

**Summary of Tenure Process for External Tenure Cases**

1. Criteria for tenure and University rules for the tenure process are described in “[Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews (2011)](http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia_University_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf)[[1]](#footnote-1).” Below are procedures and customs at the Business School.
2. The tenured faculty in the Division meet to decide whether to nominate an external candidate for tenure. The tenured faculty in the division vote. If a majority of eligible tenured faculty[[2]](#footnote-2) wish to proceed, then the tenure case is passed to the Promotions and Tenure (P&T) Committee to review the case and advise the Dean whether or not to proceed with the tenure review and solicit external referee letters.
3. If the Division votes to proceed with a tenure case, it must prepare the following materials to the Dean’s office for the P&T Committee review:
   1. A Divisional Statement
   2. A curriculum vitae
   3. Copies of 5 of the candidate’s most important research papers or publications
   4. A personal statement from the candidate (May be waived by the dean for external candidates.)

Please see pages 5-6 and 14-22 of the university guidelines for detailed explanation of these documents which are required by the University.

* 1. A list of recommended letter writers and comparable faculty.[[3]](#footnote-3)
  + For candidates who do not have tenure at another institution, the list must include 10 senior letter writers (all tenured faculty), and a comparison list of 8 faculty (with 1-3 untenured faculty and the remainder tenured faculty. Letters are not solicited from untenured faculty).
  + For external senior candidates, who have tenure at another institution, the list will consist of 7 senior letter writers and a comparison list of 8 peer writers - all of whom must have tenure.

All tenured faculty members on the comparison lists are letter writers.

* 1. Cite Counts

*(May be submitted after the P&T review and letter solicitation described in part 4 and 5 below*)

In addition to materials required by the Provost, the Division is asked to provide cite counts for the candidate and their cohort group. This should consist of two counts. The first is a commonly used ‘industry-standard’ reported by Institute for Scientific Information’s Web of Science for their identification of heavily cited scholars, articles, and journal impact factors. The second measure includes working papers and can be thought of as “leading indicator” that is more appropriate for younger scholars who have not had as much time for their published work to have an impact.

1. The P&T Committee conducts a detailed evaluation of the case. 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.
2. Upon the recommendation of the P&T Committee, the Dean’s office solicits external referee letters from all names on the senior faculty list and all tenured faculty on the peer list using the University’s approved text[[4]](#footnote-4). The senior letter writers are sent the tenure candidate’s c.v. and list of all the names of peer comparisons as well as 5 publications. The peer writers are sent candidate’s c.v., 5 publications, and list of peer comparisons, with their names omitted from the comparison list. Letter writers do not receive the divisional or candidate’s statements or the cite counts.
3. The Division meets again to review the tenure case after receiving the letters. The Division votes on whether to recommend proceeding with the tenure case.
4. The P&T Committee meets to review the tenure case and letters and vote on whether to recommend proceeding to the School’s tenured faculty. P&T members vote with a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 representing a strong recommendation in favor of granting tenure and 1 representing a strong recommendation against granting tenure.
5. The tenured faculty of the Business School meets to discuss the case and vote on whether to recommend tenure using a secret ballot. Voters must identify themselves on the ballot so the Dean and the Provost may contact voters to understand any objections.
6. In order for a case to proceed, a strong positive vote (a 2/3 majority is a bare minimum) is required, as well as the endorsement of the Dean. If the case moves forward, a dossier (statements, papers, c.v., and letters) is submitted electronically on a CD-ROM or flash drive to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration..
7. The case is reviewed by the Provost’s Office according to the procedure outlined in the university document.
8. Once the President has made a decision, the Provost informs the Dean’s office of their decision. The Dean’s office informs the candidate.
9. Trustees approve recommendation, if positive.

1. University Procedure: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia\_University\_Tenure\_Guidelines.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. University Procedure (see page 4) requires a majority of eligible tenured faculty, and an open vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. University Procedure (see page 7) 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. The nominee is not consulted in compiling the list of referees.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See pages 23-24 of University Procedure [↑](#footnote-ref-4)