II. Procedures for Recommending Reappointment and Promotion in the Professor of Professional Practice Ranks at Barnard College

This memo concerns procedures for the reappointment and promotion of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors of Professional Practice.

Professors of Professional Practice are officers of instruction with substantial professional experience and accomplishment outside of the Academy, typically in the creative and performing arts. They are accorded full membership to the Faculty of Barnard College with its attendant duties, service obligations, and benefits.

A. TIMELINE FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Assistant Professors of Professional Practice are reviewed in the third year of full-time service at the College. The Third Year Review provides the College and the department an opportunity to review and comment on the candidate’s record of professional accomplishment, including creative activity, teaching, and service. It also provides an opportunity for the candidate and the department to agree formally upon a set of expectations for reappointment and promotion to Associate Professor of Professional Practice in the seventh year.

Subsequent reviews for reappointment and promotion of Associate and Full Professors of Professional Practice typically occur on a seven-year cycle. Individuals wishing to stand for promotion to Full Professor of Professional Practice may choose to do so at an earlier date, in consultation with the Provost and the department chair. The reappointment and promotion of Professors of Professional Practice begins with the reestablishment of need for the position, followed by a review of the candidate’s performance. The review process begins no later than the candidate’s sixth year of cumulative service since the most recent appointment, promotion, or reappointment.

B. PROCEDURES FOR THE THIRD YEAR REVIEW OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

The Third Year Review is the first comprehensive review of a full-time officer of instruction at the College. The review is a responsibility of all senior faculty members of a department. For the purposes of the Third Year Review of Assistant Professors of Professional Practice, the senior faculty include those holding the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Professor of Professional Practice, and Associate Professor of Professional Practice. If there are fewer than three senior faculty members in the department to conduct the review, the Provost should be consulted about appointing a committee of at least three senior faculty members to oversee the review process. 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 II.1. Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion).

b. A statement of approximately five pages in length (single-spaced) on creative activity and professional accomplishment, 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. Documentation of creative work and professional accomplishment in all forms appropriate to the discipline since appointment; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

The department is expected to collect and review evidence of teaching effectiveness, including:

1. The candidate’s statement on teaching, as specified above.

2. Representative course syllabi, as specified above.

3. A peer review of teaching by a senior member of the department.

4. Student evaluations for all courses taught since appointment.

Other evidence may be included where relevant. 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 chair and at least one other senior faculty member of the department. Before the interview, the chair should consult all senior faculty of the department. The interview should include the following:

a. A detailed analysis of the candidate’s record, focusing on creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service.

b. A discussion of the candidate’s plans for the development of his or her professional career.

The outcomes of the formal interview should be incorporated in a letter from the chair to the candidate, to be shared with all other senior 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 signed Third Year Review letter and the candidate’s CV should be submitted to the Provost by March 15. The Third Year Review letter 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 incorporate suggestions and changes from the Provost and ATP into the letter and share it with the candidate under review. The candidate should sign a copy of the letter and may append a response. The signed letter 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.

2. Post-Review Procedures

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 section below should be consulted regarding the schedule and procedures for recommending reappointment and promotion to Associate Professor of Professional Practice.

C. PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

The reappointment and promotion of Assistant Professors of Professional Practice begins with the reestablishment of need for the position, to be followed by a review of the candidate’s performance. The review process begins no later than the candidate’s sixth year of cumulative service.

1. Affirmation of Line Allocation by the FBPC

If the department determines that there is continuing need for the position, the chair should petition the Faculty Budget and Planning Committee (FBPC) for continuation of the faculty line. The FBPC deadline is normally at the beginning of the spring semester of the candidate’s sixth year of service; chairs should refer to the “Guidelines for a Petition to the FBPC” for more specific details. Upon approval of the line allocation by the FBPC and the President, the department initiates a review of the candidate’s performance, to be completed in the fall of the seventh year.
2. Nomination for Reappointment and Promotion

Every nomination for reappointment and promotion 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 December 15 whether the department is considering any internal promotions. The ATP has established a deadline of March 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.

Full-time faculty of the department holding higher rank will make an initial assessment of the candidate’s record since appointment and may confer with the Provost should there be questions about the criteria for proceeding with the promotion review. For the purposes of the reappointment and promotion of Assistant Professors of Professional Practice, the senior faculty include those holding the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Professor of Professional Practice, and Associate Professor of Professional Practice. If there are fewer than three senior faculty members in the department to conduct the review, the Provost should be consulted about appointing a committee of at least three senior faculty members to oversee the promotion process. Following a positive initial assessment, the chair will assemble a promotion dossier as indicated below. The chair is also expected to consult all senior faculty before writing the departmental statement to accompany the dossier.

The department is not required to make a nomination for reappointment and promotion, and a favorable decision at this level should not be a routine expectation. On the contrary, a nomination should only be made if the senior faculty members 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 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 professional productivity, teaching, and/or service. Should the department decline to make a nomination, the candidate may appeal to the ATP.

3. Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Professional Practice requires evidence of achievement in the areas of creative activity and professional accomplishment, 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.

Some of the primary types of evidence the ATP evaluates when considering candidates for promotion to Associate Professor of Professional Practice are listed below.
a. Creative Activity and Professional Accomplishment
   i. Evidence of substantial creative and professional accomplishment since appointment in the candidate’s specific area of the creative or performing arts.
   ii. Evidence of the quality and impact of the candidate’s work, which may include reviews and citations by critics or scholars, invitations to lecture, perform, or exhibit, other professional activity related to the art form(s), and awards and prizes for creative excellence.

b. Teaching
   i. Evidence of continued excellence in classroom or studio 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.

4. 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 II.1. Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion).

b. A statement by the candidate of approximately five pages in length (single-spaced) on creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service.

c. A statement by the chair of approximately three to five pages in length (single-spaced) on behalf of the promotion committee evaluating the candidate’s creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service. The Provost is available for consultation or to review drafts. When a faculty member is affiliated with another department or program, a senior representative from that department or program should contribute appropriate content. The statement should:

   i. Report on the department’s ballot vote on the candidacy.
   ii. Make explicit reference to the letters from external reviewers and describe the referee selection and solicitation process (see below).
   iii. 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.
iv. Outline and comment on the candidate’s service contributions to the department, the College, the University, and the profession.

d. Documentation of the candidate’s creative work and professional accomplishment in all forms appropriate to the discipline; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

e. Evidence of teaching effectiveness, including:

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

vi. 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.

vii. A minimum of eight letters from former students/recent alumnæ 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.

viii. A peer review of teaching by a senior member of the department. The review should involve a visit by a senior 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.

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

g. Six to eight letters from external reviewers, along with a copy of the letter used for solicitation.

A list of potential reviewers should be compiled by the chair in consultation with the Provost. The list typically consists of between eight and ten names. It is best to choose as referees those who are knowledgeable and prominent in the candidate’s profession or field, and can speak to the candidate’s recent contributions and their impact.

Some referees may be chosen from individuals who wrote for the initial appointment. A letter from a person in the candidate’s field from the Columbia department is desirable and may count for one of the minimum number of required external letters. The chair may also solicit suggestions of referees from the candidate. Many good potential referees will know the candidate personally. While such referees are helpful, care should be taken to include referees who are not personally acquainted to assure objectivity.
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 II.2); the chair should consult with the Provost if substantial changes in wording are necessary for a particular case.

The dossier sent to reviewers should include:

i. The candidate’s CV and statement.

ii. Documentation of the candidate’s creative or scholarly work in all forms appropriate to the discipline since appointment; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

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

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.

5. 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 and may be invited to meet with the ATP.

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.

If reappointment and promotion is recommended, the faculty member may be eligible for a Professional Development Leave and will be awarded $1,500 to support direct professional, scholarly, or research expenses. This fund supplements travel grants and mini-grants.

A faculty member not recommended for reappointment will be offered a final year of employment at the College.

D. PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING REAPPOINTMENT IN RANK

The reappointment of Associate and Full Professors of Professional Practice in rank begins with the reestablishment of need for the position, to be followed by a review of the candidate’s performance. The review process begins no later than the sixth year of cumulative service since the most recent appointment, promotion, or reappointment.
1. Affirmation of Line Allocation by the FBPC

If the department determines that there is continuing need for the position, the chair should petition the Faculty Budget and Planning Committee (FBPC) for continuation of the faculty line. The FBPC deadline is normally at the beginning of the spring semester of the candidate’s sixth year of service; chairs should refer to the “Guidelines for a Petition to the FBPC” for more specific details. Upon approval of the line allocation by the FBPC and the President, the department initiates a review of the candidate’s performance, to be completed in the fall of the seventh year.

2. Nomination for Reappointment

Every nomination for reappointment 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.

The ATP has established a deadline of December 15 for the submission of completed dossiers for reappointment to the Provost’s Office to guarantee full consideration before the end of the academic year.

Full-time faculty of the department holding higher rank will make an initial assessment of the candidate’s record since the most recent promotion, appointment, or reappointment and may confer with the Provost should there be questions about the criteria for proceeding with the review. For the purposes of the reappointment of Associate and Full Professors of Professional Practice, the senior faculty include those holding the ranks of Professor and Professor of Professional Practice. If the candidate is also the department chair or if there are fewer than three senior faculty members in the department to conduct the review, the Provost should be consulted about appointing a committee of at least three senior faculty members to oversee the review process. Following a positive initial assessment, the chair will assemble a reappointment dossier as indicated below. The chair is also expected to consult all senior faculty before writing the departmental statement to accompany the dossier.

3. Criteria for Reappointment

Reappointment in the Professor of Professional Practice ranks requires evidence of achievement in the areas of creative activity and professional accomplishment, 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 reappointment in the Professor of Professional Practice ranks are listed below.

   a. Creative Activity and Professional Accomplishment
i. Evidence of substantial creative and professional accomplishment since the last review in the candidate’s specific area of the creative or performing arts.

ii. Evidence of the quality and impact of the candidate’s work, which may include reviews and citations by critics or scholars, invitations to lecture, perform, or exhibit, other professional activity related to the art form(s), and awards and prizes for creative excellence.

b. Teaching
   i. Evidence of continued excellence in classroom or studio teaching, advising, and mentoring.
   iii. 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.

4. 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 II.1. Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion); the CV should be highlighted to indicate new information since the last promotion, appointment, or reappointment.

b. A statement by the candidate of approximately five pages in length (single-spaced) creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service, focusing on activities since the last review.

c. A statement by the chair of approximately three pages in length (single-spaced) on behalf of the senior faculty of the department evaluating the candidate’s creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service, focusing on activities since the last review. The statement should make explicit reference to the letters from external reviewers and should describe the referee selection and solicitation process (see below).

d. Documentation of the candidate’s creative work and professional accomplishment in all forms appropriate to the discipline since the last review; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

e. Evidence of ongoing teaching effectiveness, including:
   i. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since the last review and other course material as appropriate.
ii. Student evaluations for courses taught since the last review, 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” report with student ratings on objective questions and unredacted student comments.

iii. A peer review of teaching by a senior member of the department. The review should involve a visit by a senior 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.

Letters from external reviewers, along with a copy of the letter used for solicitation.

For candidates in the rank of Associate Professor of Professional Practice, the dossier should also include three to five letters from external reviewers. For candidates in the rank of Professor of Professional Practice, external letters are not initially required; subsequent to review by the ATP, the chair may be asked to provide letters from external reviewers. Exceptions to the expectation for external letters of reference may be granted in special circumstances upon recommendation of the department chair to the Provost.

A list of potential reviewers should be compiled by the chair in consultation with the Provost. Some referees may be chosen from individuals who wrote for the previous appointment or promotion review. A letter from a person in the candidate’s field from the Columbia department is desirable and may count for one of the minimum number of required external letters. 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 II.2); the chair should consult with the Provost if substantial changes in wording are necessary for a particular case.

The dossier sent to reviewers should include:

i. The candidate’s CV and statement.

ii. Copies of the candidate’s creative or scholarly work since the last review; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

iii. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since the last review and other course material as appropriate.
5. 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 reappointment and may supply additional comments on the review for the benefit of the candidate and department.

If reappointment is recommended, the faculty member may be eligible to apply for a Professional Development Leave and will be awarded $1,500 to support direct professional, scholarly, or research expenses. This fund supplements travel grants and mini-grants.

A faculty member not recommended for reappointment will be offered a final year of employment at the College.

E. PROCEDURES FOR RECOMMENDING REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

The reappointment and promotion of Associate Professors of Professional Practice begins with the reestablishment of need for the position, to be followed by a review of the candidate’s performance. The review process shall commence no later than the sixth year of cumulative service since the most recent promotion, appointment, or reappointment. Those individuals wishing to stand for promotion to Full Professor of Professional Practice may choose to do so at an earlier date, in consultation with the Provost and the department chair.

1. Affirmation of Line Allocation by the FBPC

If the department determines that there is continuing need for the position, the chair should petition the Faculty Budget and Planning Committee (FBPC) for continuation of the faculty line. The FBPC deadline is normally at the beginning of the spring semester of the candidate’s sixth year of service; chairs should refer to the “Guidelines for a Petition to the FBPC” for more specific details. Upon approval of the line allocation by the FBPC and the President, the department initiates a thorough review of the candidate’s performance, to be completed in the fall of the seventh year.

2. Nomination for Reappointment and Promotion

Every nomination for reappointment and promotion 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 December 15 whether the department is considering any internal promotions. The ATP has established a deadline of March 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.

Full-time faculty of the department holding higher rank will make an initial assessment of the candidate’s record since the last promotion, appointment, or reappointment and may confer with the Provost should there be questions about the criteria for proceeding with the promotion review. For the purposes of the reappointment and promotion of Associate Professors of Professional Practice, the senior faculty include those holding the ranks of Professor and Professor of Professional Practice. If the candidate is also department chair, he or she should indicate to the Provost his or her interest in standing for promotion. If there are fewer than three senior faculty members in the department to conduct the review, the Provost should be consulted about appointing a committee of at least three senior faculty members to oversee the promotion process. Following a positive initial assessment, the chair will assemble a promotion dossier as indicated below. The chair is also expected to consult all senior faculty before writing the departmental statement to accompany the dossier.

3. Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

Promotion to the rank of Professor of Professional Practice requires evidence of achievement in the areas of creative activity and professional accomplishment, 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 of Professional Practice are listed below.

a. Creative Activity and Professional Accomplishment
   i. Evidence of substantial creative and professional accomplishment since the last review in the candidate’s specific area of the creative or performing arts.
   ii. Evidence of the quality and impact of the candidate’s work, which may include reviews and citations by critics or scholars, invitations to lecture, perform, or exhibit, other professional activity related to the art form(s), and awards and prizes for creative excellence.

b. Teaching
   i. Evidence of continued excellence in classroom or studio 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.

4. 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 II.1. Format of Curriculum Vitae for Tenure, Reappointment, and Promotion); the CV should be highlighted to indicate new activities since the last promotion, appointment, or reappointment.

b. A statement by the candidate of approximately five pages in length (single-spaced) on creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service, focusing on activities since the last review.

c. A statement by the chair of approximately three to five pages in length (single-spaced) on behalf of the promotion committee evaluating the candidate’s creative activity and professional accomplishment, teaching, and service, focusing on activities since the last review. The statement should make explicit reference to the letters from external reviewers and should describe the referee selection and solicitation process (see below).

d. Documentation of the candidate’s creative work and professional accomplishment in all forms appropriate to the discipline since the last review; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

e. Evidence of ongoing teaching effectiveness, including:

i. The most recent syllabus for each course taught since the last review and other course material as appropriate.

ii. Student evaluations for courses taught since the last review, 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.

A list of potential reviewers should be compiled by the chair in consultation with the Provost. Some referees may be chosen from individuals who wrote for the previous appointment or promotion decision. A letter from a person in the candidate’s field from the Columbia department is desirable and may count for one of the minimum number of required external letters. 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 II.2); the chair should consult with the Provost if substantial changes in wording are necessary for a particular case.

The dossier sent to reviewers should include:

i. The candidate’s CV and statement.

ii. Copies of the candidate’s creative or scholarly work since the last review; works in progress or under review, grant applications, and reviews of the candidate’s work may also be included.

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

5. 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.

If reappointment and promotion is recommended, the faculty member may be eligible to apply for a Professional Development Leave and will be awarded $1,500 to support direct professional, scholarly, or research expenses. This fund supplements travel grants and mini-grants.

A faculty member not recommended for reappointment will be offered a final year of employment at the College.
Exhibits

EXHIBIT II.1. 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 II.2. STANDARD LETTER TO SOLICIT REVIEW BY REFEREES FOR PROMOTION IN THE PROFESSOR OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RANKS

Dear <>,

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

Every nomination for promotion 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, we are interested in all aspects of <his/her> professional contributions, including creative activity, teaching, and service to the College, the University, and the profession. The Professor of Professional Practice ranks at Barnard are designed for officers of instruction who possess substantial professional experience and expertise in the creative and performing arts.

Please address the following questions in your evaluation:

- In what capacity do you know Professor <>?

- What is your assessment of Professor <>’s creative work and professional accomplishment? What is your view, in particular, of <his/her> recent work? 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 to date predict a <continued> successful trajectory?

- How does <his/her> work compare to that of other practitioners/scholars at or near <his/her> seniority in the field? What is your assessment of the potential for <his/her> future standing among senior practitioners/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 this promotion 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