an appointment should provide 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 school(s) or department(s)/divisions (and institutes and/or centers) in which the candidate will serve.
- The current size, field distribution, and strengths and weaknesses of the faculty in the school(s) or department(s)/division(s). If appropriate, include similar information on related units of the University.
- This description should be accompanied by a list of the faculty in the appropriate department/division and/or 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/or school must complete the statistical table attached to this document as **Exhibit E**. For candidates serving in a division, two versions of the table must be included, one for the division and the other for the school as a whole.

- 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)/division(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 or school must describe the search, include the names of others considered and explains the reasons for selecting the nominee. The department/division or school must also 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 must authorize a department/division or 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 or school must explain how it evaluated the qualifications of the nominee in comparison to other scholars in the field.

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/divisions and/or schools to the process of selecting the candidate.

Some departments/divisions 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 must 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 and the school levels. The case statement must document the process used and must include a report from the department/division and school-level committees on their 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 must also include a full description of the earlier evaluation, including the vote or votes taken. This description must be 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 or 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/or 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/division and school 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/division and/or school 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 must be conducted by an open vote or by signed ballots.

Whenever a member of a nominating department/division and/or school opposes a nomination, abstains, or chooses not to vote, the case statement must include an explanation of the reasons for their vote. The 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/division and/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 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 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 Barnard to prepare written assessments of the candidate if such a statement is not included in the dossier.

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/Division and School and Its Objectives." Since the expectations for tenure may vary among the departments/divisions 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/division or school must 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 University, the process and considerations that led to the switch must 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 about what constitutes outstanding scholarship. To assist TRAC with that task, the department/division or school should include a description of how it determines and discerns excellence and distinction in the relevant discipline or field. The department/division or school 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 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. It should assume that all of the referee letters will be read and should not reproduce large excerpts from the letters into the case statement.

In support of its assessment of the candidate, the department/division or school 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 frequency of citations to the candidate measures against the expected norms of the field.

Teaching Qualifications

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

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/division or 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 or 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 or 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.

Service

This section of the assessment should discuss the nominee's contributions beyond teaching and scholarship to both the University and their discipline. 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 must prepare a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages on their 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 can also use the statement to discuss their 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

Written evaluations of the proposed appointment by recognized authorities form a critical source of information for TRAC. Evaluations of candidates must be solicited by the nominating executive vice president or dean using the "referee letter templates" (**Exhibits A-C**). Deans and executive vice presidents may not modify the standard letters without first obtaining permission from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. 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 CUIMC by the Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences and in the other schools by their respective deans. These letters must be collected early enough in the internal deliberations of the department/division or school to allow its tenured faculty to review them before voting on the nomination.

The lists of referees and comparison scholars should be compiled by the individual responsible for collecting the evaluations taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department/division or school. The candidate should not be consulted in constructing these lists. 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. The consultants themselves should not become referees.

In tenure cases in which referee letters have been 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 dean or executive vice president should collect *at least* 10 letters from independent referees as defined below.

Referees who are *not independent* include:

- dissertation advisor
- postdoctoral mentor
- personal friend or family member
- principal or co-investigator on a grant with the nominee
- coauthored work with the nominee
- current or former colleagues, including colleagues who visited candidate's department for sabbaticals or similar extended visits and collaborated with the candidate
- 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 referee who is not independent is included in the dossier, an explanation must be included in the case statement and the 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 school 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 dean or executive vice president 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 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 include scholars from abroad as well as from other institutions within the United States, but may not be members of the faculty of Columbia or Barnard and cannot include nontenured faculty at other universities. If the members of TRAC feel that an adequate representation of the best scholars in a candidate's field has not been written, TRAC may ask for additional external evaluations, which can delay the review process.

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/division chair. However, all preliminary 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. Individuals who fail to respond or decline to write in response to such an inquiry should be included on the annotated list of referees described below. Follow-up emails should be sent after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request.

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

Departments/divisions or 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, department/divisions or schools may ask for a few preliminary letters of evaluation. For example, a department/division and/or a 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 must be 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/division and/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 Columbia. 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 Columbia's faculty.*

When the comparison list includes the leading figures in their area of expertise for junior nominees, the following paragraph should be included as a footnote 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 candidate is now comparable to them; rather, we are requesting your best estimate of their 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 Columbia.

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 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/division or school should provide electronic copies of a small, select 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 works and should be representative of the breadth and quality of their 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 in English of their contents must be included.

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

The nominating department/division or school should include, in electronic form, teaching evaluations for all internal candidates and recent teaching evaluations for external candidates. In addition, the nominating department/division or school 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 a witness 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 department/division or school should indicate in the dossier who it recommends as a witness if it becomes necessary. The dean or department/division 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/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, 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 the materials 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 pdf bookmarks should be added 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 label it "4. (Candidate last name) REPORTS.pdf." This should be done 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 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 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

<p>9. Preliminary Evaluations</p> <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 	
<p>10. Recommendation for Witnesses</p>	<p>Lastname_F_witness.pdf</p>
<p>11. All materials collected for any previous review for tenure</p>	<p>Lastname_F_previous- review.pdf</p>

EXHIBIT A
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES FOR EXTERNAL CANDIDATES

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address
City, State ZIP
e-mail address

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.]

We received your name as an authority in [Professor/Dr.]_____'s field and would be grateful for your participation in the tenure review. Your judgment will be invaluable in our deliberations.

Like every nomination to tenure at Columbia, that-of [Professor/Dr.]_____is subject to a rigorous review, first by the faculty of the department/division 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 and recognize that your own area of focus may not entirely coincide with that of the candidate. Therefore, if appropriate, we encourage you to consider the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work in your evaluation, in addition to their disciplinary contributions. We understand that you may choose to address only those aspects of the dossier that pertain to your own research areas.

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 in the candidate's field of research and non-experts.

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 their 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 their 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 their 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? Are they likely to become one of the leading figures in their field.

6. If [Professor/Dr.]_____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 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 and/or to the standing committee.

I realize that this request imposes significantly upon your time, and would be extremely grateful for your contribution. 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/Executive Vice President__

Enclosures: *Curriculum vitae*
Personal statement
Comparison list
Publications

EXHIBIT B
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES FOR INTERNAL CANDIDATES

CONFIDENTIAL

Date

Name

Address

City, State ZIP

e-mail address

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.]

We received your name as an authority in [Professor/Dr.]_____ 's field and would be grateful for your participation in the tenure review. Your judgment will be invaluable in our deliberations.

Like every nomination to tenure at Columbia, that of [Professor/Dr.]_____ is subject to a rigorous review, first by the faculty of the department/division 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 and recognize that your own area of focus may not entirely coincide with that of the candidate. Therefore, if appropriate, we encourage you to consider the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work in your evaluation, if appropriate, in addition to their disciplinary contributions. We understand that you may choose to address only those aspects of the dossier that pertain to your own research areas.

As a standard matter, all referees should be aware that any candidate's career trajectory may include periods during which the candidate has been off the clock in terms of expected research progress towards tenure. This kind of information is not shared with referees, but is taken into account in the university's internal deliberations.

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 in the candidate's field of research and non-experts.

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 their 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 their 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 their 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? Are they likely to become one of the leading figures in their field?

6. If [Professor/Dr.]_____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 that would be relevant to our deliberations, including observations about [Professor/Dr.]_____’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 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/Executive Vice President: _____

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

City, State Zip Code

e-mail 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 Division/the School] [were/was] 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 Division/the School] [have/has] 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 they compare with other scholars currently in the field of X, 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.

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/Division Chair/Executive Committee of the Department/Division/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]

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: [Title and department]

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

Sincerely,

[Dean/Executive Vice President]

EXHIBIT E

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

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Nontenured	Off-track	Total
Professor					
Associate Professor					
Assistant Professor					
Instructor					
Special Instructional Faculty					
Example: Associate Professor	10	4	0	0	14

Notes:

- 1) Special Instructional Faculty = Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Associate, Assistant
- 2) Off-Track includes the following titles: “at CUMC”, “of Professional Practice”, and “in Discipline”
- 3) 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]

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

* 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.