

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

Columbia University  
August 2011

## **INTRODUCTION**

Columbia employs a standing committee system to conduct a final University-wide evaluation whenever a school or department, including Barnard College but excepting the Faculty of Law and Teachers College, recommends a candidate for tenure. This evaluation is the culmination of a process of review involving multiple considerations of the nomination within the department and school. Its purpose is to test whether the earlier reviews were rigorous and substantive and to ensure that all candidates for tenure meet the same high standards, regardless of the school or department originating the nomination. In this manner, it seeks to promote the appointment of faculty of exceptional quality and distinction throughout the University.

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

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

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

## **PART I: GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Part I of this document begins with a discussion of the criteria by which nominations to tenure from Barnard College are evaluated. These are the same as the criteria used for the rest of the University, with the exceptions that the need for the appointment is subject to a consultative process involving the nominating department at Barnard and its counterpart in the University and that TRAC does not consider academic need in its deliberations on Barnard candidates. Therefore, Part I continues by separately describing the consultative arrangements mandated by the Amended Agreement. It then discusses the requirements for a nomination to tenure, provides an overview of the evidence considered by TRAC and describes the policies, procedures, and schedule governing the University-wide review by TRAC. It concludes with a discussion of the confidentiality expected of all those who take part in the tenure review process.

### **CRITERIA FOR AN APPOINTMENT TO TENURE**

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

In every instance, a candidate for tenure must be an outstanding scholar, a person who has demonstrated the capacity for imaginative and original work and who shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to research. Excellence as a teacher is also necessary, but by itself is not a sufficient basis for tenure. The essential requirement for the appointment of any nominee is scholarly achievement testifying to an unusually original and creative mind.

Regardless of academic age, every candidate should have produced work of truly outstanding quality. The quantity of publications is of lesser concern. A candidate need not be one who has published much, provided his or her scholarly work meets the University's high standards of excellence. Tenure, moreover, is not simply a reward for past accomplishments. It is also a vote of confidence that the candidate will continue to be an important and productive scholar. Thus, a candidate must continue to have an active scholarly agenda that shows strong promise of yielding answers to fundamental questions in his or her discipline.

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

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

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to take into account the differing disciplines of the candidates. Nonetheless, all candidates must be or have the potential of becoming leading figures in a field that is intellectually vital and important to Barnard College and the University. The burden of demonstrating that a candidate meets those criteria rests with the nominating department. TRAC will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department has made a compelling affirmative case for the nomination.

## **BARNARD-UNIVERSITY CONSULTATIONS PRECEDING THE TRAC REVIEW**

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

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

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

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

## **NOMINATION TO TENURE**

Every nomination from Barnard requires a positive vote by the tenured faculty in the department, as determined by Barnard's Code of Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Joint appointments require positive votes from all of the nominating departments. When it is anticipated that the candidate may be given a joint appointment after receiving tenure but the second department is not co-sponsoring the nomination, it does not need to vote, but it is expected to provide TRAC with an explanation of its interest in the nominee and an assessment of his or her qualifications.

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

When a department has voted not to nominate, a new review may only be initiated with the prior permission of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard and the Provost of the University. This is true regardless of whether the same department believes that a new evaluation is justified or another wishes to consider the candidate for a possible nomination to tenure.

## EVIDENCE CONSIDERED BY TRAC

Every nomination to tenure should be accompanied by the same types of supporting materials. The department originating the nomination may take the lead in preparing these materials, but the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard reviews them for completeness and accuracy and sees that they are submitted in a timely fashion after a positive recommendation by Barnard's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion and the approval of the Barnard President.

The University's Office of the Provost does not put a nomination on the TRAC agenda until it has received a complete set of the materials described in these Guidelines. It is, therefore, in the interest of the nominating department to submit the candidate's dossier for review by Barnard's Advisory Committee on Appointment, Tenure and Promotion according to the schedule established by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of the College. The original dossier may be augmented with new materials at any point prior to the actual review.

In judging a Barnard nomination, TRAC relies primarily on supporting documents compiled by the nominating department and on letters of evaluation solicited from recognized scholars in the nominee's discipline. TRAC may also ask witnesses to appear before it to provide additional information about the candidate's qualifications. Each of these is briefly described below. Part II of this document contains more detailed guidelines for the preparation of the candidate's dossier.

**Supporting Statements:** Three written statements form the core of the candidate's dossier:

- 1) **The Report on the Selection Process** describes how the nominee was chosen and reports on the formal vote by which the nomination was made. It also includes the vote of the counterpart department at Columbia. TRAC may request a written statement from dissenting members of the department that explains their negative vote.

As part of the search for an external candidate, a department may, with the special prior permission of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard, collect a few preliminary written evaluations before deciding whether to engage in negotiations with a candidate. Copies of any such evaluations are included with this report.

When a department has voted to nominate a candidate after a previous review resulting in a negative decision, this statement also describes the earlier evaluation, the reasons why the original decision was negative and why the nominating department believes those reasons are no longer valid.

- 2) **The Statement on the Nominee's Qualifications** evaluates the nominee on the basis of scholarly achievements and potential for future growth, teaching ability, and record of service to the College, University, and profession. It also compares the candidate with the leading scholars in the field.
- 3) In **the Candidate's Statement**, the nominee discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects as well as relevant activities in service to the College, University, and profession. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard may waive this requirement in the case of external recruits to tenure.

These statements are accompanied by the following supporting materials:

- A current, dated *curriculum vitae* supplemented, if necessary, with sufficient information to provide a complete record of the nominee's academic and professional training, achievements, and previous employment.
- A representative sample of the nominee's most important written work, published and unpublished.
- Evidence of the nominee's contributions to the educational programming of the department such as course syllabi.
- Evidence of the nominee's abilities as a teacher, such as course evaluations either here at Barnard/Columbia or from the candidate's previous institution, results of classroom observations, information on the candidate's former students and teaching awards.
- A vote by the counterpart department in Columbia's Arts and Sciences and a written statement of its assessment of the candidate's qualifications.
- Any additional information the nominating department wishes TRAC to consider, such as reviews of publications.

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

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

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard determines how many scholars should be contacted for evaluations as well as their identities. Typically, a dossier will contain 12-15 referee letters. The number of evaluations matters less than the scholars who provided them. Referees should consist primarily of the leading individuals in the nominee's field of specialization, but may also be established scholars or professionals in related fields who can provide informed evaluations of the nominee's work. They may include scholars from abroad as well as from other institutions in the United States but may not be members of the faculty of Barnard or Columbia.

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

The comparison list for well-established scholars includes the leading figures in his or her area of expertise. For younger nominees, it includes some scholars who are significantly senior in their careers. In those cases, the referees are asked to give their assessment of whether the nominee has the potential of reaching the level of achievement of the more senior comparison scholars. A comparison list generally contains four to six names and should not exceed eight.

Since the comparison scholars are chosen on the basis of their academic distinction, they too may be asked for evaluations of the nominee. While they should not be excluded from the list of referees simply because they are peers of the nominee, there may be other reasons why they should not be asked for evaluations. For example, a comparison scholar may hold a non-tenured appointment at another university or have applied for the position for which the candidate is being considered.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard collects the referee evaluations before the department decides whether to nominate the candidate for tenure. Typically the letters are solicited at the start of the unit's internal deliberations but may be obtained at another point in the process. Regardless of when the letters are collected, they are shared with the department, before it votes on the nomination.

To assist the referees, they are provided with the nominee's *curriculum vitae* and, at the discretion of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard, samples of the nominee's written work. As a matter of courtesy, potential referees are normally contacted prior to being sent a request for an evaluation to determine if they are willing to undertake the work involved. Potential referees should be contacted in writing rather than by phone, and a list of those who declined to write should be included in the candidate's dossier along with their responses explaining why.

**Witnesses:** TRAC normally does not hear from witnesses as part of its deliberations. When, however, it finds that it cannot reach a decision at a single meeting, the Provost arranges for individuals who can present information on the candidate's qualifications to appear at the committee's second hearing of the nomination.

## **THE COMPOSITION OF TRAC**

The Tenure Review Advisory Committee consists of 13 members chosen by the Provost from among the tenured faculty of Columbia's schools, including Barnard College. Faculty with tenure of title who have passed a University-wide review may also be asked to serve. The Provost informs the University community of the membership of TRAC at the beginning of the fall term.

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

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 or cease to be actively employed by the University. The Provost designates one of the committee's members, typically in his or her third year on the committee, to serve as its chair.

The Provost of the University, or his designee, attends the meetings of TRAC, as does the Vice Provost for Academic Administration. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard is present at its meetings as an observer whenever a nomination from the College is being discussed.

## **SCHEDULE FOR SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS TO TRAC**

Planning for the reviews of nominations begins in the spring prior to the year in which they will occur when the Provost of the University asks the deans and executive vice presidents for preliminary information on their potential nominees. By April 15th, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard submits a list of every junior faculty member the College intends to evaluate in the following year, no matter how remote the likelihood of a nomination. In addition, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard informs the Provost of the University of every external candidate the College's departments have already identified and all senior searches they expect to conduct that may result in further nominations to tenure. The list should also include the areas of specialization in which they plan to conduct an external search for a tenure appointment. For each candidate and each search on the list, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard provides an initial assessment of the likelihood of the nomination to assist the Vice Provost for Academic Administration in scheduling decisions.

By May 15<sup>th</sup> of the preceding spring, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard sends the Vice Provost for Academic Administration confirmation that the College has sent out the request for the external letters for its known candidates. For each candidate, the confirmation includes the referee and comparison lists, and the date on which the letters were mailed.

In the case of some nominations, the candidate will not be known by that date. External searches may not be completed by then or it may subsequently become necessary to organize a tenure review for a junior faculty member who is being recruited by another university. As additional candidates are identified, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard informs the Vice Provost for Academic Administration of them. For each such individual, the College includes the referee and comparison lists and the date on which the request for the referee evaluations was sent.

All parts of the University, including Barnard College, are expected to complete their internal evaluation of junior faculty, with the exception of those being recruited by other universities, by December 15th. The Provost of the University will also permit exceptions to that deadline when the size of a school's case load and its schedule for its internal evaluation of its junior faculty do not allow it to complete all of its reviews before the winter break. If these circumstances exist at Barnard, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will negotiate in advance of the start of the academic year a separate schedule for the submission of the nominations and dossiers for the College's internal candidates.

The departments should make every effort to identify external candidates as early as possible in the academic year. The University, along with most other major universities, endorses the AAUP policy guideline that sets May 15<sup>th</sup> as the last date that an offer can be made to a faculty member at another institution for appointment the following fall. The offer cannot be contingent upon a favorable outcome of a tenure review. To meet the AAUP deadline and ensure the completion of the TRAC evaluation before the end of the academic year, the Provost of the University has set March 31<sup>st</sup> as the date by which nominations and dossiers for external candidates need to be received in his office. Recognizing that negotiations with faculty at other universities can be protracted and delicate, TRAC will attempt to conduct evaluations of external candidates nominated after that date. However, if the review cannot be held by May 15<sup>th</sup>, the nominating dean will have to obtain a waiver of the AAUP's deadline from the candidate's institution before it can occur.

If a Barnard department misses the May 15<sup>th</sup> deadline for asking for the referee evaluations for any internal candidates, the Provost and Dean of Faculty of the College is expected to write to the Provost of the University explaining the reasons for the delay and how the College will insure that the December 15<sup>th</sup> deadline for submitting the nomination and supporting documentation for any such individual will be met. If the College misses the December 15<sup>th</sup> date without the prior permission of the Provost, TRAC may defer its consideration of a nominee until it has finished the reviews of all other junior faculty who were nominated on time, even if that means postponing its evaluation until the following academic year. The Provost will not accept nominations for promotion from the junior faculty after February 28<sup>th</sup>, except when there is a need to match a late and unexpected offer of tenure from another university. While there is no final deadline for asking for the review of external candidates, there is also no assurance that TRAC will finish its evaluation before the end of the academic year if the Provost receives the nomination and dossier after March 31<sup>st</sup>.

## **THE TRAC REVIEW**

TRAC meets at regular intervals from September through May. Additional meetings may be held in June but not in July or August. 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 complete the evaluation of the nominations received.

At its September meetings, TRAC discusses with the Provost the membership of the review panels that will lead the evaluations of the potential nominations by the deans and executive vice presidents. Following that discussion, the Provost, in consultation with the faculty chair of TRAC, assigns five of its members to the review panel for each candidate and designates one of them as the lead reviewer. Throughout the year, further review panels are established in this manner as the deans and executive vice presidents inform the Provost of additional nominations. The Provost may change the membership of the review panels at any time after consulting with the faculty chair. Membership on the review panels is confidential.

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

Since the purpose of the standing committee system is to provide a second, independent review of every nomination, members of TRAC are not assigned to a review panel if they have collaborated with the candidate, served on a search committee which selected the nominee for the tenure appointment or voted on the nomination at the level of the department. Members of TRAC from the Arts and Sciences are also not assigned to review panels for candidates from their cognate departments at Barnard College.

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

Every nomination is considered at least once at a regularly scheduled meeting of TRAC. At the conclusion of the discussion, the committee decides whether to call for a vote or to hold the nomination over to a future meeting for further discussion.

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. The review panel may acquire additional information by letter, e-mail, telephone or personal interview from sources both within and outside the University. While all of its members may make such inquiries, they are expected to coordinate their efforts with the lead reviewer and act with the greatest discretion to ensure the confidentiality of the tenure review.

Normally, TRAC does not hear from witnesses at the first hearing for a nomination. Whenever there is a second hearing, the appropriate department chair is invited to provide TRAC with testimony on the quality of the nominee's work. If the candidate will have appointments in more than one department, the chairs of all relevant units are asked to appear. Chairs may delegate the responsibility of serving as witnesses to other tenured faculty who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications. At the discretion of TRAC, additional witnesses may be asked to testify to the quality of the candidate's scholarship and teaching. These may include faculty from the nominating unit, from other parts of the University or from other institutions.

While the members of the review panel are primarily responsible for the evaluation of the nomination to which they have been assigned, other members of TRAC may participate in the discussions about the candidate's qualifications. However, only the members of the review panel vote on the nomination.

The Provost of the University, or a representative, attends all TRAC meetings and may actively participate in the discussion about a nomination. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard or his or her representative is present at the evaluations of all candidates from the College to provide context and background if necessary.

TRAC serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost of the University who is not bound by its recommendation. In particular, a split vote in favor of a candidate is not a strong endorsement. In addition to the final vote, the Provost of the University weighs the evidence presented to TRAC and the discussion of its members at their meeting before deciding whether to accept its recommendation. Before making a decision on a nomination, the Provost of the University may also obtain additional information after TRAC has completed its evaluation. That information could, for example, include written assessments of the nominee from the members of TRAC or from the nominating department. It could also take the form of additional written or verbal evaluations from experts at other institutions. This additional information is normally not shared with the chair of the nominating department or the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard.

Following the completion of his or her review, the Provost of the University submits his or her recommendation to the President of the University. If the Provost's decision is negative, he or she will first inform the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard. 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 President of Barnard will have the opportunity to comment upon or to withdraw the College's nomination before the Provost of the University sends a negative recommendation to the President of the University.

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

A second review may be conducted for a candidate after a negative decision if the Provost of the University determines that the first was marked by procedural irregularities of a magnitude that materially affected its outcome. In the absence of procedural irregularities, a candidate is reconsidered only in rare instances when the Provost of the University is satisfied that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision. A request from a department for a second review of a candidate requires the endorsement of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard who will forward it to the Provost of the University. A department must have the approval of both Provosts before it solicits any further letters of evaluation, votes on the candidate or begins to prepare for a new nomination in any other way. In support of such requests, the nominating department submits a statement that explains why it believes the new work meets the standard for a second review. That statement should deal only with the new materials and not with the work considered during the first review. The Provost of the University may seek the advice of selected scholars in the candidate's field before reaching a decision on whether to reopen consideration of the nomination.

If the Provost accepts the request from the nominating department for a new hearing, the review committee established by TRAC does not reassess the quality of the materials submitted in support of the original nomination. Instead, the new evaluation focuses on the scholarship completed after the first review and on whether it is of sufficient quality to overcome the reservations that led to the initial negative decision on the candidate's nomination.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY**

While the membership of TRAC is public information, all aspects of its proceedings are conducted with strict confidentiality. The membership of the review panel and 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, the President of Barnard, 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.

While candidates are not given confidential information about their reviews, the Vice Provost for Academic Administration does inform them of the process. Following the receipt of a nomination, the Vice Provost sends the candidate a copy of this policy statement and invites the individual to call with any questions about how the evaluation will be conducted. The candidate may also ask to meet with the Vice Provost. Further information should be obtained from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard 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 should be 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 to see that the dossier is complete, accurate and submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration on schedule after it is prepared by the department.

Each dossier should consist of the documents the described below.

### ***CURRICULUM VITAE***

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

- A. Field of specialization
- B. Academic training
  - 1. Colleges and universities attended;
  - 2. Degrees and the years awarded;
  - 3. Dissertation title, and name of sponsor; and
  - 4. Honors and fellowships received, society memberships.

- C. Teaching experience
    - 1. Courses taught; and
    - 2. Experience as sponsor, first or second reader, and examiner of undergraduate majors and master's and doctoral candidates. (When possible, include the number of students in each category and titles of theses and dissertations.)
  - D. All academic and non-academic positions held since the baccalaureate degree was conferred.
  - E. Publications (in bibliographic form)
    - 1. All published work; and
    - 2. All unpublished work completed or in progress, together with information on the status of manuscripts under review and the expected publishers and publication dates (when known).
- Note:* if any of the published or unpublished work was co-authored, the *curriculum vitae* should indicate whether the nominee was the first author.
- F. All grants and contracts awarded, current and past, and all grant applications still under review with the following information for each:
    - 1. Full name of the granting agency (abbreviations should be explained);
    - 2. Period of the award;
    - 3. Amount of the award; and
    - 4. If the grant was awarded to more than one individual, the names of the co-investigator(s) and indication of who was the principal investigator.

## **REPORT ON THE SELECTION PROCESS**

This statement should discuss the efforts made to locate the best possible candidate for the position. For nominees from other institutions, it describes the search and explains the reasons for selecting the nominee. In the case of a nomination for promotion from the junior faculty, the department explains how it evaluated the qualifications of the candidate in comparison to other scholars in the field and decided that he or she should be proposed for tenure.

This statement also reports on the vote of the tenured members of the department making the nomination.

1. It indicates the number of faculty with the right to vote on the nomination, states the date and method of voting, and gives the results. If the information is known, it also states the reasons why absent members did not participate in the review.
2. If any faculty voted against the nomination or abstained, the report explains the reasons why. In addition, TRAC may ask for written statements from the dissenting members explaining the reasons for their vote.

Some departments establish internal committees to conduct a preliminary evaluation before their full tenured faculty decides on whether to nominate potential candidates. In those cases, they append to this statement any written evaluations prepared by such a committee.

If the candidate will have a joint appointment, this statement also includes a description of the process by which the second department conducted its review.

The dossier should include a statement obtained from the counterpart department at Columbia providing both its vote on the nomination and an assessment of the candidate. If any of the faculty in the counterpart department voted against the nomination, care should be taken to ensure that the statement includes an explanation of their reasons.

If the department is nominating a candidate it previously decided not to propose for tenure, it includes a full description of the earlier evaluation, accompanied by all of the materials it collected as part of that process. In such cases, this part of the statement describes:

1. the procedures used in the first review; and
2. the vote or votes taken during the first review on the proposed nomination and the number eligible to vote who did not participate.

Any letters of evaluation obtained as part of the earlier evaluation accompany the description of the review.

Similar information is required if the candidate was previously considered by a different department.

## STATEMENT ON THE NOMINEE'S QUALIFICATIONS

The nominating department uses this statement to discuss the qualifications, accomplishments, and future promise of the nominee in the areas of teaching, scholarship, research, and service to the College, University, and his or her discipline.

### A. Research and scholarship

This section of the statement evaluates the principal publications, research, and other scholarly accomplishments of the candidate. It assesses his or her qualifications in comparison with other leading scholars in the field. Finally, it discusses the candidate's potential for future scholarly development.

If the candidate was previously evaluated for tenure and turned down at the level of the department or College, it discusses, in particular, why the scholarship completed since the first review was deemed to be sufficiently better in quality than the earlier work to merit a reversal of the original negative decision.

### B. Teaching qualifications

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

Evidence of the nominee's educational contributions, such as course syllabi, may be included in support of this section of the statement. When possible, the discussion of teaching effectiveness should be accompanied by documentation, such as the results of surveys of student opinion and letters from current and former students. If the nominating department uses student evaluations for that purpose, it should include a statistical summary of the results rather than the individual student forms.

### C. Service

This section of the statement discusses the nominee's contribution beyond teaching and scholarship to the College, University, and his or her discipline. It also describes any future service expected of the nominee.

## **STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE**

The nominee should prepare a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages on his or her current and future plans with regard to research 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. This statement is required of all junior faculty being considered for promotion to tenure. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard may waive the requirement for external candidates recruited by Barnard departments.

## **REFEREE LETTERS**

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

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

Normally, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard collects no more than 12-15 letters. These include letters from the most prominent individuals in the candidate's field. In the event that TRAC feels that the College has not obtained the views of the key people in the field, it may ask the Provost of the University for additional letters which will delay the completion of its review. No referee should be a member of the Barnard or Columbia faculty.

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

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

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

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

As a matter of courtesy, potential referees are asked if they will review the candidate's work before they receive the formal request for evaluation. All preliminary inquiries should be made by e-mail and should ask the potential referee to respond in writing so that there will be a written record of who has declined to evaluate the candidate and their reasons (see Exhibit C).

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

The dossier will include copies of all the responses received by the Barnard Provost, including actual reviews of the candidate and letters or e-mails from potential referees who declined to write. To the extent possible, information about attempts to communicate with referees who did not respond at all should also be included.

Along with this correspondence, the following documentation should be included in the candidate's dossier about the referees and comparison scholars:

- A. A complete list of the potential referees who were approached for evaluations of the candidate, accompanied by a brief description of the credentials of each, including complete title, area of specialization and standing in the discipline. The list should also indicate which referees declined to respond to either a preliminary inquiry about their willingness to write or the actual letter requesting an evaluation.
- B. The list of scholars with whom referees were asked to compare the candidate, accompanied with a brief description of the credentials of each, including complete title, tenure status, area of specialization and standing in the discipline.

These lists should be accompanied by samples of all correspondence with referees, including the preliminary e-mail asking whether the referees are willing to provide an evaluation of the candidate; the letter(s) formally requesting the evaluations, including the date or dates of the request and the comparison list enclosed; and any follow-up letter or e-mail sent to referees, indicating the date the request was made, and a list of the people who received it.

The College normally collects only one round of evaluations as part of its internal assessment of a potential candidate. There may, however, be unusual circumstances under which the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard may ask for a few preliminary letters before embarking upon the process described above to obtain the referee letters. For example, a department may need a small number of evaluations to help it determine if it wants to open negotiations with a potential external candidate about moving to the College. Copies of all such letters are included in the dossier, along with the following information:

1. A complete list of the persons from whom these assessments were solicited and their affiliations. Individuals who did not respond should be included with an indication that they did not write and, if the information is available, an explanation of the reasons why.
2. A brief description of the evaluator's credentials, including complete title, area of specialization and standing in the discipline.

These lists are accompanied by samples of all correspondence with referees, including any preliminary e-mail asking whether the referees are willing to provide an evaluation of the candidate; the letter(s) formally requesting the evaluations, including the date or dates of the request and the comparison list enclosed; and any follow-up letter or e-mail sent to referees, indicating the date the request was made, and a list of the people who received it.

## **PUBLICATIONS**

The dossier should include six copies of a select sample of the nominee's published and other written work that is representative of the candidate's scholarship. It may include forthcoming publications and manuscripts, conference papers and grant proposals that have a bearing on the nomination. If any of the papers or publications were written in collaboration with others, those works should be annotated to indicate who was the principal author. If important publications are in a language other than English, a brief synopsis in English of their content should be included.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION**

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

## **WITNESSES TO APPEAR BEFORE TRAC**

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

## **SUBMISSION OF THE DOSSIER**

The different parts of the dossier described above should be submitted electronically on a CD-ROM or a flash drive to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration with the exception of published books which should be submitted in hard copy along with the electronic version of the dossier. (Articles and manuscripts should be included on the electronic medium used.)

The electronic materials should be included in acrobat “.pdf” format with no protection or security restrictions. In preparing the electronic version of the dossier, the nominating unit should follow the checklist below for the contents and name of each file and for the order in which they should be included.

The maximum size for a .pdf file is 28 MB. If the file is larger, first use the PDF Optimizer. If the PDF Optimizer does not reduce the size below 28 MB, please separate the file into two documents and name appropriately, i.e., Lastname\_F\_supp-mats1.doc and Lastname\_F\_supp-mats2.doc. If the size of the dossier is too large to fit on a single CD, articles, manuscripts and, if necessary, the supplemental materials should be put on additional disks. (Note: “F” identifies the first initial of the candidate.)

<b>File Contents</b>	<b>File Name</b>
1. Table of Contents	Lastname_F_toc.pdf
2. Candidate's <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	Lastname_F_cv.pdf
3. Case Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of the department and its objectives</li> <li>• Report on the selection process</li> <li>• Statement of the nominee's qualifications</li> <li>• Statement of the nominee</li> <li>• The assessment of the candidate by internal committee, if written</li> <li>• Assessment of Barnard/Columbia counterpart department, when appropriate</li> </ul>	Lastname_F_statements.pdf
4. Supplemental Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of contributions to the educational purpose of the department</li> <li>• Teaching qualifications, including evaluations</li> <li>• Articles and unpublished manuscripts</li> </ul>	Lastname_F_supp-mat.pdf
5. Referee documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annotated list of referees</li> <li>• Annotated list of comparison scholars</li> <li>• Sample of letter sent to referees and sample of any follow-up letters sent</li> <li>• All responses from referees</li> <li>• Recommendations for witnesses</li> </ul>	Lastname_F_referee.pdf
6. All materials collected for any previous review for tenure	Lastname_F_previous-review.pdf

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

Date

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Name  
Address

Dear :

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

Barnard is an independent undergraduate college of the liberal arts affiliated with Columbia University. Barnard has its own trustees, administration, faculty, endowment and physical plant. While it has its own faculty, they also hold University appointments. Barnard and Columbia share resources on many levels and interact extensively to assure a single standard of excellence for initial appointment to tenure on their faculties.

The evaluation procedure for a tenure appointment is a thorough and searching one; approval of a nomination is by no means automatic. In making their assessments, the Barnard Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) and the University's standing committee on tenure evaluate a nominee's qualities as a scholar, abilities as a teacher and standing among leaders in the relevant field(s).

Columbia University Criteria for an Appointment with Tenure assert that:

In every instance, the nominee must be an outstanding scholar; a person who has demonstrated the capacity for imaginative and original work; a person, moreover, who is making and shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to research in vital fields of knowledge. A person's proven capacity for the highest effectiveness as a teacher is also necessary, but by itself, is not a sufficient basis for tenure. The essential requirement for the appointment of any nominee is scholarly achievement testifying to an unusually critical or original mind. In assessing a young scholar's record, it should be necessary to point to examples of published work of truly outstanding quality; the quantity of publications should be of lesser concern.

As an undergraduate college, Barnard accords special significance to demonstrated ability in undergraduate teaching. The Faculty and Board of Trustees of Barnard College have determined that:

The Barnard faculty consists of scholar-teachers who have long recognized that their teaching depends upon their scholarship and grows out of it. .... The Faculty's abiding achievement is a constant demonstration in the classroom of the binding ties of teaching and scholarship to each other which simply will not accept the possibility of any serious conflict between them.

I would greatly appreciate receiving your candid opinion concerning as many of these considerations for tenure as you feel confident to comment upon. I would also appreciate your comparison of Professor <> with other scholars in the field of <>. For your reference, we have attached a list of individuals to whom we feel Professor <> might be compared, recognizing that not everyone on the comparison list is of the same age and experience. Please feel free to augment the comparison list as you see fit.

Your response will, of course, be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law and shown only to members of the ATP and University standing committee, the Department's Chair and Executive Committee, the President and Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Barnard College, and the President and Provost of Columbia University. In the event that you wish to address certain comments confidentially to the University standing committee or 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.

We look forward to receiving your evaluation by <date>. Let me express in advance Barnard's and the University's appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Provost and Dean of the Faculty  
PHONE: (212) 854-2708  
FAX: (212) 854-6947  
E-MAIL: XXX

Enclosures: comparison list  
department context statement  
Barnard mission statement  
*curriculum vitae*  
candidate's personal statement  
selected publications  
course syllabi  
works-in-progress

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

Date

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Name  
Address

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Provost and Dean of the Faculty

PHONE: (212) 854-2708

FAX: (212) 854-6947

E-MAIL: XXX

Exhibit C  
SAMPLE OF INITIAL E-MAIL

Dear Professor <>:

Assistant Professor <> of the Department of <>, Barnard College, Columbia University is being considered for promotion to a tenured position. It has been suggested that your review 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 a University-wide standing committee on tenure. Letters from external reviewers, 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 and promotion.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Provost and Dean of the Faculty