****

**Summary of Tenure Evaluation Procedures for Junior Faculty at Columbia Business School**

**Unanimously approved by the Faculty Executive Committee on December 14, 2011.**

**Clarifying language added and approved by the Faculty Executive Committee in July 2013 and April 2014.**

1. Criteria for tenure and University rules for the tenure process are described in [Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews (2013)](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. Untenured faculty members receive annual written evaluations as well as verbal feedback from senior faculty in their division. They also receive written feedback from the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee when they are put up for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure. Details on promotion to Associate Professor without tenure are at <http://www4.gsb.columbia.edu/null?&exclusive=filemgr.download&file_id=72131>78.
3. By the end of the sixth year on the tenure clock (usually toward the end of the Spring semester), if the candidate agrees, the tenured faculty members in the Division meet to decide whether to consider a candidate for tenure.
	1. A candidate may also be considered for tenure before the end of the sixth year if:
		1. she or he submits a written request to be considered for tenure to the Division Chair and to the Senior Vice Dean, or
		2. if the Division Chair submits a written request to the Senior Vice Dean on behalf of the division and the candidate agrees to this request.
	2. If the candidate does not wish to be considered for tenure at the end of his or her sixth year on the tenure clock, he or she should submit a written note to that effect to the Division Chair and the Senior Vice Dean.
	3. If it is agreed by the division and the candidate that a candidate’s case will be considered, the chair meets with the faculty member to confirm required materials which would normally include a CV, 3-5 of the candidates most important research papers and a personal research statement (as described below).
	4. 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.
	5. The tenured faculty members in the division carefully review the candidate’s research, teaching, and service 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 vote, and their vote should be counted, but if they are not present, they should not be counted in the denominator when determining if a quorum has been reached.
		1. 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.
		2. Each member of the Division who is present, votes using a signed ballot with options of yes, no, or abstain. Votes are counted by the divisional chair or staff person.
		3. Votes are only shared with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and are otherwise private. The vote is recorded and the case is passed to the P&T Committee for review.
4. Regardless of the outcome of the divisional vote about whether to solicit external letters, the case is reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
	1. 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).
		1. The candidate’s current curriculum vitae (c.v.)
		2. Copies of 3 to 5 of the candidate’s most important research papers or publications
		3. 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 when and if letters are solicited.
	2. If the vote is at least 50% in favor of the nomination then the following items must also be included:
5. A divisional statement that assesses the quality of the candidate’s scholarship, teaching, and service and makes the case for tenure.
6. A list of recommended senior letter writers along with a detailed justification for their choice.[[2]](#footnote-2) This list must include ten senior letter writers (all tenured faculty). This list may be modified by the P&T Committee and the tenured faculty of the School.
7. A comparison list of eight faculty (with at most three untenured faculty and the remainder tenured faculty), all of whom are in the primary field of the candidate. Only tenured faculty members on the comparison list are asked to write letters. This list may be modified by the P&T Committee and the tenured faculty of the School.
8. In addition to materials required by the Provost, the Division is asked to provide cite counts for the candidate and their cohort group. The required cite count is a commonly used ‘industry-standard’ 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.

In the normal timetable, these documents are submitted to the Dean’s office in August or early September of the seventh year on the tenure clock.

1. The P&T Committee decides whether the case is worthy of a full examination.
	1. In making this decision, the P&T considers the vote from the Division and the process it followed. If the Divisional process is deemed fair and without irregularities, a Divisional vote of 50% in favor will be needed for the P&T to give the case a full examination.

1. If the P&T Committee decides that the case is worthy of a full examination, it forms a subcommittee of two members to evaluate the tenure case. Subcommittee members meet individually with members of the tenured faculty in the Division as well as the candidate. The P&T Committee conducts a detailed evaluation of the case and votes. The P&T Committee votes on whether or not to recommend the tenure case to the tenured faculty. Each member of the P&T Committee present at the meeting votes yes or no. The P&T committee may recommend changes to the list of letter writers. The candidate is told by the Divisional Chair and a P&T representative whether a majority of the Division and P&T voted for tenure. The candidate makes the decision on whether to take the case to the tenured faculty in the School.
2. If the candidate decides to proceed, the tenured faculty in the School meets to discuss the tenure case, and to hear reports from the Division and the P&T Committee. In the normal timetable, this will occur by October of the seventh year on the tenure clock. During this stage of the process, the faculty may also recommend modifications to the list of letter writers. The tenured faculty votes on whether or not to proceed with the tenure review and solicit external referee letters using a signed ballot indicating: proceed, don’t proceed, or abstain. Votes are only shared with the Dean, Senior Vice Dean, and the Provost, and are otherwise private. Voters must identify themselves on the ballot so the Dean and the Provost may contact voters to understand any objections.
3. Based on the outcome of the vote, the Dean decides whether to solicit 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.[[3]](#footnote-3) The senior letter writers are sent the tenure candidate’s c.v. ,the personal statement, and list of all the names of peer comparisons, as well as the papers. Each peer writer is sent the candidate’s c.v., papers, and list of peer comparisons, with his or her name omitted from the comparison list. Letter writers do not receive the divisional or statements or the cite counts.
4. The Division meets again to review the tenure case and the external letters. Each member of the Division present (in person or over the telephone) votes using a signed ballot with options of yes or no or abstain. Votes are only shared with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and are otherwise private. The vote is recorded and the case is sent to the P&T Committee for review.
5. The P&T Committee meets to review the tenure case and votes on whether to recommend proceeding to the School’s tenured faculty. P&T members vote on the strength of the tenure case using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 representing a strong tenure case and 1 representing a weak tenure case.
6. The Divisional Chair and a P&T representative communicate with the candidate whether a majority of the votes were positive. The candidate decides whether to take the case forward to the tenured faculty.
7. If the candidate decides to proceed, the tenured faculty of the School meets for a second time to vote using a signed ballot on whether to recommend tenure. In the normal timetable, this vote occurs by December of the seventh year on the tenure clock. Votes are only shared with the Dean, the Senior Vice Dean, and the Provost, and are otherwise private. Voters must identify themselves on the ballot so the Dean and the Provost can contact any voters against the case to understand their objections. Quoting from the university Tenure Guidelines document (p. 4): “The decision on whether to nominate must be made by an open vote or by signed ballots. In this manner, any faculty who votes no may be identified and asked to provide TRAC with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition.”
8. Based on the outcome of the vote, the Dean decides whether to move the case forward to the university standing tenure review advisory committee (TRAC). If the case moves forward, the dossier (statements, papers, c.v., and letters) is sent to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Administration electronically on a CD-ROM or flash drive.[[4]](#footnote-4)
9. The case is reviewed by TRAC and the Provost’s Office according to the procedure outlined in the University document. The Provost makes a recommendation to the President.
10. Once the President has made a decision, the Provost informs the Dean’s office of their decision. The Dean’s office informs the candidate. This notification typically occurs before May 15th of the seventh year.
11. If the Provost’s recommendation is positive and the President’s decision is positive, then the appointment is forwarded to the Trustees for approval.

On November 14, 2013, a tenured faculty meeting was held to discuss the issue of voting procedures in tenure cases. 51 faculty members attended the meeting and the faculty voted to continue the following procedures.

*·        Votes of the tenured faculty about whether the School should solicit external referee letters for a potential tenure case should be conducted by secret, signed ballots visible only to the Dean and the Senior Vice Dean.*

*·        Votes of the tenured faculty about whether the School is in favor of granting tenure to a candidate and submitting the tenure case to TRAC should be conducted by secret, signed ballots visible only to the Dean, Senior Vice Dean, the Provost’s Office and TRAC.*

1. http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia\_University\_Tenure\_Guidelines.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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-2)
3. See page 23-24 of University Procedure. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia_University_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf> (see page 21 for specifications). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)