I. Procedures for Recommending Reappointment and Promotion in the Tenure-Line Ranks at Barnard College

This memo concerns procedures for the reappointment and promotion of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors in tenure-eligible and tenured positions.

A. TIMELINE FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Assistant Professors are reviewed for reappointment to an additional term in the third year of full-time service at the College. The Third Year Review provides the College and the department with an opportunity to review and comment on the candidate’s record of professional accomplishment, including research, teaching, and service. It also provides an opportunity for the candidate and the department to agree formally on a set of expectations for research to be undertaken during the Special Assistant Professor Leave (SAPL) and for scholarly progress and improvements in teaching and service over the balance of the individual’s appointment period in a tenure-eligible rank.

Review for reappointment and promotion to Associate Professor with tenure normally begins in the candidate’s sixth year of counted service at the College. The Code of Academic Freedom and Tenure (Code) provides that Assistant Professors in tenure-eligible lines may be appointed and reappointed for no more than seven years before tenure consideration. Further information concerning the tenure timeline and exceptions can be found in the Code. The tenure review process is expected to be completed by the end of the candidate’s seventh year of counted service. If the outcome is affirmative, the candidate is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure on July 1 of the eighth year of counted service. Specific deadlines and requirements for each stage of the tenure review are included below.

Tenured Associate Professors have the responsibility to inform their department chairs when they wish to be considered for promotion to Professor, but this does not usually occur until they have been in rank for at least five years.

A detailed tenure timeline is provided as Exhibit I.1.

B. PROCEDURES FOR THE THIRD YEAR REVIEW OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

The Third Year Review is the first comprehensive review of a tenure-eligible officer of instruction at the College. The review is a responsibility of all tenured members of a department. If there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in a candidate’s department to conduct the review, the Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) will recommend the appointment of senior faculty from other departments who will serve, with the chair, as the department’s tenured faculty for the purpose of the review. In cases where the faculty member has been hired with the expectation of teaching regularly in more than one Barnard department or interdisciplinary program, the chair or director (or a tenured member of the department or program committee) will become a voting member of the Third Year Review Committee; this additional member is expected to provide evidence of the candidate’s
performance and to ensure that the perspectives of the interdisciplinary program are incorporated into the review. The deadline for submitting the completed Third Year Review letter to the Provost is **March 15** of the candidate’s third year of full-time service.

1. **Dossier Requirements and Review Procedures**

The candidate under review should submit the following to the department:

   a. A complete *curriculum vitae* in the standard format recommended by the ATP (see Exhibit I.2. Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion).

   b. A statement of approximately five pages (single-spaced) on the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. The statement should include reflective commentary on the teaching experience, on the development of course materials and syllabi, and on student course evaluations.

   c. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since appointment and other course material as appropriate.

   d. All published work and work in progress; grant applications and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

Other evidence may be included where relevant.

The department chair or Third Year Review Committee should solicit three outside letters as part of this review. These letters may be from among those who wrote letters of reference at the time of the initial appointment, members of the Columbia faculty, or other appropriate experts. Chairs should indicate the number of letters requested and the number received and include this in their statement.

Prior to the meeting of the Third Year Review Committee with the candidate and before the review letter is submitted to the Provost for ATP review, the department chair should also submit evidence of the candidate’s achievement in the area of teaching, including representative syllabi, course evaluation data, and peer teaching observation reports, to the Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development, who will ensure that institutional expectations are being met regarding the evaluation of teaching quality. The Dean will also be available as a consultant to the chair with regard to the content and organization of the Third Year Review document, to ensure that the purposes of the Third Year Review as both a formative and summative review are being met. Chairs are encouraged to consult with the Provost or the Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development should they have questions about the departmental assessment of teaching.

The Third Year Review includes a formal interview between the candidate and the tenured members of the department or Third Year Review Committee. This interview should encompass the following:
a. A detailed analysis of the candidate’s record, focusing on research, teaching, and service.

b. A discussion of the candidate’s plans for the development of his or her professional career and a general outline of the trajectory and expectations for progress to be made before tenure consideration.

The outcomes of the formal interview should be incorporated in a letter from the chair to the candidate, to be shared with all other tenured members of the department. It should provide a summary and evaluation of past professional achievement and offer specific advice for the future.

The chair’s letter to the candidate constitutes the “Third Year Review.” While it should contain a summary of past professional development and achievements, it should focus on a thorough evaluation of the quality of research, teaching, and service and should provide specific advice on future efforts the individual should make in each of these areas. The Third Year Review should also:

a. Make explicit reference to the standards for tenure articulated by Barnard and Columbia, and provide appropriate context to such standards from within the particular discipline of the candidate.

b. Address issues of productivity and impact in interdisciplinary fields in which the candidate is working.

c. Contain information as to how the department has been evaluating, and will continue to evaluate, the individual’s teaching.

If there are dissenting views among the tenured faculty or the Third Year Review Committee on the progress or recommendations given to the faculty member under review, the reasoning behind such dissenting views should be incorporated into the Third Year Review.

The signed Third Year Review letter and the candidate’s CV should be submitted to the Provost by March 15. The Third Year Review will be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion (ATP), chaired by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. The department chair will meet briefly with the ATP to discuss the review and will incorporate suggestions and changes from the Provost and ATP before sharing the Third Year Review with the candidate. The revised Third Year Review will be returned to the Provost, who may share it with the ATP and President as needed. The Committee’s recommendation is then presented to Barnard’s President for approval.

Once the Third Year Review letter is finalized, the Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development will meet with the candidate to ensure that the individual has a good understanding of the department’s expectations going forward. Any questions or concerns that arise should be brought to the attention of the department chair or Third Year Review Committee and the Provost so that the Third Year Review letter may be modified as appropriate.
Approval of the Third Year Review by the ATP and the President affirms eligibility for a Special Assistant Professor Leave (SAPL). In anticipation of a successful Third Year Review, the candidate should also prepare an application for mini-grant funding to support research during the SAPL. Applications are due to the Grants Committee in mid-February for consideration during its spring meeting.

2. Post-Review Procedures

A brief summary of work accomplished while on the SAPL becomes part of the faculty member’s Annual Personnel Form to be submitted in May or June of the year on leave. In the following fall semester (no later than the end of September), the chair should arrange a meeting with the individual to review progress made since the Third Year Review. If there have been substantial changes in the progress expected or if the plans as outlined in the Third Year Review have changed, the chair should write an addendum to the Third Year Review, copies of which should be provided to the candidate and to the Provost.

Each year, the chair should meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her professional progress and contributions to the department and communicate any concerns to the Provost. The Third Year Review letter should serve as a template for these discussions.

Copies of the Third Year Review letter and any addenda become part of the individual’s personnel file in the Office of the Provost and will be made available to the ATP when the candidate stands for reappointment and promotion with tenure. While the Third Year Review letter is part of the dossier reviewed by the ATP, it is not sent to external referees or to the corresponding Columbia department and is not included in the dossier forwarded to Columbia’s Tenure Review Advisory Committee.

C. PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION WITH TENURE

The Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion (ATP) is responsible for reviewing the dossiers of Barnard officers of instruction nominated for promotion or appointment with tenure. The tenure dossier is normally prepared by the chair of the department (or a tenured faculty member designated by the chair) in consultation with all tenured members. Where a faculty member is appointed to or affiliated with another department or program, a tenured representative of that department or program becomes part of the review committee. Administrative support is provided by the department assistant or administrator, working closely with the Manager of Academic Programs and Faculty Support in the Provost’s Office.

This document is intended as a guide for those involved in preparing and presenting tenure dossiers. Its purpose is to provide basic information about the standards and expectations of the ATP Committee in reviewing dossiers, as well as practical information about the normal calendar and procedures followed in tenure presentations and the contents of a tenure dossier. Department chairs and candidates are also urged to read thoroughly the relevant parts of the Code of Academic Freedom and Tenure (Code) and the most recent edition of Columbia...
University’s “Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Review for Nominations from Barnard College” (“Principles and Customs”). A detailed tenure timeline is also provided as Exhibit I.1.

Questions and situations will inevitably arise that are not covered in these guidelines. These should be directed to the Provost, who is responsible for making judgments about procedures where the rules and guidelines may be silent, as well as for assisting department chairs and the ATP in presenting and assessing tenure candidacies. It should also be remembered that procedures evolve over time. The University may update “Principles and Customs” annually, and the Barnard ATP Committee modifies its procedures and practices as circumstances require. It is important when beginning to prepare a tenure dossier to obtain the most recent information and to consult with the Provost throughout the process.

1. Nomination for Appointment or Promotion with Tenure

Every nomination for appointment and promotion is subject to rigorous review, first by the tenured faculty of the nominating department(s), then by the Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP), and, in the case of a positive review and a decision to grant tenure by the President of Barnard College, by the Columbia University Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC).

The Code provides that Assistant Professors in tenure-eligible lines may be appointed and reappointed for no more than seven years before tenure consideration. As such, the department must decide before the mid-point of the candidate’s sixth year of counted service (i.e. January 15) whether or not it intends to nominate the candidate into the tenure process.

The decision on whether to nominate is normally made by the executive committee of the department, consisting of all its tenured members, and, if applicable, a tenured representative from the department or program in which the candidate is also appointed. The decision should be made in a formal meeting, by ballot. If there are fewer than three tenured members in the department to conduct the review, the responsibility for the dossier falls to the ATP in consultation with any tenured member of the department, or to a special sub-committee appointed by the ATP. If the decision on a possible nomination is negative at the departmental level, the individual is notified by June 30 of the sixth year of counted service that the seventh year will be the final year of reappointment. The Provost should be notified of the department's decision as soon as it is made and prior to notifying the faculty member.

The department is not required to make a nomination into the tenure process, and a favorable decision at this level should not be a routine expectation. On the contrary, a nomination should only be made if the tenured faculty of the department have substantial confidence in the quality of the candidate’s record to date and believe that evaluation by external referees in the candidate’s area of scholarship is warranted. As applicable to the candidate, the department should consult with faculty in other Barnard or Columbia departments or programs who have the relevant expertise and experience to judge the candidate’s performance in research, teaching, and/or service. Should the department decline to make a nomination, the candidate may appeal to the ATP.
The department’s preliminary decision in favor of a nomination is made when the candidate’s credentials and accomplishments constitute a promising case for tenure. This requires careful review of the candidate’s professional progress, especially since the Third Year Review. If the preliminary departmental decision is affirmative, the chair should immediately advise the candidate to prepare the following materials in preparation for a full review:

a. A *curriculum vitae* in the standard format recommended by the ATP (see Exhibit I.2, *Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion*).

b. A personal statement of up to ten pages (single-spaced) on research, teaching, and service.

c. Copies of all published scholarly or creative work since appointment; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of published work may also be included.

d. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since appointment and other course material as appropriate.

These documents may be amended or supplemented at a later time, but throughout the process a complete, accurate, and up-to-date CV in the standard format is essential. The chair should review drafts well before the submission deadline. Candidates can also consult the Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development, as well as the Provost, for guidance.

The chair should simultaneously begin to develop:

a. A brief description of the candidate’s field of specialization and scholarly focus.

b. A department context statement.

c. An annotated referee list.

d. An annotated comparison list.

e. A list of the leading institutions/programs and the leading liberal arts colleges in the candidate’s field of specialization.

f. A plan for the solicitation of letters from former students.

The department context statement provides a summary of the essential characteristics of the current position and its relation to departmental staffing. It is generally less than a page in length. It is not an advocacy document and chairs should refrain from adding evaluative statements. Where a faculty member has been appointed in support of another program or department, a tenured representative from the program or department should contribute to and co-sign this document. Sample context statements are available from the Provost’s Office.
The referee and comparison lists should be prepared in consultation with the chair of the counterpart Columbia department or his/her designee. The outcomes of these discussions should be confirmed in writing, with a copy sent to the Provost.

The ATP strongly recommends that departments give careful consideration to the development of the referee and comparison lists, as the quality of the letters received can have significant influence on the way a nomination is judged. Effective consultation—with tenured colleagues at both Barnard and Columbia, with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and/or with colleagues in related departments—is advisable. The candidate for tenure is not to be consulted in developing either the referee list or the comparison list, nor should the final list of referees be shared with the candidate.

The referee list typically consists of between fifteen and twenty names, with greater numbers in cases where the candidate has more than one research focus and where consultation of experts in more than one area is desirable. The object is to collect at least twelve to fifteen letters for the dossier. It is best to choose as referees those who are both knowledgeable and prominent in the candidate’s field and to avoid requesting letters from those who are unlikely to provide thoughtful statements. Referees may not be Barnard or Columbia faculty and must be tenured faculty from other institutions.

Many good potential referees will know the candidate personally. While such referees are often helpful, care should be taken to include referees who are not personally acquainted to assure objectivity. Letters from dissertation advisors are acceptable and can be valuable in ascertaining progress since receipt of the Ph.D. The candidate’s relationship to such referees should be clearly noted.

The comparison list usually includes six to eight names of scholars from other institutions, at least two of whom could be considered the candidate’s contemporaries and at least two of whom are clearly senior, well-known figures in the field (against whom the candidate could be compared only in terms of potential). At least two of those on the comparison list should also be solicited as referees. The comparison list normally does not include non-tenured faculty.

A sample demonstrating the preferred format for referee and comparison lists is available in “Principles and Customs” (see exhibits).

Additions to the referee list may be made later in the process by the Barnard Provost, the ATP, the University-wide standing committee (TRAC), or the University Provost (see “Principles and Customs”). Requests for additions do not necessarily reflect negatively on the candidate or on the original list prepared by the chair, though they sometimes add new dimensions to a dossier. When the original list is effective, objective, and strong, the chance of subsequent additions is minimized. When additions are made (by any party), the department chair is informed and given copies of the letters received.

As soon as a department has decided to support a nomination into the tenure process (but no later than February 1 of the candidate’s sixth year), the chair should submit a copy of the candidate’s
CV, a brief description of the candidate’s field of specialization and scholarly focus, and the draft referee and comparison lists to the Barnard Provost for approval.

The department context statement, the final referee and comparison lists, the list of leading institutions/programs and the leading liberal arts colleges in the candidate’s field of specialization, and a written plan for the solicitation of letters from former students should be submitted to the Provost by March 1 of the candidate’s sixth year of counted service, along with the rest of the candidate’s dossier materials to be sent to referees.

Letters soliciting external reviews are sent to all referees using a standard form letter with the Provost’s signature (see “Principles and Customs” for a sample). No one other than the Provost (or her staff designee) should at any time communicate with any referee. A copy of the candidate’s CV, his or her personal statement, a selected group of recent publications, works in progress, and representative course syllabi are sent to the referees, along with the comparison list (the referee’s own name is deleted from the comparison list if he or she is on it). Sufficient copies of these materials should be given to the Provost when the department context statement and final referee and comparison lists are delivered.

After consideration of the full set of referee letters received, the department has another opportunity to decide whether to support a nomination or not. If the letters raise significant questions about the candidacy, the department may vote against proceeding further and withdraw the candidate’s nomination. In this case, the candidate will be notified that the case will not be considered for tenure and that the following year will be terminal (again, such a decision should be made in a formal meeting, either by open vote or signed ballot). Alternatively, the department may decide to vote positively and move forward with the case. An affirmative departmental vote results in the case being heard by the ATP.

The tenure dossier must be complete by the end of the summer. The chair or designee should devise a calendar to ensure that all additional evidence required for the final departmental vote and ATP review is collected before the start of the candidate’s seventh year of counted service (see “Dossier Requirements” below). By early September of the candidate’s seventh year, one electronic copy and three hard copies of the complete dossier should be delivered to the Provost for review before distribution to members of the ATP. Material not available when the referees were asked for their evaluation may be added at this time.

The chair should also submit a copy of the dossier to the chair of the Columbia counterpart department no later than early September, requesting a consultative opinion. Following this submission, the two departments should arrange for the Barnard department chair to present the candidate to the Columbia department. At the conclusion of the presentation and discussion, the tenured faculty of the Columbia department vote on the qualifications of the candidate. The vote and a written summary of the evaluation must be communicated to the Barnard department chair, with copies to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty at Barnard and the Vice President of Arts and Sciences at Columbia. Once the Columbia department statement and report on the vote are received, the Barnard department has a final opportunity to decide whether to move forward with the nomination to the ATP.
After review by the Provost, the entire dossier is forwarded to the ATP for formal consideration. The Provost is responsible for convening the ATP (and for arranging for the substitution of alternate members when regular members have conflicts of interest). The first meeting of the committee is usually given over to a discussion of the dossier-as-received, and its intended outcome is the compilation of a set of questions to which the department chair is expected to respond at a subsequent appearance before the committee. These questions are communicated to the chair by the Provost as promptly as possible, so as to give the chair time to formulate considered responses. The chair’s appearance, normally at the beginning of the committee’s second meeting, also provides the occasion for a brief formal statement.

Following the presentation of the candidacy, the ATP resumes discussion of the dossier (if necessary, over several meetings). The outcome of the Columbia consultation (described above) must be received and considered before any final vote. The ATP may request other materials including additional testimony, referee letters, or clarification from the chair. Any additional letters must be included in the dossier if the individual is subsequently nominated for University-wide committee review, but other materials do not necessarily have to be included. Whenever such supplementary materials or counsel are sought, the department chair is informed.

The tenure consideration concludes with a vote (by written ballot) of the five elected faculty members of the ATP (the Provost and the President do not vote). This vote constitutes the committee’s non-binding recommendation to the President, who has the right to accept or reject the advice provided by the committee.

The proceedings of the ATP are confidential. It is highly inappropriate for any person not a member of the committee to seek information about any aspect of a tenure candidacy, just as it is for any member to give such information. No exceptions to the rule of confidentiality should be made. Any questions about this matter should be discussed with the Provost.

When the recommendation of the ATP Committee is negative and the President accepts that recommendation, the case is closed. The Provost informs the chair, and the chair informs the candidate of the outcome. The Provost subsequently writes formally to the candidate that the following year will be the final year of reappointment.

When the recommendation of the ATP is affirmative, the President begins her independent deliberation. She may request additional discussion of some issues before making her decision. In the case of an affirmative recommendation by the President, the committee may suggest modifications or improvements in the dossier that have emerged from its analysis and evaluation of the documentation. The suggestions from the ATP are communicated to the department chair by the Provost.

The review and recommendation of the ATP should normally be complete by December 15 of the candidate’s seventh year of counted service in order to meet the deadline for submission of dossiers to the Provost of the University for the University-wide review by the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC). The Provost of Barnard provides digital copies of the dossier to the Provost of Columbia for consideration by TRAC.
Each year, the Provost of Barnard works with the Columbia Provost to recommend tenured Barnard officers of instruction to serve on TRAC in either a temporary or full-time capacity. The Columbia Provost will designate one member of the Barnard faculty a full-time member of TRAC. As such, this Barnard faculty member will vote on all tenure cases before TRAC. The Columbia Provost will designate three members of the Barnard faculty to serve as additional members of TRAC for Barnard-only cases. One additional Barnard faculty member from among these three will be selected to participate as a member of TRAC in voting on Barnard cases.

The work of the University-wide committee is expected to be complete by June 30 of the candidate’s seventh year of counted service. The vote of TRAC is a recommendation to the Provost of Columbia, who in turn, submits his recommendation to the President of Columbia, copying the President of Barnard (see “Principles and Customs” for details about the decision-making process and the consultations). If the recommendation is not affirmative, the nominee is notified by June 30 of the seventh year that the next (eighth) year will be terminal. If it is affirmative, the individual is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure on July 1 of the eighth year of counted service.

In the case of initial appointment to a tenured position, the same procedures are followed. Dates for submission of materials are established in consultation between the department chair and the Provost.

2. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion

In reviewing the dossiers of candidates for promotion or appointment with tenure, the ATP makes judgments about the qualities and qualifications of the candidate. It seeks to identify outstanding scholar-teachers whose quality of mind and intellectual accomplishment have been positively acknowledged by students, by colleagues, and by scholars outside of Barnard. It also seeks promise of continuing growth, and the probable trajectory of a candidate’s scholarly career becomes an important element in the discussion and decision regarding the awarding of tenure.

a. Research and Scholarship

The ATP looks for evidence that the candidate’s scholarship includes work beyond the Ph.D. dissertation. An extensively revised dissertation prepared for publication may constitute such evidence, although this is not always the case; work initiated after graduate school obviously does. The ATP tries to estimate whether the candidate is making—and is likely to continue to make—significant contributions to the body of scholarship in the field.

In considering scholarly output, the ATP weighs carefully the views expressed in letters from scholars in the field, as well as the views of the tenured members of the Barnard department and the consultative advice of the Columbia counterpart department. Completed manuscripts may be considered, but published research (or work accepted for publication) has a higher value. Still higher is published scholarship that has been subject to peer scrutiny (in refereed journals or by book review, for example). Whereas a threshold exists in terms of the expected frequency and volume of published scholarly work (which varies according to the discipline), the ATP is less interested in the quantity than in the quality of such work, and, above all, the importance of the ideas it expresses.
b. Teaching

Analysis of teaching is of special importance to the ATP. The focus is on disciplinary teaching, but the committee is also interested in evidence attesting to the candidate’s teaching versatility. The ATP looks for evidence of the candidate’s ability to work effectively in a variety of teaching settings, including (as applicable) the lecture hall, the seminar, the laboratory, and in individual consultation. The ATP also looks for evidence of the connection between the candidate’s teaching and scholarship (recognizing that in some cases advanced research is not within reach of the typical undergraduate), as well as for evidence of coherence in classroom presentation and ability to impart knowledge and encourage creative and effective learning.

Student course evaluations are an expected part of the dossier. In addition, the observation of colleagues is expected, as are the views obtained from a random solicitation of recent graduates who have been students of the candidate.

The ATP also considers the contributions made by the candidate to the department’s curriculum in developing or modifying courses, laboratories, or related activities, and to the Columbia graduate department and other Barnard departments or programs. Finally, the Committee also values the candidate’s teaching activity outside the classroom, including formal and informal advising.

Additional information about the ATP’s expectations concerning documentation of teaching effectiveness can be found in the “Dossier Requirements” section below.

c. Service

The service rendered to the academic community is not limited to membership on committees. The ATP Committee considers service to the department, to the College, to the University, and to the profession, with a preference for limited but focused participation on committees or other projects.

3. Dossier Requirements

The tenure dossier is assembled for four different audiences at four different points in the process: first for the external referees, next for the counterpart Columbia department, then for final departmental vote and for the ATP at Barnard, and finally for the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC) at Columbia. Listed below are the elements needed at each stage; explanations of the various elements follow.

**Dossier for External Referees**

a. Candidate’s *curriculum vitae*.

b. Candidate’s personal statement(s) on research, teaching, and service.

c. Barnard mission statement.

d. Department context statement.

e. Publications, works in progress, and other evidence of scholarly activity.

f. Course syllabi.
**Dossier for the Columbia Counterpart Department**

a. All documents and materials listed above, plus any new or revised material since the previous submission.

b. Barnard department chair’s statement.

c. Referee documentation, including:
   i. An annotated referee list.
   ii. An annotated comparison list.
   iii. A copy of the letter sent to referees.
   iv. All referee responses.

**Dossier for the Barnard Department and the ATP**

a. All documents and material listed above, plus any new or revised material since the previous submission.

b. Table on the composition of the department faculty and faculty listing.


d. Statement from the chair of Columbia counterpart department indicating their vote and the rationale.

e. Report of the Columbia department’s reading committee.

f. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, including:
   i. Report on the candidate’s courses taught and enrollments.
   ii. Statistical summary of course evaluation ratings.
   iii. Student course evaluations.
   iv. Letters from former students.

g. A copy of the candidate’s Third Year Review letter.

h. A list of the leading institutions/programs and the leading liberal arts colleges in the candidate’s field of specialization.

**Dossier for Columbia TRAC**

a. All documents and material listed above, except for the Third Year Review. New or revised material since previous submission may also be incorporated.

b. Dossier cover letter from the Barnard Provost.

c. Barnard ATP statement.

d. Recommendation for witness(es) to TRAC.
Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae and Personal Statement: Use of the standard format for the curriculum vitae is especially important in tenure and promotion cases; review by the ATP or others involved may be delayed if the information provided in the CV is not complete (see Exhibit I.2).

For the purposes of the tenure review, the candidate should prepare a personal statement of up to ten pages (single-spaced) on research, teaching, and service.

These documents may be amended or supplemented at a later time, but throughout the process a complete, accurate, and up-to-date CV in the standard format is essential. The chair should review drafts well before the submission deadline. Candidates can also consult the Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development, as well as the Provost, for guidance.

Department Context Statement and Table on the Composition of the Department Faculty and Faculty Listing: The department context statement provides a summary of the essential characteristics of the current position and its relation to departmental staffing. It is generally less than a page in length. It is not an advocacy document and chairs should refrain from adding evaluative statements. Where a faculty member has been appointed in support of another department or program, a tenured representative from the department or program should contribute to and co-sign this document. Sample context statements are available from the Provost’s Office.

The table on the composition of the department faculty and faculty listing of the nominating department includes data on the Barnard department’s full- and part-time faculty by rank and tenure status. It is accompanied by a complete listing of the department’s full-time faculty, along with their fields of specialization. A template is available from the Provost’s Office.

Department Chair’s Statement: This is a critically important element of the dossier. The Provost is available for consultation or to review drafts. It is difficult to prescribe either the exact content or length of such a letter, for they will vary with the differing circumstances of particular candidates. Where a faculty member is appointed to another department or program, a tenured representative from that department or program should contribute to and co-sign this document. Where faculty member is affiliated with another department or program, a tenured representative from that department or program should contribute appropriate content.

At a minimum, the letter should accomplish the following:


b. Identify the focus, strength, and significance of the candidate’s research within their particular field and the broader discipline. The chair should provide information about the journals, series, or presses in which the candidate’s works appear. For co-authored work, identify the candidate’s unique contribution.
c. Provide a guide to the referee letters and comparison scholars, indicating how and why the names were chosen and which are particularly important, and suggesting means of interpreting, distinguishing, and understanding commentary or criticism in the letters.

d. Explain and discuss the candidate’s teaching strengths and weaknesses and indicate the specific evidence the department used to evaluate teaching competence. Describe the candidate’s contributions to the departmental curriculum, as well as any extra-departmental teaching.

e. Outline and comment on the candidate’s service contributions to the department, the College, the University, and the profession.

See “Principles and Customs” for additional advice about writing the Chair’s Statement.

Publications, Works in Progress, and Reviews of Candidate’s Work: Copies of all publications authored or co-authored by the candidate should be provided. In certain cases, after consultation with the Provost, the chair may choose a portion of the candidate’s significant work to be included in the dossier.

Manuscripts submitted for publication should be included in typescript, along with proof of publication status (if subsequently published, the printed versions may be substituted). Works in progress or under review, grant applications, and the candidate’s reviews of published works may also be included. Published reviews of the candidate’s work should also be included (with some information about the review journal or the reviewer).

Referee Documentation: Copies of all referee letters received, a copy of the letter of solicitation, the original referee and comparison lists, and any subsequent list(s) should be supplied. In addition, fully annotated referee and comparison lists that indicate the referees’ responses should be provided. All responses to referee solicitations must be included. This material is collected by the Manager of Academic Programs and Faculty Support in the Provost’s Office.

Report on the Selection Process: The report on the selection process should document the search and hiring process by which the candidate was originally selected, the means by which the department evaluated the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and the executive committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications for tenure. See “Principles and Customs” for further guidance on writing the report on the selection process.

Teaching Materials: Evidence of teaching effectiveness is important to the success of any case. The dossier must include the following:

a. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since appointment and other course material as appropriate.

b. A report on the candidate’s courses taught and enrollments, to be obtained from the Provost’s Office.
c. A statistical summary of student course evaluation ratings on key questions as specified in “Principles and Customs” (see exhibits). A template is available from the Provost’s Office.

d. Student evaluations for all courses taught since the Third Year Review. Course evaluations should be retrieved from Courseworks and include both the “concise” reports with student responses to objective questions and unredacted student comments.

e. A minimum of eight letters from former students/recent alumnae who have been taught and/or advised by the candidate since appointment. The letters should be solicited by the chair from a random sample, as approved by the Provost. A sample letter of solicitation is available from the Provost’s Office.

f. A peer review of teaching by a tenured member of the department. The review should involve a visit by a tenured member of the department (or related department) to a class at a pre-arranged time, a discussion between the candidate and the tenured faculty member in advance of the class visit to go over the course syllabus and discuss the particular aims of the class session, and a written memo to the candidate and chair after the class visit providing both a description and an evaluation of the class observed. For the purposes of the tenure review, such visit(s) should be conducted in the fifth or sixth year of counted service.

Chairs are encouraged to consult with the Provost should they have questions about the requirements or if the department wishes to supplement the required evidence with additional material attesting to the quality of the candidate’s teaching.

In cases where candidates are nominated from outside the College, teaching materials will be developed in consultation with the Provost.

**Service-Related Material:** Evidence of service to the department, College, University, and/or profession is relevant, and any supporting material concerning the candidate’s record of service that is not already covered in the candidate’s own statement or *curriculum vitae* or in the department chair’s statement may be included.

**D. PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

1. **Nomination for Promotion**

Every nomination to the rank of Full Professor at Barnard is subject to thorough review, first by the senior faculty in the candidate’s own department, then by the Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion (ATP), chaired by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. The Committee’s recommendation is then presented to Barnard’s President for approval.

Chairs must inform the Provost by **October 1** whether the department is considering any internal promotions. The ATP has established a deadline of **February 1** for the submission of completed
internal promotion dossiers to the Provost’s Office to guarantee full consideration before the end of the academic year.

Tenured associate professors have the responsibility to indicate to their department chairs when they wish to be considered for promotion to Professor, usually not until they have been in rank for at least five years. If the candidate is also the department chair, he or she should indicate to the Provost his or her interest in standing for promotion. The tenured full professors of the department will make an initial assessment of the candidate’s record while in rank and may confer with the Provost should there be questions about the criteria for proceeding with the promotion review. If there are fewer than three tenured full professors in the department to conduct the review, the Provost should be consulted about appointing a committee of at least three tenured full professors to oversee the promotion process. Should the tenured full professors make a positive initial assessment, the chair will assemble a promotion dossier as indicated below. The chair is expected to consult all full professors in the department before writing the departmental statement to accompany the dossier.

2. Criteria for Promotion

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of achievement in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. While it is understood that candidates will present records that vary in the balance of achievements in the three major areas of evaluation, there must be convincing evidence of overall excellence, with clear distinction of achievement in at least two of the three areas.

Some of the primary types of evidence the ATP evaluates when considering candidates for promotion to Professor are listed below.

a. Scholarship and Professional Accomplishment
   i. Evidence of substantial progress on research projects since tenure, generally shown by publication in peer-reviewed journals or presses.
   ii. Evidence of the quality and impact of the candidate’s research and scholarship, which may include citations by other noted scholars, reviews of the candidate’s work, invitations for lectures, contributions to edited volumes, and awards for research and/or prizes for scholarship from external agencies.

b. Teaching
   i. Evidence of continued excellence in classroom teaching, advising, and mentoring.
   ii. Evidence of curricular development and innovation.

c. Service
   i. Evidence of service to the department, College, and University.
   ii. Evidence of service to the profession.
   iii. Evidence of professionally-related community service.
3. Dossier Requirements

The dossier should consist of the following materials:

a. A complete curriculum vitae in the standard format recommended by the ATP (see Exhibit I.2, Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion). The CV should be highlighted to indicate new activities since tenure.

b. A statement by the candidate of approximately five pages (single-spaced) on research, teaching, and service, focusing on activities since tenure.

c. A statement by the chair of approximately three to five pages (single-spaced) on behalf of the full professors of the department or promotion committee evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service, focusing on activities since tenure. The statement should make explicit reference to the letters from external reviewers and should describe the referee selection and solicitation process (see below).

d. Copies of all published scholarly or creative work since tenure; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of published work may also be included.

e. Evidence of ongoing teaching effectiveness since tenure, including:

   i. A report on the candidate’s courses taught and enrollments since tenure, to be obtained from the Provost’s Office.

   ii. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since tenure and other course material as appropriate.

   iii. Student evaluations for courses taught since tenure, including, at a minimum, one set of evaluations for each course taught in the past three years. Course evaluations should be retrieved from Courseworks and include both the “concise” reports with student responses to objective questions and unredacted student comments.

f. Five letters from external reviewers, along with a copy of the letter used for solicitation.

As soon as a department has decided to support a nomination into the tenure process, the chair, in consultation with the Provost, should compile a list of potential reviewers. At least three letters must be from individuals who have neither previously written for the candidate nor co-authored publications with the candidate since tenure. One of the letters may be from a person in the candidate’s field from the Columbia department. The chair may also solicit suggestions of referees from the candidate.

The chair should contact potential referees in advance to determine their willingness to participate in the review. The letter soliciting review by the referees should follow the general format of the College’s standard letter (see Exhibit I.3); the chair should consult
with the Provost if substantial changes in wording are necessary for a particular case. Departments are advised to send solicitation letters and referee dossiers to external reviewers by **November 15** and request response by **December 15**.

The dossier sent to reviewers should include:

i. The candidate’s CV and statement.

ii. Copies of published scholarly or creative work since tenure; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of published work may also be included.

iii. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since tenure and other course material as appropriate.

4. **Review by ATP and Notification of Outcome**

After review by the Provost, the entire dossier is forwarded to the ATP for formal consideration. The ATP may request other materials including additional testimony, referee letters, or clarification from the chair. Whenever such supplementary material or counsel is sought, the chair is informed.

Upon recommendation by the ATP and the decision by the President, the Provost will inform the candidate and the chair of the decision on promotion and may supply additional comments on the review for the benefit of the candidate and department.
## Exhibits

### EXHIBIT I.1. TENURE TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clock Year</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Prior to hire</td>
<td>Appointment to a tenure-track position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Meeting with chair for review of progress using Annual Personnel Form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Department initiates Third Year Review (including conducting a teaching observation); CU department consulted; Candidates and chairs meet separately with the Provost and Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Candidate applies for SAPL grant; Grants Committee reviews applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATP reviews Third Year Reviews (due March 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>Fall or Spring</td>
<td>SAPL for those passing Third Year Review (SAPL year is off clock).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Chair interviews faculty returning from SAPL; evaluates progress in light of plans articulated in personal statement for Third Year Review; adjusts guidance from Third Year Review as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Tenured member(s) of the department conducts additional classroom observation(s) in preparation for the tenure review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Candidates and chairs meet separately with the Provost and Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development; Candidate submits dossier material for review by department by the end of the fall semester; department establishes suitable deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No later than Jan 15</td>
<td>Department votes on nomination into tenure process. Chair notifies Provost of decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-Feb 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>BC chair develops annotated referee and comparison lists in consultation with CU chair (or designee). Lists are sent to Provost for approval, along with a current CV description of the candidate’s field of specialization and scholarly focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>One copy of referee-stage dossier due to Provost for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost sends referee solicitations; prepares dossiers for shipment to referees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-May</td>
<td>BC chair asks CU chair to appoint a reading committee; sends referee-stage dossier to CU reading committee chair, with the understanding that referee letters and the Barnard Department Chair’s Statement will be sent in early fall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>BC Provost sends CU Provost a list of potential nominees for tenure in the coming year; provides CV and field description for each candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-May</td>
<td>BC Provost notifies CU Provost that referee solicitations have been completed; provides referee and comparison lists for each candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-July</td>
<td>Referee letters returned; annotated referee list completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-Aug</td>
<td>Department collects additional evidence required for ATP review (e.g., teaching evaluations, letters from former students).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Early Sept Department decision on whether to proceed to ATP review. Chair completes Department Chair’s Statement, including a report on departmental vote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early fall Referee documentation, Department Chair’s Statement, and any updates to candidate’s materials sent to CU department for review and final vote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td>Dossier (now with CU statement/vote) presented to ATP. ATP deliberates and makes recommendation to BC President. Affirmative cases forwarded to CU Provost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-May</td>
<td>University standing committee (TRAC) meets. If requested, BC chair or designee and CU chair or designee appear as witnesses. CU Provost recommends to CU President, copying BC President.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Affirmative cases presented to Barnard and Columbia Boards of Trustees for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>July Tenure becomes effective, or last year of appointment begins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>July Tenured faculty eligible for first sabbatical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT I.2. FORMAT OF CURRICULUM VITAE FOR TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION

Use of this standard format for a curriculum vitae is encouraged for all personnel actions at the College. It is especially important that it be followed in the consideration of tenure, reappointment, and promotion cases; review by the ATP or other involved may be delayed if the information provided is not complete.

N.B. - Within a category, begin with most recent. If categories do not apply, they may be omitted. Always include current date on CV.

A. Name, Current Rank, Work and Home Addresses and Phone Numbers

B. Degrees in Higher Education
   • Institution
   • Dates attended and date of degree
   • Major(s)
   • For the Ph.D., include name of adviser and title of dissertation

C. Additional Professional Training
   • Institution
   • Dates attended and date of degree
   • Major(s)

D. Professional Experience in Higher Education (Note if less than full-time)
   • Institution and department
   • Dates
   • Rank

E. Professional Experience Outside Higher Education (if any) (Note if less than full-time)
   • Institution and department
   • Dates
   • Rank

F. Academic and Professional Honors

G. Current Membership in Professional Societies

H. Courses Taught
   • List noting courses taught at Barnard, Columbia, and elsewhere
   • Independent study/senior theses, etc.
   • Graduate dissertation committees
I. Publications and Creative Work
   - Separate into appropriate sections:
     Books/Monographs
     Journal Articles
     Chapters in Books/Anthologies
     Book Reviews
     Conference Presentations and Lectures
     Exhibitions/Performances
     Reports and Other Work
   - Clearly indicate works that are edited, co-authored, translated, completed, etc.
   - Clearly indicate reprinting of a work following its original citation
   - Include only works published, in press, or accepted for publication; for those in press or accepted for publication, clearly indicate the status and append verification of the publication status
   - Include complete page citations

J. Works in Progress / Submitted for Publication
   - Indicate stage of progress and approximate length

K. Grant Activity (Research and Institutional)
   - Separate into appropriate sections:
     Prior Awards Now Terminated
     Active Grants
     Grants Submitted for Funding
   - Project title
   - Granting agency
   - Term of grant
   - Amount of award
   - Indicate co-investigators, if any

L. Service to the College/University
   - Name of committee or special appointment
   - Dates of service
   - Role (member, chair, etc.)

M. Service to the Profession
   - Name of committee or special appointment
   - Dates of service
   - Role (member, chair, etc.)

N. Professionally-related Community Service

O. Consultantships
EXHIBIT I.3. STANDARD LETTER TO SOLICIT REVIEW BY REFEREES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Dear <>,

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate Associate Professor <>, who is being considered for promotion to Professor in the Department of <> at Barnard College. This evaluation is focused on the period since <his/her> <promotion/appointment> with tenure in <year>. Enclosed please find a copy of Professor <>’s dossier for promotion.

Every nomination to the rank of Professor at Barnard is subject to thorough review, first by the senior faculty in the candidate’s own department, then by the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion, chaired by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. The Committee’s recommendation is then presented to Barnard’s President for approval.

In assessing Professor <>’s candidacy for promotion to the rank of Professor, we are interested in all aspects of <his/her> professional contributions, including research, teaching, and service to the College, the University, and the profession. While it is understood that candidates will present records that vary in the balance of achievements in the three major domains of evaluation, there must be convincing evidence of overall excellence, with clear distinction of achievement in at least two of the three areas. We solicit your evaluation of <his/her> post-tenure scholarly and creative activities, and, to the extent that you are able, your comments on <his/her> teaching abilities and service to the College, the University, and the profession.

Please address the following questions in your evaluation:

- In what capacity do you know Professor <>?
- What is your assessment of Professor <>’s scholarship? What is your view, in particular, of <his/her> post-tenure scholarship? How important has <his/her> work been in <his/her> field?
- How would you assess the originality of Professor <>’s work? To what extent does the work predict a continued successful trajectory?
- How does <his/her> work compare to that of other scholars at or near <his/her> seniority in the field? What is your assessment of the potential for <his/her> future standing among senior scholars in <his/her> subdiscipline? In the field more broadly construed?
- How would you evaluate Professor <>’s overall record of service to the profession?
- How would you assess Professor <>’s approach to teaching?

Any other comments on the matter of the promotion of Professor <> are welcome. We would appreciate your response by <date to be four weeks from letter date>. We extend our collective thanks for your participation in this important evaluation process.

Sincerely,
Department Chair