**Annual Review Process for Junior Tenure-track Faculty Members at Columbia Business School**

Columbia Business School strives for a clear and transparent annual feedback process for tenure-track faculty members. Our goal is for junior faculty members to have the information they need to understand the promotion and tenure process, and the feedback and guidance from their tenured colleagues to understand their progress against the very high standards for research, teaching, and service required to be granted tenure at Columbia University.

This document is intended to outline the annual review process and list some best practices for implementation.

* Each January, all faculty members are asked to submit a “Faculty Activity Report” (FAR) form, along with a CV and an “Outside Activities Report” reporting on the previous calendar year to the Dean’s Office.
  + The FAR is used for many purposes, including the Division’s annual review of junior faculty progress, the Dean’s Office review for all faculty salary increases, and by the External Relations and Marketing and Communications departments, to better understand faculty work.
* The FAR and CVs of junior faculty members are sent to the Divisional Chairs.
* New working papers and publications should also be requested from junior faculty by the division at this time if they were not requested earlier in the year.
* Each Division assigns tenured faculty members to write a formal review of their junior colleagues.
  + Reviews are drafted for each junior faculty member and agreed to and signed off on by the entire tenured faculty of the division.
  + Reviews must to be delivered to the Dean’s Office in February or March for review and approval in advance of sharing them with the faculty member.
  + If reviews are controversial, the Division is encouraged to discuss them with the Dean’s Office early in the process
  + The tenured faculty members who wrote the review, then meet with the junior faculty member, normally in person, to deliver the review and discuss its contents with them.
  + The reviews normally cover the following topics:
    - Formal reminders of the criteria for earning tenure at Columbia
    - Discussion of research, both published and in progress, noting implications of questions addressed, evidence of impact, clarity of field definition, research design, etc.
    - Discussion of teaching efforts and results
    - Discussion of service to the School and University
    - Discussion of activity in the field beyond the University
    - Overall assessment of progress against promotion and tenure benchmarks
  + While the reviews are intended to be honest assessments by tenured faculty members, they of course, just reflect the consensus opinion of the Division’s tenured faculty, and are thus never a guarantee of a specific future outcome.

Best Practices for Divisions in Annual Review Process for Junior Faculty Members

* Normally it is preferred for two tenured faculty members to collaborate on the review of each junior faculty member.
* It is ideal for there to be a rotation through the senior faculty members so that each year there is a primary and secondary reviewer for each junior faculty member, and the senior person rotates off after the second year.
  + This is recommended because it creates some continuity among reviews, but also brings fresh perspective, and expands the number of senior faculty members who are familiar with the junior faculty member’s work.
* It is usually helpful if review assignments are made in the summer or fall of the year for the following spring review so that reviewers have more time to become familiar with the work and progress of their junior colleagues.
* If the Division has a mentor strategy that assigns formal mentors to each junior faculty member, then it is best to keep the mentor out of the rotation for the formal annual reviews.