

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

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/or school. Its purpose is to test whether the earlier reviews were rigorous and substantive and to ensure that all candidates 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 TRAC’s review of all tenure nominations with the exception of those originating in Barnard College. While the criteria for reviewing nominations from Barnard are the same as those applied in evaluating candidates in the rest of the University, the procedures followed differ in some respects, as provided for in the inter-institutional agreement between the College and the University. Therefore, the process by which Barnard nominations are reviewed is described in a separate document.

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

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

Even more critical than the academic need for a tenure appointment are the qualifications of the individual proposed to fill it. In every instance, the nominee must be an outstanding scholar, a person who has demonstrated the capacity for imaginative, original work and who shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to research. Excellence as a teacher is also necessary, 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. 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. 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 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 fields.

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to take into account the differing disciplines of the candidates and the missions of their schools. Nonetheless, all candidates 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 those criteria rests with the nominating department or school. TRAC will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department or school has provided evidence that there is 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 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 it for review by TRAC. With the approval of the appropriate dean or executive vice president, schools and departments may establish a higher percentage of positive votes as the requirement for making a nomination.

The decision on whether to nominate must be made by an open vote or by signed ballots. In this manner, any faculty who vote no may be identified and asked to provide TRAC with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition.

Joint appointments require positive votes from all of the nominating departments and schools. When it is anticipated that the candidate may be given a joint appointment after receiving tenure but the second department or school 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.

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

EVIDENCE CONSIDERED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE

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 it is the responsibility of the dean or executive vice president to review them for completeness and accuracy and to see that they are submitted in a timely fashion.

The 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 dean or executive vice president to send the candidate's dossier to the office as early as possible. The original dossier may be augmented with new materials at any point prior to the actual review.

In judging a nomination, TRAC relies primarily on supporting documents compiled by the nominating department or school 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: Four written statements form the core of the candidate's dossier:

- 1) **An Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives** establishes the importance of the proposed appointment for the nominating unit. It discusses the current state of the nominating department or school and its future direction, and describes the needs the proposed appointment is expected to fill.
- 2) **The Report on the Selection Process** describes how the nominee was chosen and reports on the formal vote by which the nomination was made. For nominations in the Arts and Sciences, it also includes the vote of the counterpart department at Barnard College. Whenever members of a nominating department or school oppose a nomination or abstain, it includes an explanation of the reasons for their votes. Dissenting faculty should also be asked to prepare written assessments of the candidate which may accompany this report or, at the individual's discretion, be submitted directly to the Provost.

As part of the search for an external candidate, a department or school may, with the special prior permission of the dean or executive vice president and the Provost, collect a few preliminary written evaluations before deciding whether to engage in negotiations with the nominee. Copies of any such evaluations are included with this report.

Whenever a department or school votes 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.

- 3) **The Statement on the Nominee's Qualifications** evaluates the nominee's scholarly achievements and potential for future growth, documents his or her teaching abilities, and compares the candidate with the leading scholars in the field. It also discusses how the nominee's qualifications as a scholar and teacher will fulfill the needs and further the objectives of the department or school described in the Analysis above.
- 4) **In the Candidate's Statement**, the nominee discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects.

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 prior contributions to the educational programming of the department or school (or planned in the case of external hires), such as course syllabi.
- Evidence of the nominee's abilities as a teacher, such as course evaluations either here at Columbia or from the candidate's previous institution, results of classroom observations, information on the candidate's former students and teaching awards.
- In the case of nominations from the Arts and Sciences, an assessment by the counterpart department at Barnard College of the candidate's qualifications.
- Any additional information the nominating department or school wishes TRAC to consider, such as reviews of publications.

Referee Letters: Written evaluations of the proposed appointment by recognized authorities form a critical source of information for TRAC. Evaluations of candidates are solicited by the nominating executive vice president or dean, or by their designees. As part of its work of evaluation, described below, TRAC may request that the Provost solicit further referee letters on its behalf.

Copies of the standard letters which are sent to referees for nominations in all Faculties are appended to this document as exhibits. These letters may be modified only with the consent of the Provost. If solicited by the Provost, letters are shared with the appropriate department chair, dean, and executive vice president unless specifically restricted to the Provost and TRAC by the referee.

The dean or executive vice president responsible for obtaining the evaluations selects the scholars who will be asked for referee letters, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department, division, or school. The nominee is not consulted in compiling the list of referees.

While a dossier will typically contain 12-15 referee letters, the number of evaluations matters less than the scholars who provide them. Referees should consist primarily of the leading figures in the nominee's area of specialization but may also be well-established scholars or professionals in related fields who can provide informed evaluations of his or her work. They may include scholars from abroad as well as from other institutions in the United States and may include scholarly collaborators or former mentors of the candidate. They may not, however, be members of Columbia's faculty.

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 always contains leading figures in the nominee's specialization, even when the nominee is a younger scholar. In those cases, the referees are asked to give their assessment of whether the nominee has the potential of reaching the level of achievement of the more senior comparison scholars.

Since the comparison scholars are chosen on the basis of their academic distinction, they may also be asked for evaluations of the nominee. While they should not be excluded from the 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 may have applied for the position for which the candidate is being considered.

Typically, the external letters are solicited at the start of the internal deliberations of the department or school but may be obtained at another point in the process. Letters obtained by the dean, executive vice president or designee are shared with the tenured members of the department or school before it votes on the nomination, unless a referee states that the letter should be shown only to the Provost and TRAC.

To assist the referees in preparing their evaluations, they are provided with the nominee's *curriculum vitae* and, at the discretion of the dean or executive vice president, samples of his or her written work. As a matter of courtesy, potential referees may be contacted prior to being sent a request for an evaluation to determine if they are willing to undertake the work involved. In schools with multiple departments or divisions, the dean or executive vice president may delegate the responsibility for making such inquiries to the unit initiating the review. The 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 the reasons 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 need for the tenure appointment and on the nominee'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.

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

While the members of TRAC are broadly representative of the disciplines covered by the University's faculty, no school, department or discipline is guaranteed a seat on the committee, with the following exception. As stipulated in the inter-institutional agreement with Barnard, the membership of TRAC may be augmented by one or two additional faculty from the College. These additional members only participate in the evaluation of Barnard candidates, as described in the tenure guidelines governing the evaluation of nominations from the College.

SCHEDULE FOR SUBMITTING NOMINATIONS TO TRAC

Planning for the reviews of nominations begins in the spring prior to the year in which they will occur when the Provost asks the deans and executive vice presidents for preliminary information on their potential nominees. By April 15th, the deans and executive vice presidents should submit a list of junior faculty they intend to evaluate, no matter how remote the likelihood of a nomination. In addition, they should inform the Provost of external candidates they have already identified and all senior searches they expect to conduct that may result in further nominations to tenure. For each candidate and each search on the list, the dean or executive vice president should provide an initial assessment of the likelihood of the nomination.

By May 15th of the preceding spring, the dean or executive vice president should send the Office of the Provost confirmation that they have sent out the request for the external letters for their known candidates. For each candidate, the confirmation should include 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 deans and executive vice presidents should inform the Office of the Provost of them. For each such individual, they should include the referee and comparison lists and the date on which the request for the referee evaluations was sent.

The departments and schools are expected to complete their internal evaluation of junior faculty, with the exception of those being recruited by other universities, by December 15th. The Provost will permit exceptions to that deadline when the size of a school's case load does not allow it to complete all of its reviews before the winter break. In those cases, it is the responsibility of the dean or executive vice president to negotiate in advance of the start of the academic year a separate schedule for the submission of the nominations and dossiers for the school's internal candidates.

The departments and schools should make every effort to identify external candidates as early as possible in the academic year. The University, along with most other major universities, endorses the AAUP policy guideline that sets May 15th as the last date that an offer can be made to a faculty member at another institution for appointment the following fall. The offer cannot be contingent upon a favorable outcome of a tenure review. To meet the AAUP deadline, the deans and executive vice presidents should send the Provost the nominations and dossiers for their external candidates by March 31st. Recognizing that negotiations with faculty at other universities can be protracted and delicate, TRAC will attempt to conduct evaluations of external candidates nominated after that date. However, if the review cannot be held 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 it can occur.

The dean or executive vice president of a school or department that misses the May 15th deadline for asking for the referee evaluations for internal candidates is expected to write to the Provost explaining the reasons for the delay and how the school will insure that the December 15th deadline for submitting the nominations and supporting documentation for any such individual will be met. If a department or school misses the December 15th date without the prior permission of the Provost, TRAC will 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 28th, 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 31st.

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 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. 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 primary 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, the Provost seeks to ensure it 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 a candidate's specialization is not a requirement, and at least one member of each panel is always distant from the candidate's field.

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 or voted on the nomination at either the level of the department or the school. Members of TRAC from the Arts and Sciences and Barnard are also not assigned to review panels for candidates in their cognate departments at the other institution.

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 to collect further information before it reconsiders the nomination, including additional external letters of evaluations and additional written statements from the nominating department or school. With the approval of the faculty chair of TRAC, members of the review panel may obtain additional information on their own. They are expected to coordinate any such efforts with the lead reviewer and to act with the greatest discretion to ensure the confidentiality of the 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 or dean is invited to provide TRAC with testimony on the quality of the candidate's work and the significance of the appointment for the nominating unit. If the candidate will have appointments in more than one department, the chairs or deans of all relevant units are asked to appear. Department chairs and deans may delegate the responsibility of serving as witnesses to other tenured faculty who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications and his or her proposed role in the department 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.

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, or a representative, attends all TRAC meetings and may actively participate in the discussion about a nomination. The Vice Provost for Academic Administration also attends to support the committee's work. No other individual who is not a member of TRAC is present during the initial hearing of a nomination. When the committee defers a decision to a second meeting, the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences, the Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences, the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, or the Dean of the Fu Foundation School of Engineering and Applied Science is invited to observe the evaluation if the candidate is from his or her school.

TRAC serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost who is not bound by its recommendations. In particular, a split vote in favor of a candidate is not a strong endorsement. In addition to the final vote, the Provost weighs the evidence presented to TRAC and the discussion of its members at their meeting. Before making a decision on a nomination, the Provost 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 or dean of the nominating department or school.

Upon completion of his or her review, the Provost will submit 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. Candidates from the Faculty of Medicine are also reviewed by the Faculty Council and those from the Faculty of Public Health by the Faculty Assembly before they are proposed to the Trustees for appointment without stated term.

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

A second review may be conducted for a candidate after a negative decision but only if it can be held within the period permitted by the provisions in the University Statutes governing the limits on non-tenured service. The Provost may authorize a new review if he or she determines that the first was marked by procedural irregularities of a magnitude that materially affected its outcome. In the absence of procedural irregularities, a candidate is reconsidered only in the rare instance where the Provost is satisfied that there is evidence of substantial scholarly growth since the original negative decision. It is incumbent upon the school or department to obtain the approval of the Provost to conduct a new review before it solicits any further letters of evaluation, votes on the candidate or begins to prepare for a new nomination in any other way. Requests from departments require the endorsement of the dean or executive vice president before they are forwarded to the Provost. In support of such requests, the nominating school or 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 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 or school for a new hearing, TRAC does not reassess the quality of the materials submitted in support of the original nomination. Instead, the new evaluation focuses on the scholarship completed after the first review and on whether it is of sufficient quality to overcome the reservations that led to the initial negative decision on the candidate's nomination.

CONFIDENTIALITY

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 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 Academic Administration.

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

PART II: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING A TENURE NOMINATION

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

It is the responsibility of the dean or executive vice president of the school making the nomination to see that the dossier is complete, accurate and submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration on schedule even when it is prepared by a department or division chair. The Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences submits the nominations and supporting materials for the departments in the Arts and Sciences. The Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences transmits them for the Faculties of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Nursing and Public Health. Nominations and supporting materials from the other professional schools are submitted by their deans.

Each dossier should consist of the documents described below.

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, whether published, 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 bachelor's 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 expected publisher and publication date when it is 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 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.

ANALYSIS OF THE DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL AND ITS OBJECTIVES

This statement describes the current state and objectives of the department or school and how the proposed appointment relates to them. It should cover the following topics:

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

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

REPORT ON THE SELECTION PROCESS

For nominees from other institutions, this statement describes the search and the reasons for selecting the nominee. It is not necessary to conduct a search before nominating a member of the junior faculty for promotion to tenure. If the department or school chose to forego an external search, it nonetheless uses this statement to explain how it evaluated the qualifications of the internal 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 or school 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. Voting on tenure cases cannot be by secret ballot. It is conducted by an open vote or by signed ballots.
2. If any faculty voted against the nomination or abstained, the report explains the reasons why. Faculty who opposed the nomination or abstained are also asked to prepare a statement describing the reasons for their vote. At their discretion, these statements may be included with the dossier or submitted directly to the Provost for the consideration of TRAC. 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.

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

If the candidate will have a joint appointment, this statement includes a description of the process by which the second department conducted its review, a record of its vote and if any of its faculty opposed the nomination, a description of the reasons for their vote.

For a proposed tenure appointment in a Columbia department with a counterpart in Barnard, the vote of the tenured faculty in the counterpart department on the academic qualifications of the nominee is part of the record available to TRAC. In addition, the nominating department obtains a written assessment of the candidate from the counterpart department. If any of the faculty in the counterpart department voted against the nomination, care should be taken to ensure that the statement includes an explanation of their reasons.

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

STATEMENT ON THE NOMINEE'S QUALIFICATIONS

The nominating department or school uses this statement to discuss the qualifications, accomplishments, and future promise of the nominee, particularly in relation to the objectives outlined in the "Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives."

A. Research and scholarship

1. This section of the statement evaluates the research, principal publications 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.
2. If the candidate was previously evaluated for tenure and turned down at the departmental or school level, it discusses 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

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

2. 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 or school 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 both the University and his or her discipline. It also describes any future service expected of the nominee.

STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE

The nominee prepares a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages on his or her current and future plans with regard to research (or artistic or professional activities when relevant) and teaching. The purpose of the statement is to provide TRAC with information about projects that are underway but have not been completed and those that are still in the planning stage. This statement is required of all junior faculty being considered for promotion to tenure. The dean or executive vice president submitting the nomination may waive the requirement for external candidates.

REFEREE LETTERS

Every nomination to tenure must be supported by evaluations from outside scholars using the "referee letters" appended to this document. 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 other schools by their respective deans. The executive vice president or dean may delegate this responsibility to the appropriate department chair or another designee. These letters are collected early enough in the internal deliberations of the department or school that its tenured faculty may review them before voting on the nomination.

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

Normally, the dean or executive vice president collects no more than 12-15 letters. Care should be taken to include letters from the most prominent individuals in the candidate's area of specialization. In the event that TRAC feels that the nominating unit has not obtained the views of the key people in the field, it may ask the Provost for additional letters which will delay the completion of its review. Referees may not be Columbia faculty, but they may include scholars who have trained or collaborated with the candidate.

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

The 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 dean or executive vice president, samples of the candidate's publications may be included with the request for evaluations.

As a matter of courtesy, potential referees may be asked if they will review the candidate's work before they receive the formal request for evaluation. The dean or executive vice president who collects the referee letters may make that inquiry or delegate the responsibility to a representative, such as a department chair. However, all preliminary inquiries should be made by letter or e-mail and should ask the potential referee to respond in writing so that there will be a written record of who has declined to evaluate the candidate and their reasons. 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 letters 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 following documentation about the referees and comparison scholars is a required part of the candidate's dossier:

- A. A complete list of the potential referees who were approached for evaluations of the candidate, accompanied by a brief description of the credentials of each, including complete title, area of specialization and standing in the discipline. The list should also indicate which referees were approached about writing who did not respond to either a preliminary inquiry 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.
- C. A sample of any preliminary letter or e-mail used to ask if the referee was willing to provide an evaluation of the candidate.
- D. A sample of the letter(s) formally requesting an evaluation, including the date or dates the request was made, and of the comparison list enclosed.
- E. A sample of any follow-up letter sent to referees, indicating the date the request was made, and a list of the people who received it.
- F. Copies of all responses received, including those to any preliminary inquiry from the department or school.

Departments and 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, they may ask for a few preliminary letters of evaluation. For example, a department or school may need a small number of evaluations to help it determine if it wants to open negotiations with a potential external candidate about moving to Columbia. Copies of all such letters are included in the dossier, along with the following information:

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

PUBLICATIONS

The nominating department or school should provide six copies of a selected set of the nominee's published and other written works, with a cover sheet listing the materials submitted. The set should not be large but should include a sufficient number to be representative of the breadth and quality 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 in which the nominee was the principal author should be so indicated. If important publications are in a language other than English, a brief synopsis in English of their content should be included.

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

The nominating department or school may include in the candidate's dossier any additional information it wishes TRAC to consider, e.g., teaching citations, reviews of publications, 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 asks the Provost to arrange for at least one witness to appear before it. To prepare for that possibility, the department or school indicates in the dossier whom it recommends as a witness if it is necessary. The dean or department chair usually serves in that role, but may delegate the responsibility to another faculty member who is closer to the field of the nominee. When a candidate is nominated by more than one department or school, the list of recommended witnesses should include representatives from each of the units.

SUBMISSION OF THE DOSSIER

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

The materials should be electronically submitted in acrobat “.pdf” format with no protection or security restrictions. In preparing the CD-Rom or flash drive, the nominating unit should follow the checklist below for the contents and name of each file and for the order in which they should be included.

The maximum size for a .pdf file is 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 them appropriately, i.e., Lastname_F_supp-mats1.doc and Lastname_F_supp-mats2.doc. If the size of the dossier is too large to fit on a single CD, articles, manuscripts and, if necessary, the supplemental materials should be put on additional disks.

(Note: “F” identifies the first initial of the candidate.)

File Contents	File Name
1. 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"> • Analysis of the department or school • Report on the selection process • Statement of nominee’s qualifications • Statement of the nominee • Assessment of candidate by internal committee, if written • Assessment of Barnard/Columbia counterpart department, when appropriate 	Lastname_F_statements.pdf
4. Supplemental Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contributions to the educational purpose of the department, division or school • Teaching qualifications, including evaluations • Articles and unpublished manuscripts 	Lastname_F_supp-mat.pdf
5. Referee Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotated list of referees • Annotated list of comparison scholars • Sample of letter sent to referees and sample of any follow-up letters sent • All responses from referees • Recommendation for witnesses 	Lastname_F_referee.pdf
6. All materials collected for any previous review for tenure	Lastname_F_previous-review.pdf

EXHIBIT A
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES FOR EXTERNAL CANDIDATES

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address

Dear _____:

I write to ask for your help in evaluating [Dr./Professor] [Candidate], currently of [name of college or university], who is being considered for an appointment to a tenure position in the [Departments/Schools] of X at Columbia. [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed [as are several of [his/her] recent publications]. [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] currently holds the rank of X in the Department of X at [name of college or university].

Like every nomination to tenure at Columbia, that of [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] is subject to a thorough and searching review, first by the faculty of [his/her/our] own department/school, [subsequently by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions of the Faculty of Dental Medicine/Medicine/Public Health, and of the Faculty of Health Sciences, and] [finally/then] by an independent University-wide standing committee. In assessing [his/her] candidacy, we are interested in [his/her] effectiveness as a teacher and [his/her] service to the University, but we are above all concerned to evaluate [his/her] qualities as a scholar [and artist/architect/journalist]. It would help our assessment considerably to have your views on the following:

1. How original has [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] 's work been? Is [he/she] likely to be a productive and creative scholar [and artist/architect/journalist] in the future?
2. How important has [his/her] work been to the development of [his/her] discipline? As the discipline evolves, can we expect [him/her] to work on problems which will be central to it?

In considering [Dr./Professor][Candidate], as we do with all candidates, we wish to make certain that [he/she] is, or has the potential to be, a leader in [his/her] field. We will, therefore, also appreciate your opinion on these additional questions. How does [he/she] compare with other [scholars/scientists] in the field of X? If [he/she] is not now a leader in the field, may we expect [him/her] to become one? For your reference, we have attached a list of individuals to whom we believe [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] might be compared, recognizing that not everyone on the list is at the same stage in their professional careers. Please feel free to augment the comparison list as you see fit.

Finally, if [Dr./Professor][Candidate] were under consideration for a tenured appointment at your institution, would you support [his/her] nomination?

We would be most grateful to have your views on these questions and any other points you consider relevant to our assessment of [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s candidacy. We 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, and the [Department Chair/Executive Committee of the Department/School] [and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions of the Faculty of Dental Medicine/Medicine/Public Health and of the Faculty of Health Sciences]. If you wish, however, you may address any restricted comments to the Provost or to the standing committee.

While I realize that my request imposes upon your time, the opinions of outside referees play an important part in Columbia's system of tenure review. For this reason I would very much appreciate the benefit of your views, which I hope you will give us as soon as you possibly can.

With thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

[Dean/Executive Vice President]

Enclosures: *curriculum vitae*
comparison list

EXHIBIT B
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES FOR INTERNAL CANDIDATES

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address

Dear _____:

I write to ask for your help in evaluating [Dr./Professor][Candidate], who is being considered for a promotion to a tenured position in the [Departments/Schools] of X at Columbia. [Dr./Professor][Candidate]'s *curriculum vitae* is enclosed [as are several of [his/her] recent publications]. [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] currently holds the rank of X in the [Department/School of X].

Like every nomination to tenure at Columbia, that of [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] is subject to a thorough and searching review, first by the faculty of [his/her/our] own department/school, [subsequently by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions of the Faculty of Dental Medicine/Medicine/Public Health, and of the Faculty of Health Sciences, and] [finally/then] by an independent University-wide standing committee. In assessing [his/her] candidacy, we are interested in [his/her] effectiveness as a teacher and [his/her] service to the University, but we are above all concerned to evaluate [his/her] qualities as a scholar/scientist [and artist/architect/journalist]. It would help our assessment considerably to have your views on the following:

1. How original has [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s work been? Is [he/she] likely to be a productive and creative scholar/scientist [and artist/architect/journalist] in the future?
2. How important has [his/her] work been to the development of [his/her] discipline? As the discipline evolves, can we expect [him/her] to work on problems which will be central to it?

In considering [Dr./Professor][Candidate], as we do with all candidates, we wish to make certain that [he/she] is, or has the potential to be, a leader in [his/her] field. We will, therefore, also appreciate your opinion on these additional questions. How does [he/she] compare with other [scholars/scientists] in the field of X? If [he/she] is not now a leader in the field, may we expect [him/her] to become one? For your reference, we have attached a list of individuals to whom we believe [Dr./Professor] [Candidate] might be compared, recognizing that not everyone on the list is at the same stage in their professional careers. Please feel free to augment the comparison list as you see fit.

Finally, if [Dr./Professor][Candidate] were under consideration for a tenured appointment at your institution, would you support [his/her] nomination?

We would be most grateful to have your views on these questions and any other points you consider relevant to our assessment of [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s candidacy. We 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, and the [Department Chair/Executive Committee of the Department/School] [and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions of the Faculty of Dental Medicine/Medicine/Public Health and of the Faculty of Health Sciences]. If you wish, however, you may address any restricted comments to the Provost or to the standing committee.

While I realize that my request imposes upon your time, the opinions of outside referees play an important part in Columbia's system of tenure review. For this reason I would very much appreciate the benefit of your views, which I hope you will give us as soon as you possibly can.

With thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

[Dean/Executive vice president]

Enclosures: *curriculum vitae*
comparison list

EXHIBIT C
STANDARD LETTER TO REFEREES WHO WERE SENT
THE SCHOOL OR DEPARTMENTAL SEARCH LETTER

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Address

Dear _____:

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

I am writing to ask if you would like to add to the comments on [Dr./Professor] [Candidate]'s qualifications in your previous letter, a copy of which is enclosed. In particular, we would appreciate your views on how [he/she] compares with other scholars currently in the field of X, such as those on the enclosed list, and whether [he/she] is likely to be among the leaders in that field in the future. The list that we have provided is meant only as a guide. Please feel free to adjust it as you see fit. Not everyone on the list is at the same age and level of experience, and this, of course, needs to be considered in comparing them.

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

With thanks in advance.

Sincerely,

[Dean/Executive Vice President]

Enclosures: comparison list
previous letter of evaluation