

# Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) of the Arts and Sciences

## Tenure Review Guidelines - July 1, 2025

### Introduction and Overview

A candidate for tenure in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences undergoes a rigorous review process, first by the tenured faculty of the nominating department(s), or in the case of School of the Arts, the nominating division and school.

Then, the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences depends on a standing committee to conduct an Arts and Sciences level evaluation. The purpose of this review 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.

If successful, the nomination is then reviewed by a University-wide standing committee (Tenure Review Advisory Committee, or TRAC). Subsequent approval is then required of the Provost, President and the Board of Trustees.

Part I of this document provides an overview of the policies and procedures for conducting tenure reviews at the Arts & Sciences level. It describes how the PTC is constituted, the work of the PTC, and the manner in which the meetings are conducted. Part II and the appendices provide guidelines and worksheets for schools and departments to follow in preparing materials for referee solicitation letters and preparing the candidate's dossier for the PTC (and TRAC) reviews. It also includes contacts and a timeline for submitting materials to the Office of Academic Affairs of the Office of the Executive Vice President for Arts & Sciences.

## Part I

### Criteria for an Appointment to Tenure

The criteria for an appointment to tenure are set forth in the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews" which are available at

[https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure_Guidelines.pdf) (pages 2-3)

They are reprinted here:

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/division and/or school.

Nomination to tenure is the occasion for a department/division and/or school to consider its current condition and its future direction. Because of the financial implications of tenure, it may not fill a tenure position without prior budgetary authorization from the appropriate dean or executive vice president.

The qualifications of the individual proposed to fill the position are even more critical. In every instance, the nominee must be an outstanding scholar who has demonstrated the capacity for imaginative, original work and who shows promise of continuing to make significant contributions to scholarship, teaching, and service. Excellence as a teacher is necessary, and service to the University and discipline is important. Neither however, individually or taken together, is 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 true outstanding quality. Quantity is of lesser concern, although the number of publications, or other materials, may be one of the measures used in assessing the contributions of a candidate's work to their field. 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 have an active scholarly agenda that shows strong promise of yielding answers to fundamental questions in their discipline.

Peer esteem is a valuable measure of scholarly achievement. Established scholars must be widely recognized as among the leaders in their disciplines. Junior scholars must have achieved a level of scholarly accomplishment that demonstrates extraordinary promise and who can be expected, with a high degree of confidence, to become leaders in their disciplines.

A comparable standard applies 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 field.

These criteria must necessarily be interpreted with flexibility to accommodate the differing disciplines of the candidates and the missions of their departments/divisions and/or schools. Because the scholarship candidates pursue can vary, measures used to evaluate the quality of work will appropriately vary as well. Nonetheless, all candidates must meet a common University-wide expectation.

Regardless of the type of scholarly or other work in which they are engaged, all 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 that standard rests with the nominating department/division and/or school. TRAC will recommend in favor of awarding tenure only if it finds that the department/division or school has provided a compelling affirmative case for the nomination.

## **Nomination to Tenure**

Every nomination to tenure requires a positive vote by the tenured faculty in the relevant department(s) 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.

## **Selection of the Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The PTC consists of approximately fifteen full professors in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, representing the departments of the Social Sciences, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and the School of the Arts, who typically serve for three-year terms. Occasionally, faculty will serve for a shorter term, and may replace PTC members on leave. PTC members may choose to continue service to the PTC during a semester of leave. The PTC members are appointed by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the divisional deans and chair of the PTC. The

chair of the PTC is appointed by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the divisional deans.

### **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 and the divisional deans. The review panel consists of a reading subpanel of two tenured Columbia faculty members not on the PTC (the external, or 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 members of the subpanel will be asked to be chair of the subpanel. The remainder of the review panel consists of two supplemental 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 the search committee that selected the candidate, be in the same department as the candidate, or voted on the candidacy at any stage. The outside members may hold tenured appointments in any faculty in the University. Retired members of the tenured faculty may also serve as outside members when the chair of 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.

### **Evidence Considered by the PTC**

The evidence considered by the PTC includes supporting statements – a case statement prepared by the department, a teaching and research statement prepared by the candidate, and in some departments, the report of an internal review panel – along with the candidate's cv, solicited external referee letters, the candidate's representative publications, syllabi and teaching evaluations, and the testimony of witnesses. These materials are described in detail in the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews" which are available at

[https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure_Guidelines.pdf) (pp. 12-23)

## **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 referee solicitation materials (cv, teaching/research statement, names of referees, consultants, comparison scholars, selected publications, etc., described in Part II) for all individuals whom they expect to review for tenure no later than **March 1** of the academic year preceding the expected review. In the case of some nominations, the candidate will not have been identified by the beginning of March. 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.

The dossier (case statement and supporting materials, described in Part II) for internal candidates (meeting their up-out date in the year following the review) must be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President as soon as feasible during the fall semester as Provost requires submission of these dossiers to TRAC by December 15<sup>th</sup>. Therefore the PTC review for these internal candidates must be scheduled in October, November or December. [Please note that the review subpanel of the PTC is usually given three to four weeks to review the materials; therefore the complete dossier should be delivered to Academic Affairs four to five weeks before the PTC review date for vetting and distribution to the subpanel.]

The nominations and complete dossiers for other internal and all external candidates should be submitted as soon as is feasible and no later than mid-January. 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 have been submitted. 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;
- 2) give authorization to the department to advance to the letter writing stage;
- 3) vet the lists of referees and comparables with consultants

- 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) consult with the department chair on the witnesses to appear before the PTC;
- 8) provide other input to the Executive Vice President and the Chair of the PTC as needed;
- 9) attend the PTC review meetings, and where necessary, advise on procedural questions;
- 10) issue a written opinion as to whether the Executive Vice President should recommend the candidate for tenure. This written opinion becomes part of the dossier delivered to TRAC.

### **Scheduling of the Meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVP) schedules regular standing meetings of the PTC in advance of the academic year. The PTC meets weekly from early October through early May.

While scheduling, the AVP makes every effort to find a time that is convenient for everyone who may participate in the review to attend, but 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 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.

Meetings may be held by video-conferencing or in person. For meetings held in person, the Executive Vice President may choose to have members participate by video- or tele-conferencing.

New PTC members are expected to attend two PTC meetings as observers and, thereafter, all meetings of the tenure reviews to which they are assigned as review panel members 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 reading 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 review panel is expected to consult with the reading 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 reading 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 necessarily 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 for that review. The Executive Vice President may attend reviews and may actively participate in the questioning of witnesses and in the discussion of the committee. A Divisional Dean must attend reviews for candidates in their division; if they are unable to attend, another Divisional Dean may be called on to participate.

Witnesses from the candidate's department appear before the PTC review panel to present information about, and answer questions regarding, the need for the tenured appointment and the candidate's qualifications. The department chair, consulting with the Divisional Dean, will choose and invite the witness(es) to participate. 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. A second witness, typically 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 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 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 EVPAS in an informative and candid report which provides the vote and the reasons for the vote and summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case, including any reservations or concerns that arose during the discussion and how they were addressed. Any abstentions or "no" votes will require a statement from the PTC member, and will be attached to the recommendation.

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 Chair of the PTC.

## **Part II**

### **Preparing a Nomination to Tenure for the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC)**

This section 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 appendices, provides a timeline for their submission.

#### **Preliminary Preparations**

##### ***Internal Promotions to Tenure***

For internal promotions to tenure, the tenure review process begins, when in mid- September, the Office of Academic Affairs in the Arts and Sciences sends to each department chair and director of academic administration and finance (DAAF) the Departmental Service Records that provide the review schedules of each non-tenured faculty member, and a list of those faculty who must be considered for tenure in the subsequent year. These include associate professors in their 6<sup>th</sup> 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. At the same time, the Office of Academic Affairs will send to the chair and DAAF, a zip-file of teaching evaluations for candidates in their 6<sup>th</sup> counted year of service. At every stage of the review process, teaching should continue to be examined and evaluated, in addition to the candidate's scholarship, and/or creative work.

At the department's discretion, candidates are invited to submit dossier materials to the department any time before February 1<sup>st</sup>. This includes an updated 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. By the beginning of March, the department decides whether to proceed to the letter-writing stage and notifies the Office of Academic Affairs of its decision.

##### ***External Hires to Tenure***

For external hires to tenure, the tenure review process begins as soon as possible during 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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 dossiers for their external candidates by January 15.

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 15<sup>th</sup>, the Executive Vice President will have to obtain a waiver of the AAUP's deadline from the candidate's institution before it can occur.

### **Solicitation of Referee Letters**

Once the department has decided to forward the candidate to the letter-writing stage, the department submits preliminary review materials to the Office of Academic Affairs by March 1 in the case of internal candidates for promotion to tenure and as soon as is feasible in the case of external candidates.

Please see **A&S TENURE REVIEW List Prep Worksheet** for a full list of the necessary materials.

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.

The Divisional Dean determines the scholars who will be asked for referee letters and serve as the comparison scholars, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department(s) or school, and recommendations made by consultants.

For each nominee, one, or occasionally more, scholars at other institutions who are familiar with the candidate's field of specialization, are selected as **consultant(s)** so that the Divisional Dean on behalf of the EVPAS may consult them at any point in the review process if he or she 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 consultants are recommended by the department and may not include anyone who has participated in the candidate's doctoral or post-doctoral training or who has collaborated, worked or published with the candidate. To avoid the possibility of prior association, the Divisional Dean does not normally ask scholars who served as a colleague at another institution or overlapped with the candidate at an institution when the candidate was a doctoral student or post-doc. Consultant(s) will not be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's tenure review; unused consultants may be asked to write.

**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; they may not, however, be members of Columbia's faculty. Further advice on choosing referees and the latest mandate from the Provost regarding a minimum number of referee letters and the need for their independence from the candidate is contained in the LIST PREP document. At this time, we recommend preparing a list of **15 independent** referees for solicitation for Natural Science candidates and a list of **20 independent** referees in the Social Sciences, Humanities and the Arts. If the number of independent letters received does not exceed the 10 required by TRAC, we may ask for additional recommendations and send for additional letters; this will likely lengthen the review process.

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 5-6 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. The comparison list should include tenured scholars only. However, there may be 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 of evaluating the candidate, the referees are provided with the nominee's curriculum vitae, the nominee's research and teaching statement, and samples of the nominee's written work, and names of the comparison scholars.

Once the lists have been vetted by the Divisional Dean, the Executive Assistant to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences prepares to solicit the referee letters. Before sending the letters, the chair is asked to review the draft of the referee letter, with particular reference to the deadline for the receipt of letters. When the letters are sent in late spring, the deadline given is usually three months 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, generally six to eight weeks. The chair is always consulted in setting this deadline. At this time, the Assistant Vice President also asks the chair or DAAF to confirm that

the hard-copy of any publications (primarily books) are ready to send to the referees, upon request.

Once the letters are solicited, the referees respond to the Executive Assistant indicating their willingness to provide a letter or declining to write. These email responses are forwarded to the department as they are received, and are sent to the chair and DAAF, and/or any additional chair designee. For those who commit to write on behalf of the candidate, the candidate's selected publications (articles, papers and unpublished manuscripts) will be made available to them. However, published books must be purchased by the department and sent to each referee who commits. In this case, the Executive Assistant forwards the email to a designated point person in the department who is responsible for sending any books (and, if requested, the entire publication set) to the referees who commit to writing.

The Executive Assistant sends follow-up letters after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request. 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.

### **Department or School Review, Deliberation and Vote**

When the full set of referee letters is received, the department, or departments in the case of joint appointments, 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 of the Dossier for PTC Review**

Once the department has voted, the chair, or chair designee among the tenured faculty, prepares the dossier. The dossier consists of the case statement and all supporting materials. This is the same dossier that will be submitted to TRAC in the case of a positive outcome at the PTC review.

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. 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.

Please see **A&S TENURE REVIEW Dossier Prep Worksheet** for the full list of necessary materials.

## The Case Statement

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

- Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives
- Report on the Selection Process
- Detailed Report on the Departmental Tenure Vote
- Assessment of the Nominee's Qualifications
  - a) Research and scholarship – this is the centerpiece of the case statement. For a more detailed accounting of what should be in this section, please see the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews"  
[https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure_Guidelines.pdf) (p. 17)
  - b) Teaching qualifications - the department/division or school should discuss the nominee's qualities as a teacher. The case statement must explain what the teaching expectations are in the department/division or school providing information on courses taught, students (both graduate and undergraduate) and postdocs advised, and, where appropriate, participation in curricular development. It also must assess the nominee's effectiveness in the classroom and as a mentor. Evidence of the nominee's educational contributions, such as representative course syllabi and student evaluations must be included. For this purpose, Arts & Sciences will share with the nominating unit(s) all teaching evaluations for internal candidates. External candidates must provide these documents to the nominating unit.
  - c) Service - For a more detailed accounting of what should be in each section, please see the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews" which are available at:  
[https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines/Tenure_Guidelines.pdf) (p. 18)

For **joint appointments**, it is recommended that the participating units prepare a joint case statement, though a separate one prepared by the secondary department and appended after the primary department's case statement is an option.

## Submission of Case Statement and Dossier

Once the case statement is prepared, the chair or dean forwards the case statement electronically to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the relevant Divisional Dean, who vet the document.

Once the Associate Vice President or Divisional Dean indicates that the case statement has been vetted, all dossier materials should be placed on the X: drive to be shared with the Office of the Executive Vice President, with the exception of published books which must be submitted hard-bound (or paperback) in 210 Low Library.

### **Preparations for PTC Review**

The Assistant Vice President prepares the full dossier according to the specifications in the Provost's Guidelines, and once the dossier is deemed complete, distributes it to the review panel.

### **Preparations for TRAC Review**

Upon completion of the PTC review and his or her own review, the Executive Vice President and Divisional Dean submit their recommendations to the Provost, including a written account of the discussion and vote (the PTC panel chair report), and the candidate's dossier, and conveys the outcome of each case to the department chair, who may then inform the candidate.

### **Appendices**

- Steps in a Successful Tenure Review - Timeline
- List Preparation Worksheet
- Dossier Preparation Worksheet