

Arts and Sciences Tenure Review Guidelines

November 2011

Introduction

The Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences depends on a standing committee to conduct an Arts and Sciences level evaluation whenever a department or school recommends a candidate for tenure. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess whether the department or school level review was rigorous and substantive and to ensure that all Arts and Sciences candidates meet the same high standards. In this way, a faculty of the highest quality and distinction will be maintained.

The standing committee – the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) – serves in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice President who determines whether or not the candidate should be recommended to the Provost for tenure. The Arts and Sciences standing committee is administered on behalf of the Executive Vice President by the Executive Vice Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Part I

General Procedures

Part 1 of this document provides an overview of the policies and procedures for conducting tenure reviews at the Arts and Sciences level. It describes how the PTC is constituted, the work of the PTC, and the manner in which its meetings are conducted. Part 2 provides guidelines for schools and departments to follow in preparing nominations for tenure review and a schedule for submitting materials to the Office of the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences. This document should be read at all times in conjunction with the Provost's Tenure Review Guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews," which are available at http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia_University_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf.

Criteria for an Appointment to Tenure

The criteria for an appointment to tenure are set forth in the Provost's guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews":

"An appointment to tenure is made in the University only when an individual of widely recognized excellence is found to fill a scholarly need that is demonstrably vital to a discipline central to the University's purposes. The process of tenure review, therefore, is concerned with both the qualities of the

nominee and the potential impact of the proposed appointment on the nominating department or school.

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

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

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

Peer esteem is a valuable measure of scholarly ability. Established scholars must be widely recognized as among the leaders in their disciplines. Younger scholars must have achieved a level of scholarly accomplishment which demonstrates extraordinary promise. Serious consideration should be given only to those younger scholars who can be expected, with a high degree of confidence, to become leaders in their disciplines. A comparable standard is applied when the candidate is in a professional or artistic discipline. The customary academic

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

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to take into account the differing disciplines of the candidates and the missions of their schools. Nonetheless, all candidates must be or have the potential of becoming leading figures in a field that is intellectually vital and important to the University. The burden of demonstrating that a candidate meets those criteria rests with the nominating department or school. The Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC) will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department or school has provided evidence that there is a compelling affirmative case for the nomination.”

Nomination to Tenure

Every nomination requires a positive vote by the tenured faculty in the relevant department and, in the case of the School of the Arts, a positive vote by the tenured faculty and the endorsement of the dean. At a minimum, a majority of the eligible tenured faculty in a department or school must vote in favor of forwarding it for review by the PTC. The decision on whether to nominate must be made by an open vote or by signed ballots, or a mechanism must be in place that permits any faculty who vote no or abstain to be identified and asked to provide the PTC with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention. Joint appointments require positive votes from all of the nominating departments and schools.

Evidence Considered by the PTC

The evidence considered by the PTC includes supporting statements, referee letters, and the personal testimony of witnesses:

Supporting Statements and Materials

The supporting statements are described in the Provost’s Guidelines, “Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews.” An abbreviated description is reproduced below, modified to highlight the department’s role in preparing the supporting statements and to include specific practices in the Arts and Sciences.

The Case Statement

The nominating department or school prepares a case statement containing the following written components:

1) An Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives establishes the importance of the proposed appointment for the nominating unit, discusses the current state of the nominating department or school and its future direction, and describes the needs the proposed appointment is expected to fill.

2) Depending on whether the candidate is an external or internal promotion to tenure, the Report on the Search and Selection Process and/or the Summary of the Department Review Process is included. For external promotions to tenure, the Report on the Search and Selection Process describes how the nominee was chosen and reports on the formal vote by which the nomination was made, including the vote of the counterpart department at Barnard College. It lists the search committee members, describes the materials used to evaluate the nominee's scholarly achievements for future growth and his or her teaching abilities, and summarizes the department's deliberations and reasons for its vote. For internal promotions to tenure, the Report on the Search and Selection Process describes how the nominee was chosen when hired and the Summary of the Departmental Review Process describes the methods by which the nominee was evaluated in the department or school, and reports on the formal vote by which the nomination was made, including the vote of the counterpart department at Barnard College. It lists the review committee members, describes the materials used to evaluate the nominee's scholarly achievements for future growth and his or her teaching abilities, and summarizes the department's deliberations and reasons for its vote.

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

This statement includes the following sections:

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

- Teaching qualifications - This section describes the nominee's contribution to the educational programs of the departments and schools in which he or she currently holds appointments, such as courses taught, students advised (both graduate and undergraduate), and, where appropriate, participation in curricular development. It also discusses the nominee's qualities as a teacher and identifies the sources on which the assessment is based.
- University service - This section of the statement addresses the nominee's contribution to the University beyond teaching and scholarly activities and describes any future service expected of the nominee.
- English proficiency - If the nominee's first language is not English, this section must describe the nominee's capacity for lecturing and discussion in English.

These statements provide the core of the department's or school's case for the tenured appointment. They are accompanied by the following supporting statements and materials:

- A brief statement from the nominee of no more than 5-10 pages that discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects.
- A current, dated curriculum vitae prepared according to the specifications in the Provost's Guidelines.
- A copy of the department's or school's Report on the Search and Selection Process and/or Summary of the Department Review Process.
- The vote of the counterpart department at Barnard College and a statement of its assessment of the candidate's qualifications.
- Evidence of the nominee's prior contributions to the educational programming of the department or school (or planned in the case of external hires), such as course syllabi.
- Evidence of the nominee's abilities as a teacher, such as course evaluations, results of classroom observations, information on the candidate's former students, and/or teaching awards.
- A representative set of the nominee's published and other written works, with a cover sheet listing the materials submitted. The set should not be large, but should include a sufficient number of works to be representative of the breadth and quality of the

nominee's scholarship. It may include forthcoming publications and manuscripts, conference papers, and grant proposals that have a bearing on the nomination. If any of the papers or publications were written in collaboration with others, those works in which the nominee was the principal author should be so indicated. If important publications are in a language other than English, a brief synopsis in English of their content should be included.

- Any additional information the nominating department or school wishes the PTC to consider, such as reviews of publications.

Consultants

For each nominee, several scholars at other institutions who are familiar with the candidate's field of specialization are selected so that the Executive Vice President may consult them at any point in the review process if he chooses to do so. For example, the consultant may be asked for input on the proposed referee and comparison lists or the candidate's curriculum vitae. These scholars are recommended by the department and may not include anyone who has collaborated with the candidate, has served as a colleague at another institution, or will write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's tenure review. Similarly excluded from consideration are individuals who participated in the candidate's doctoral and postdoctoral training. To avoid the possibility of a prior association, the Executive Vice President normally does not consult scholars who were at the institutions at which the candidate was a doctoral student or a post-doc.

Referee Letters

Written evaluations of the proposed appointment by recognized authorities form a critical source of information for the PTC. Evaluations of candidates are solicited by the Executive Vice President. As part of its review, described below, the PTC may request that the Executive Vice President solicit further referee letters on its behalf.

The Executive Vice President selects the scholars who will be asked for referee letters, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department or school.

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

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

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

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

To assist them in their task, the referees are provided with the nominee's curriculum vitae and, at the discretion of the Executive Vice President, samples of the nominee's written work. For example, the Executive Vice President may direct the samples to be sent upon the referee's request or at the time of the solicitation. At the department's discretion, the nominee's statement may also be included.

Witnesses

The Executive Vice President regularly calls upon persons to appear before the PTC who can present information on the need for the tenured appointment and on the nominee's qualifications. These witnesses are selected in consultation with the chair of the PTC, the Executive Vice Dean, and the chair of the nominating unit.

The appropriate department chair or dean presents the case for the nomination and is usually the principal witness. He or she may delegate this responsibility to another tenured faculty member who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications and proposed role in the department or school. At the request of the chair, dean, or Executive Vice President, a second witness from the nominating department or school will be asked to testify to the quality of the candidate's scholarship and teaching. When the candidate will have appointments in more than one department or school, the chairs or deans of all of the relevant units are routinely invited to appear before the committee. The chair or dean of the nominating unit is informed of all witnesses who will appear before the PTC.

Selection of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The PTC consists of nine full professors in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, representing the three divisions, who serve for three year terms. The PTC members are appointed by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the Planning and Policy Committee (PPC). The chair of the PTC is appointed by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the PTC.

Selection of the Review Panel for Each Tenure Review

For each tenure review, a seven person review panel is constituted by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the chair of the PTC. The review panel consists of a subpanel of two tenured Columbia faculty members (the outside members) and two PTC members who are familiar with the candidate's field of specialization and will be charged with performing a critical reading of the candidate's scholarly work. One of the four subpanel members will be designated as the chair of the subpanel. The remainder of the review panel consists of two additional PTC members, one of whom is close in discipline to the candidate and another of whom is distant from the candidate's field, and the chair of the PTC. This representation is intended to ensure an appropriate depth and breadth of knowledge while also ensuring that the standards for tenure are consistent across the disciplines.

Members of the review panel may not have collaborated with the candidate, served on a search committee that selected the nominee, or voted on the nomination at either the department or school level. The outside members may hold appointments in any Faculty in the University, including Barnard College and Teachers College. Retired members of the tenured faculty may also serve as outside members when the PTC and the Executive Vice President conclude that they can bring a needed expertise to the evaluation of a candidate. The Executive Vice President may change the membership of the review panel at any time after consulting with the chair of the review panel and the chair of the PTC. Membership on review panels is confidential.

Deadlines for Submitting Materials to the PTC

To assist the Office of the Executive Vice President in planning the work of the PTC, the chair or dean should submit materials for all individuals whom they expect to review for tenure no later than the start of April of the academic year preceding the expected nomination. In the case of some nominations, the candidate will not have been identified by the beginning of April. External searches may not be completed by then or it may become necessary to prepare a tenure review for a junior faculty member who is being recruited by another university. As additional candidates are identified, the chair or dean should notify the Office of the Executive Vice President. For each individual, he or she should include the same information as is required for internal nominees.

The nominations and complete dossiers for internal candidates must be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President by the beginning of December. The nominations and complete dossiers for external candidates should be submitted as soon as is feasible and no later than mid-February. The Executive Vice President will grant exceptions to that deadline only to meet a competing offer from another university, or where there are other, special circumstances that make a late nomination unavoidable. A dossier is not considered complete until all of the materials described above have been submitted.

The Executive Vice President's Office normally does not schedule the review until it has received a complete set of the materials. The nominating chair or dean should, therefore, submit the candidate's dossier and supporting materials as early as possible. The original dossier may be augmented with new materials at any point prior to the meeting of the PTC. It is especially important for the chair or dean to ensure that the PTC has a current curriculum vitae and statement from the nominee at the time of its meeting.

Role of the Divisional Deans

The divisional deans normally participate in reviews within their divisions at the following stages in the process: 1) give authorization to the department to conduct the review (typically in December of the year before the review); 2) give authorization to the department to advance to the letter writing stage; 3) vet the lists, cv and nominee statement using consultants if they are deemed necessary; 4) review the referee letters; 5) vet external members for subpanels; 6) vet the draft of the case statement and other materials as needed; 7) provide input to the Executive Vice President, the Executive Vice Dean and the Chair of PTC on the witnesses to appear before the PTC; 8) provide other input to the Executive Vice President, the Executive Vice Dean and Chair of the PTC as needed; 9) attend the reviews within their divisions as an observer, without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the PTC; 9) assist the Executive Vice President in drafting the letter that goes the Provost with the dossiers of successful candidates.

Scheduling of the Meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Assistant Director for Academic Affairs schedules regular standing meetings of the PTC in advance of the fall semester. The PTC meets at regular intervals from September through May. The PTC chair and the Executive Vice President will establish the committee's calendar of work and set agendas for each meeting.

To ensure that the PTC has adequate time to prepare, the Assistant Director for Academic Affairs normally does not start to schedule the review until the review panel has received the candidate's dossier.

While the Assistant Director for Academic Affairs makes every effort to find a time that is convenient for everyone who may participate in the review to attend, it is not always possible to avoid conflicts with other responsibilities. Since tenure is of the highest importance to the University, it may be necessary to ask participants to reschedule other commitments so that they are available to attend a committee meeting. PTC meetings take precedence over all other committee assignments and all administrative duties within the University. In some cases, it may also be necessary to ask participants to rearrange meetings with students and occasionally classes in order to provide sufficient time for the committee's deliberations.

While every effort is made to accommodate the witnesses, it may be necessary to ask the dean or the chair of the nominating unit for someone else to testify on behalf of the candidate, or to proceed with the committee meeting without an individual who cannot attend. If the dean or the chair considers both of these alternatives detrimental to the nominee's case, he or she may ask the Executive Vice President to delay the meeting to a time when the witness is available.

It is not always possible to arrange for all members of the review panel to attend the meeting in person. The Executive Vice President may, therefore, choose to have members participate by videoconferencing or by telephone.

All PTC members must attend the first four PTC meetings of the year and, thereafter, all meetings of the tenure reviews to which they are assigned as review panel members (by phone or videoconference where necessary) for the maintenance and communication of uniform standards. No review may occur without the participation of all the review panel members assigned to it.

Tenure reviews and completion of tenure reviews will not be delayed due to the unavailability of administrators who have the right to attend as observers.

Tenure Review

It is the responsibility of each review panel, working under the guidance of the chair of the PTC, to conduct a thorough and independent review of the nomination under consideration. The review panel should not feel pressured by external circumstances to come to a hasty judgment. At the same time, fairness to the candidate and the deadline for forwarding the case to the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC) require that the review panel complete its review and reach its decision as soon as it responsibly can.

The work of the review panel begins with the careful review of the nominee's dossier and the careful reading of the candidate's scholarly work by the subpanel. While referee evaluations provide the committee with the views of leading scholars in the nominee's field, these cannot substitute for the subpanel's reasoned assessment of the quality of the nominee's scholarship.

The chairs of the PTC and the subpanel are responsible for ensuring that the dossier is sufficient to meet the review panel's needs. The chair of the subpanel is expected to consult with the rest of the subpanel in advance of the meeting to determine whether further information is needed and to alert each member to any concerns that other members might have about the nomination.

After evaluating the documentation presented by the nominating department or school, the review panel may make any further inquiries it feels are necessary to ensure that it has sufficient information about the proposed appointment. For example, the review panel has the right to request that the Executive Vice President solicit additional referee evaluations or to ask for further written statements from the nominating unit. It may also ask for additional witnesses, even from outside the University, if it is not satisfied that those suggested by the department or school will enable it to make an informed judgment about the nomination.

The subpanel may meet in advance of the meeting to discuss and prepare the case for presentation to the review panel, but will only vote at the same time as the review panel at the conclusion of the full deliberations. The subpanel is responsible for reading both the dossier and the set of representative written work. The remaining members of the review panel are responsible for reading the dossier for each candidate, but not the set of representative written work.

The PTC chair conducts the meetings of the review panel. If the chair of the PTC is serving on the subpanel assigned to read the candidate's work or is unable to attend a meeting, the Executive Vice President in consultation with the chair of the PTC will select an acting chair of the PTC. The Executive Vice President or a representative attends all PTC meetings and may actively participate in the questioning of witnesses and in the discussion of the committee. When appropriate, other individuals such as the relevant divisional dean are invited to attend the meetings as an observer, without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the PTC. The divisional dean may not actively participate in the questioning of witnesses and the discussion.

The chair of the subpanel leads the discussion about the nominee's qualifications. If the review panel decides that additional information, testimony, or deliberation is required, the review is resumed at a subsequent meeting or subsequent meetings until the deliberations are complete. Once the review panel has concluded its deliberations its seven members, the five PTC members and the two outside members, vote on the nomination by open vote. The chair of the subpanel conveys the recommendation to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences in writing, providing the vote and the reasons for the vote.

The PTC serves in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice President who is not bound by the recommendation. In particular, a split vote in favor of a candidate is not a strong recommendation. In addition to the final vote, the Executive Vice President weighs the evidence presented to the committee and the discussion of the members at their meeting before deciding whether or not to accept their recommendation. The Executive Vice President may also obtain additional information after the meeting before reaching a decision on the nomination, such as written assessments of the nominee from the members of the PTC or further written or verbal evaluations from experts at other institutions. Upon completion of his or her review, the Executive Vice President submits a recommendation to the Provost, along with the dossier, for consideration by the Provost's Standing Committee on Tenure – the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC). When forwarding a candidate to the Provost for the next level of review, the Executive Vice President will provide the Provost with a written account of the PTC's vote and the reasons for the decision. The Executive Vice President will convey the outcome of each case to the department chair who may inform the candidate whether the case has been forwarded to the Provost for the next level of review.

Confidentiality

While the membership of the PTC is public information, all aspects of its proceedings are conducted with strict confidentiality. Committee members, witnesses, and any others who are involved with the tenure review process in any way are expected to maintain confidentiality at all times. Because of the need for confidentiality, the membership of the review panel and its meeting date are made known only to individuals who participate in its constitution or deliberations. The content of the discussion about a nomination and the actual vote are similarly restricted to the members of the review panel and to the Executive Vice President or his representatives. Anyone involved in a review who wishes to discuss the proceedings should do so by communicating not to a member of the PTC but with the Executive Vice Dean or the Chair of the PTC.

Part Two

Preparations for a Nomination to Tenure for the Promotion and Tenure Committee

Part II of this document is intended to assist departments and schools in preparing their tenure nominations in a thorough and timely manner, so as to avoid the delays that will result from incomplete documentation or late submission. It contains guidelines on the required materials that should be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President and, in the final section, provides a schedule for their submission. A checklist of the required materials is included at the end of this section.

The PTC begins its evaluation of a nomination with the information provided in the dossier. It is therefore in the interest of the nominating unit to present its case as clearly and coherently as possible, addressing all of the issues that the PTC is expected to consider. The following outline of the required materials should be read in reference to Part I of this document, particularly the sections that describe the "Criteria for an Appointment to Tenure" and the "Evidence Considered by the PTC" and to the timeline attached to these guidelines, "Steps in a Positive Tenure Review."

It is the responsibility of the chair or dean making the nomination to see that the materials required for the dossier are complete, accurate, and submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President on schedule.

Preliminary Preparations

Internal Promotions to Tenure

For internal promotions to tenure, the tenure review process begins, when in the first week of October, the Office of Academic Affairs in the Arts and Science sends to each department chair and academic department administrator: 1) a list of faculty who must be considered for tenure in the subsequent year; and 2) Service Records that provide the review schedules of each non-tenured faculty member. Typically on the review list are: associate professors in their 6th counted year of service who were hired as assistant professors, and associate professors, hired as such, in their second or third year of counted service.

By the beginning of December, if the department wishes to consider whether to solicit referee letters for the candidate, the department is asked to request authorization from the Executive Vice President to conduct a review. In its request, which is sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, the department should provide, for each candidate, information on the department's need for a tenured appointment in the field of specialization, an initial assessment of the likelihood of the nomination, and a preliminary assessment of the candidate's qualifications for tenure. Normally within two weeks of receiving the department's request, the Executive Vice President will decide whether or not to authorize the department to conduct a review.

By mid-January, the department chair invites the candidate to prepare dossier materials. The department chair's written invitation asks the candidate to submit a curriculum vitae, a representative set of written work, published and unpublished, and a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages that discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects. At the department's discretion, deadlines for the candidates to submit dossier materials to the department may be anywhere from the beginning of February to the third week of March.

By the beginning of April, the department decides whether to proceed to the letter-writing stage and notifies the Office of Academic Affairs of its decision.

External Promotions to Tenure

For external promotions to tenure, the tenure review process begins when the department has completed the recruitment process.

Every effort should be made to identify external candidates as early as possible in the academic year. The University, along with most other major universities, endorses the AAUP policy guideline that sets May 15th as the last date on which an offer can be made to a faculty member at another institution for appointment the following fall. The offer cannot be contingent upon a favorable outcome of a tenure review. To meet the AAUP deadline, chairs and deans should send the Office of the Executive Vice President the nominations and dossiers for their external candidates by February 17. Recognizing that negotiations with faculty at other universities can be protracted and delicate, the PTC will attempt to conduct evaluations of external candidates nominated after that date. However, if the review cannot be conducted by TRAC by May 15th, the Executive Vice President will have to obtain a waiver of the AAUP's deadline from the candidate's institution before it can occur.

Submission of Preliminary Review Materials

Once the department has decided to forward the candidate to the letter-writing stage, the department submits the following materials to the Office of Academic Affairs by the first week of April in the case of internal candidates for promotion to tenure and as soon as is feasible in the case of external candidates for tenured appointments:

- 1) a curriculum vitae (cv) for the candidate;
- 2) a list of three scholars at other institutions familiar with the candidate's field of specialization whom the Executive Vice President might consult;
- 3) an annotated list of 18-20 referees to whom the Executive Vice President might write for letters;
- 4) an annotated list of 5-6 scholars in the candidate's field with whom he or she might be compared;
- 5) a list of 4 members of the Columbia faculty with expertise in the candidate's field or in fields cognate with the candidate's, who may be appointed by the Executive Vice President to serve on the PTC subpanel for the candidate's review;
- 6) a description of the candidate's field(s) of study.

Solicitation of Referee Letters

Once the lists have been vetted, the Executive Assistant to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences prepares to solicit the referee letters. Before sending the letters, she asks the chair to review the draft of the referee letter, with particular reference to the deadline for the receipt of letters. Normally, the deadline given is six weeks from the date of the solicitation. In some cases, however, it is possible to set a deadline one month from that date or, if necessary, to allow a longer period before the due date. In these cases, the chair is always consulted. At this time, the Executive Assistant also asks the chair to confirm that the publications are ready to send to the referees.

Once the letters are solicited, the referees respond to the Executive Assistant indicating their willingness to provide a letter or declining to write. Those who indicate their willingness to write frequently request publications. In these cases the Executive Assistant forwards the email to a designated point person in the department who is responsible for sending the publication sets to the referees who request them.

The Executive Assistant sends follow-up letters after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request. It may also be necessary to contact them by phone. The timing and form of these reminders is determined by the urgency of the tenure review. The Executive Assistant thanks each referee and forwards the tally sheet and the letters as they arrive to the department chair.

Department or School Review, Deliberation and Vote

The department conducts the review according to its procedures. The tenured members of the department discuss the case and vote on whether to recommend appointment to tenure.

Preparation and Vetting of Case Statement

The chair or dean prepares the case statement according to the specifications in Part I of this document. Once the case statement is prepared, the chair or dean forwards the case statement electronically to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Submission of Materials

Once the Associate Vice President indicates that the case statement has been vetted, the materials should be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President by hard copy or electronically on a CD-ROM or flash drive with the exception of published books which must be submitted in hard copy.

Dossier Checklist

The materials submitted should include all of the items listed below. The omission of any materials without the approval of the Office of the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences may delay the review.

- ☐ 1. Case Statement (Analysis of the department or school and its objectives, Report on the search and selection process and/or the Summary of the Department Review Process and the Statement of the Nominee's Qualifications)
- ☐ 2. Statement of the nominee
- ☐ 3. Copy of the Department's or School's Search Report or Review Committee Report and other internal review materials such as departmental letters of evaluation, *if obtained*
- ☐ 4. Assessment of Barnard counterpart department
- ☐ 5. Curriculum Vitae
- ☐ 6. Evidence of contributions to the educational purpose of the department or school, such as syllabi
- ☐ 7. Evidence of teaching qualifications, including evaluations
- ☐ 8. List of publications and publication set
- ☐ 9. Annotated list of referees, *if not already submitted*
- ☐ 10. Annotated list of comparison scholars, *if not already submitted*
- ☐ 11. List of witnesses to appear before the PTC
- ☐ 12. All materials collected for any previous review for tenure, regardless of whether a decision was made or deferred at either the school/departmental or University-wide level

Compilation of the Dossier

The Executive Assistant prepares the full dossier according to the specifications in the Provost's Guidelines. Once it is prepared, it is distributed to the Chair of the PTC, who determines whether it may be sent to the members of the review panel.

Preparations for PTC Review

Once the dossier is deemed ready to distribute, the Assistant Director of Academic Affairs distributes it to the review panel in hard copy or electronically on a CD-ROM or flash drive. As soon as the chair of the subpanel and the chair of the PTC have indicated that the dossier is sufficient to meet the PTC's needs, the Assistant Director of Academic Affairs schedules the review.

Preparations for TRAC Review

Upon completion of the PTC review and his or her own review, the Executive Vice President submits a recommendation to the Provost which includes a written account of the vote and the candidate's dossier, and conveys the outcome of each case to the department chair who may inform the candidate.

Steps in a Successful Tenure Review - Initiated in 2011-12 for Tenure Review to Occur in 2012-13

Step	Time Frame	Action	Contact Person
1	First week of October, 2011	The Office of Academic Affairs sends list of faculty to chair who must be reviewed in 2011-12 for consideration for tenure in 2012-13 as part of the Service Record email to department chair and academic department administrator.	Michael Susi, Associate Director of Academic Affairs
2	By December 5, 2011	Department requests authorization from Divisional Dean to conduct a review via Office of Academic Affairs, providing the following information: 1) Department's need for tenured appointment in field of specialization 2) Initial assessment of likelihood of nomination 3) Preliminary assessment of candidate's qualifications for tenure	Department Chair Michael Susi
3	By December 16, 2011	Divisional dean authorizes the department to conduct a review.	Divisional Dean
4	By January 17, 2012	Department invites candidate to prepare materials and names review committee. Written invitation asks candidate to gather: 1) updated curriculum vitae 2) a representative set of written work, published and unpublished 3) brief statement of 5-10 pages that discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects.	Department Chair
5	From February 1 to March 23, 2012	Candidate submits materials to department.	Department Chair
6	By March 30, 2012	On the basis of the review, department determines whether to proceed to the letter writing stage. Department chair notifies Office of Academic Affairs of its decision.	Department Chair Michael Susi
7	By first week of April, 2012	Department chair submits to Office of Academic Affairs for approval by divisional dean: 1) an updated curriculum vitae (dated at top) 2) a list of three consultants whom the EVPAS might consult 3) an annotated list of 18-20 referees to whom the EVPAS might write for letters 4) an annotated list of 5-6 scholars in the candidate's field with who he or she might be compared 5) a list of 4 members of the Columbia faculty who might serve on the PTC subpanel (with expertise in the candidate's field, or in fields cognate with the candidate's) 6) a description of the candidate's field(s) of study	Department Chair Michael Susi
8	From April 16 until May 1, 2012	Department prepares publication sets in electronic or hard copy so that they are available for mailing to referees. At least 10 sets should be available for mailing. If books are in print, they must be purchased to use in the publication set.	Department Chair's designee.
9	From May 1 to May 30, 2012	EVPAS solicits letters via email from referees. Executive Assistant checks with chair to review the letter draft and approve the deadline before sending.	Ruby Cruz, Executive Assistant to EVPAS Department Chair
10	From June 1 to August 31, 2011	Executive Assistant forwards referee letters as they arrive to the chair.	Ruby Cruz

		Chair designee mails/emails publication sets to those referees who request them. Executive Assistant sends follow-up emails after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request.	Department Chair and designee Michael Susi
11	From September 10 to October 1, 2012	The department conducts a review according to its procedures. Chair forwards the materials used by the department in its deliberations to the chair of the parallel Barnard department. The letter of transmittal should request a written letter of assessment from the Barnard department, including a record of the vote taken. The chair of the Barnard department prepares a statement of its assessment of the candidate's qualifications that transmits the vote of the department.	Department Chair Barnard Department Chair
12	From September 15 to November 15, 2012	Department chair prepares the case statement according to the specifications in Part I of the attached document. Department chair forwards the department vote and case statement, in a WORD document via email, to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.	Department Chair Margaret Edsall
13	From October 3 to November 15, 2012	Once the Associate Vice President indicates that the case statement has been vetted by the divisional dean, the supporting materials below should be submitted in electronically on a CD-ROM or flash drive to the Associate Director (with the exception of published books which should be submitted at the same time but in hard copy.) • candidate's updated cv (dated at top) • vetted case statement • updated statement of the nominee (teaching & research) • department review committee report, if obtained • assessment of Barnard counterpart department • evidence of contributions to the educational purpose of the department • teaching qualifications, including evaluations • list of articles, unpublished manuscripts and books included • articles and unpublished manuscripts • additional materials (if any) – book reviews, prizes, teaching citations, etc. • annotated list of referees and comparisons, if not already submitted • list of witnesses to appear before the PTC • 9 sets of books (hard copy), if any	Margaret Edsall Michael Susi Department Chair and designee
14	From November 4, 2012 to February 17, 2013	Promotion and Tenure Committee Review – Dossier distributed; PTC review scheduled; Once the PTC has reviewed the candidate, the Executive Vice President provides the Provost with a written account of the vote, and Executive Dean conveys outcome to department chair who informs the candidate.	David Eisenberg, Assistant Director of Academic Affairs
15	November 7, 2012 to February 20, 2013	Executive Vice President forwards recommendation for tenure with complete dossier to Provost.	Ruby Cruz
16		Once dossier is deemed ready to distribute, the case is forwarded to the Tenure Review Advisory Committee for consideration.	Stephen Rittenberg, Vice Provost Angel Flesher, Manager of Tenure Reviews

17		Tenure Review Advisory Committee Review	Stephen Rittenberg
18		Provost confers with President on candidate's tenurability.	Stephen Rittenberg
19		Provost notifies Executive Vice President and department chair of decision.	John Coatsworth, Interim Provost
20		Department chair notifies candidate.	Department Chair
21		Executive Vice President sends letter confirming result.	Ruby Cruz
22		Trustees authorize tenure of candidate; communication to department chair and ADA from Academic Affairs	Michael Susi
23		Secretary's Office sends letter of Trustee action	Pearl Spiro, Associate Provost, Academic Appointments