

Tenure Evaluation Procedures for External Cases

Revised and Approved by Tenured February 11, 2020.

Preamble

- The purpose of our promotion and tenure processes is to create and maintain an excellent and diverse faculty by evaluating faculty members' past accomplishments and anticipated future achievements, in an equitable and, to the extent appropriate, transparent process.
 - Consistent with University policy, the primary basis for a promotion to untenured associate, to tenure, or to full professor is research productivity and impact. Teaching, collegiality, and service (to the division, school, and broader academic community) also matter.
1. Criteria for tenure and University rules for the tenure process are described in "[Principles and Customs Governing University-wide Tenure Reviews](#) ¹." Below are procedures and customs at the Business School.
 2. The role of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee and election of its members is outlined in the Business School's [By-Laws](#). The role of the Senior Vice Dean of Faculty Affairs (SVD) as the chair of Promotion and Tenure Committee is non-voting. The SVD is responsible for insuring that policy is followed and tasks are executed, but not for canvassing or presenting cases.
 3. The tenured faculty members in the Division meet to decide whether to consider a candidate for tenure
 - a. If it is agreed by the division that a candidate's case will be considered, the chair confers with the candidate to confirm interest in consideration and to specify required materials which would normally include a c.v., 3-5 of the candidates most important research papers and a personal statement (as described below). For external candidates, a waiver of the personal statement can be requested from the Provost. These documents must be submitted and available to the reading committee and the division at least one week in advance of the meeting at which they will consider the case.
 - b. A reading committee of tenured faculty members is formed in the Division to read and evaluate the candidate's research. This committee presents its conclusions to the tenured faculty in the division (including pros and cons of the case).
 - c. The tenured faculty members in the division carefully review the candidate's research, teaching, and service based on the submitted materials and vote on whether they recommend moving the case forward (by soliciting external reference letters). A quorum for the meeting is 50% of the tenured faculty members in the division who are not on leave. Faculty members on leave may participate and vote, and their vote and participation should be counted (as if they were not on leave) in both the numerator and denominator when determining if a quorum has been reached. If they are not participating, they should not be counted in the denominator when determining if a quorum has been reached.
 - i. In person attendance at this meeting is strongly encouraged, but if this is not possible, then phone attendance is permitted with prior approval from the Divisional Chair.
 - ii. Each member of the Division who is present votes using a signed ballot with options of yes, no, or abstain.² Votes are counted by the divisional chair or staff person.

¹ University Procedure:

<https://provost.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Faculty%20Affairs/Tenure%20Guidelines%202019-20.pdf>

² Throughout the document, the reported % in favor should be calculated by the number of yes votes over the number of people present, thus abstain votes are included in the denominator.

- iii. Ballots are only shared with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and are otherwise private. The tally of the vote is recorded and shared with the tenured faculty and the case is passed to the P&T Committee for review.
4. If the division's vote is at least 70% in favor of the nomination then the Division must submit the following material to the Dean's office for the P&T Committee review (please see the University guidelines for a detailed explanation of these documents which are required by the University):
- a. The candidate's current curriculum vitae (c.v.)
 - b. Copies of 3 to 5 of the candidate's most important research papers or publications
 - c. Unless waived by the provost, a personal statement from the candidate that describes both past and future research. Details on research should be included here (not in the division statement). This statement will be sent to all letter writers per TRAC's guidance if and when letters are solicited.
 - d. A procedural checklist confirming that the process and timeline for the divisional review was completed in accordance with policy.
 - e. A divisional statement that assesses the quality of the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service and makes the case for tenure.
 - f. A list of recommended senior letter writers along with a detailed justification for their choice.³ This list must include ten senior letter writers (all tenured faculty) and may include alternates as well. This list may be modified by the P&T Committee. (As per the University Guidelines, the candidate should not be consulted and the information listed should include complete credentials as well as any prior or current associations the reviewer has with the candidate (e.g. co-authors, colleagues, advisor/advisee, classmates etc.)
 - g. A comparison/peer list of tenured faculty⁴, all of whom are in the primary field of the candidate. This list must include eight comparison/peer letter writers. Alternate letter writers may also be specified on the list. This list may be modified by the P&T Committee. (As per the University Guidelines, the candidate should not be consulted and the information listed should include complete credentials as well as any prior or current associations the reviewer has with the candidate (e.g. co-authors, colleagues, advisor/advisee, classmates etc.)
 - h. In addition to materials required by the Provost, the Division is asked to provide cite counts for the candidate and their peer-comparison list. The required cite count used is that reported by the Institute for Scientific Information's Web of Science, that counts cites by published papers to the candidate's research. A second measure (based on Google Scholar) can also be reported. It includes cites by unpublished working papers to the candidate's published and unpublished research and can be thought of as a "leading indicator" that is more appropriate for younger scholars who have not had as much time for their research to have an impact in Web of Science's count.

³ University Procedure (see page 8) says: "The dean or executive vice president responsible for obtaining the evaluations selects the scholars who will be asked for referee letters, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department, division, or school. Scholars at other universities may also be consulted in compiling the list of referees, **but not the nominee.**"

⁴ The University discourages including non-tenured faculty on the comparison list, although requests for exceptions may be to the Senior Vice Dean if there are exceptional circumstances. If an exception is made, letters are not solicited from the untenured candidates. Only tenured faculty members are asked to write letters.

5. If the Division votes to proceed with a tenure case and to prepare materials, the Dean's Office must also send the c.v. of the candidate to the tenured faculty at least one week in advance of the P&T Committee meeting.
6. The P&T Committee conducts a detailed evaluation of the case, by appointing a subcommittee of two members. Subcommittee members confer individually with all members of the tenured faculty in the Division. The P&T Committee will then proceed to conduct a detailed evaluation of the case based on the submitted materials and findings of the subcommittee.
7. The P&T Committee then takes a vote in order to advise the Dean whether or not to proceed with the tenure review and solicit external referee letters. Each member of the P&T committee must vote yes or no. (There is no vote of the tenured faculty about whether to go out for letters for external tenure appointments.) The Committee may also recommend changes to the list of letter writers.
8. Based on the outcome of the votes of the Division and the P&T Committee, the Dean decides whether to solicit external referee letters from all names on the senior faculty list and all tenured faculty on the comparison/peer list using the University's approved text⁵. The senior letter writers are sent the tenure candidate's c.v. and list of all the names of peer comparisons as well as 3- 5 publications. The peer writers are sent candidate's c.v., 3-5 publications, and list of peer comparisons, with their own names omitted from the comparison list. If a personal statement was solicited, it should be included as well. Letter writers do not receive the divisional statement or the cite counts.
9. The Division meets again to review the tenure case and the external letters. Each member of the Division present at the meeting (either in person or over the telephone) votes on whether to recommend tenure using a signed ballot with options of yes, no, or abstain. Ballots are only shared with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean, and the Senior Vice Dean of Faculty Affairs and, if the case is forwarded to TRAC, with the Provost's Office. The tally of the vote is recorded and shared with the tenured faculty. The case, including the Division's post-letter addendum, is sent to the P&T Committee for review.
10. The P&T Committee meets to review the tenure case and the external letters and votes on whether to recommend tenure. P&T members vote on the strength of the tenure case using with a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 representing a strong tenure case and 1 representing a weak tenure case. A vote of 3 or 4 is considered a vote in favor of the case, and 1 or 2 is a vote against the case.
11. If there is less than 70% support from both the divisional faculty and the P&T committee, the process normally ends, but the Dean may decide that the case should be forwarded to the tenured faculty of the School.
12. The tenured faculty of the Business School meets to discuss the case and vote using a signed ballot on whether to recommend tenure. Ballots are only shared with the Dean, the Senior Vice Dean of Faculty Affairs, and if the case is forwarded to TRAC, with the Provost, and are otherwise private. Voters must identify themselves on the ballot so the Dean and the Provost may contact voters to understand their position. Quoting from the university Tenure Guidelines document (p. 4): "The decision on whether to nominate is made by an open vote or by signed ballots. Faculty who do not vote affirmatively will be asked to provide the Office of the Vice Provost with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention." The tally of the vote is announced to the tenured faculty after all cases in the current cycle are considered. Normally, a vote of at least 70% in favor would be necessary for the Dean to move the

⁵ See pages 23-24 of University Procedure

case forward to the University's standing Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC). In person participation is required to vote.

13. The case is reviewed by the Provost's Office according to the procedure outlined in the university document, and a recommendation is made to the President
14. Once the President has made a decision, the Provost informs the Dean's office of the decision. The Dean's office informs the candidate.
15. If the Provost's recommendation is positive and the President's decision is positive, then the appointment is forwarded to the Trustees for approval.