



**Guide to
Reappointment,
Promotion and
Tenure
Procedures
at UBC**

2009/10

FOREWORD

We are pleased to introduce the 2009/10 edition of the *Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC*.

Reappointments, tenure and promotion reviews are some of the most important decisions we make as an academic community at UBC. As we strive to improve as a university and to build excellence in our teaching, research and service, these decisions are critical to our collective success. There is particular emphasis on the decision to grant tenure. Tenure is not automatic and is only granted after a faculty member's record has been vigorously reviewed by his or her peers, the Head, Dean and the President. The decision to grant tenure represents a high degree of trust in the faculty member by colleagues and by the University, and it is only granted where the candidate has demonstrated that this trust is warranted. Likewise, promotion to full professor is not automatic and does reflect an outstanding contribution to teaching and research. Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence – a hallmark of our University – and that should not be an onerous task because that is the basis on which we hire faculty members. We believe we will all succeed!

Excellence needs to be continually assessed and that is what these procedures do. The procedures may appear lengthy and complex but they set out a multi-leveled and well defined set of rules that are all designed for one purpose: that is, to ensure academically sound decisions of reappointment, tenure and promotion are made within the context of a process that is fair for both the candidate and for the University. And it does work. As a result of these procedures and based on the academic assessment of all involved, the right person is placed in the right position. Our goal at UBC is to maintain high standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure and to apply these standards in a fair, deliberate and transparent way. This Guide is intended to contribute towards that goal.

Finally, this year's edition of the Guide is designed to make it as useful as possible for individual faculty members, Heads and Directors, Deans, and the Senior Appointments Committee. We trust you will find it helpful.

David H. Farrar
Provost and Vice President, Academic
UBC Vancouver

Alaa Abd-El-Aziz
Provost
UBC Okanagan

September 11, 2009

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | ABOUT THE GUIDE | 5 |
| 2 | ABOUT THE PROCESS | 5 |
| 2.1 | EXPECTATIONS..... | 5 |
| 2.2 | TIMING..... | 6 |
| 2.3 | TENURE CLOCKS..... | 7 |
| 2.4 | PROMOTION SCHEDULES..... | 8 |
| 3 | THE CRITERIA | 10 |
| 3.1 | SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY..... | 10 |
| 3.2 | TEACHING..... | 13 |
| 3.3 | SERVICE..... | 14 |
| 4 | INFORMATION FOR THE CANDIDATE | 14 |
| 4.1 | MEETINGS WITH THE HEAD..... | 14 |
| 4.2 | CURRICULUM VITAE AND PUBLICATION RECORD..... | 15 |
| 4.3 | EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS..... | 15 |
| 4.4 | SELECTING REFEREES..... | 15 |
| 4.5 | SUPPLEMENTING THE FILE..... | 16 |
| 4.6 | COMMUNICATION FROM THE HEAD..... | 17 |
| 4.7 | COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEAN..... | 17 |
| 4.8 | COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT..... | 18 |
| 4.9 | THE DECISION..... | 18 |
| 5 | INFORMATION FOR THE HEAD AND THE DEPARTMENT | 18 |
| 5.1 | MEETING WITH THE CANDIDATE..... | 18 |
| 5.2 | PROMOTIONS TO PROFESSOR WHERE THE DEPARTMENT HEAD IS AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR..... | 19 |
| 5.3 | DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION..... | 20 |
| 5.4 | RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN..... | 25 |
| 5.5 | NOTIFICATION TO THE CANDIDATE..... | 26 |
| 6 | INFORMATION FOR THE DEAN AND THE FACULTY | 27 |
| 6.1 | DEAN'S REVIEW AND CONSULTATION..... | 27 |
| 6.2 | RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT..... | 28 |
| 6.3 | NOTIFICATION OF DEAN'S DECISION..... | 30 |
| 7 | NEW APPOINTMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY SAC | 31 |
| 8 | JOINT APPOINTMENTS | 32 |
| 9 | INFORMATION ABOUT THE SENIOR APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE | 32 |
| 9.1 | COMPOSITION..... | 32 |
| 9.2 | MEMBERSHIP OF SAC FOR 2009/10..... | 32 |
| 9.3 | CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S FILE..... | 33 |
| 9.4 | SCHEDULE OF SAC MEETINGS FOR 2009/10..... | 33 |
| 10 | INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION | 34 |
| 11 | CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE | 35 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| APPENDIX 1 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR PERIODIC REVIEWS ONLY | 36 |
| APPENDIX 2 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 7TH YEAR CASES | 37 |
| APPENDIX 3 – TEACHING EVIDENCE | 38 |
| APPENDIX 4 – ANNOTATED CV | 40 |
| APPENDIX 5 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE..... | 49 |
| APPENDIX 6 – HEAD’S LETTER (SUGGESTED FORMAT) | 53 |
| APPENDIX 7 – SAC COVER SHEET | 56 |
| APPENDIX 8 – SAC’S PROCEDURES | 57 |
| APPENDIX 9 – EXCERPT FROM THE AGREEMENT ON CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY | 63 |
| APPENDIX 10 – MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT RE REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AT UBC OKANAGAN IN 2009/10 | 76 |

1 ABOUT THE GUIDE

- 1.1 The Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC (the “Guide”) is intended to summarize and supplement the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty (the “Agreement”). The substance of this document has been agreed to by the Senior Appointments Committee (“SAC”) and the Committee of Deans at both UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan. The document is provided for guidance. Reference should also be made to the relevant provisions in the Agreement (in particular, see Articles 1 - 5 and 9 in Appendix 9) and the Memorandum of Agreement re Review for Promotion at UBC Okanagan in 2009/10 (the “UBCO MOA”) in Appendix 10. If there is a conflict or inconsistency between the Guide and what is in the Collective Agreement (also online at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/agreements/), the latter prevails.
- 1.2 Each year, this document will be reviewed by the Provosts and the Chair of SAC, who will consult with SAC and the Committees of Deans regarding any proposed changes. If you have suggestions for improvement or corrections, please send them to Faculty Relations at UBC Vancouver in care of Colette Hogg at chogg@exchange.ubc.ca.
- 1.3 The Guide will be updated whenever it is appropriate to do so.
- 1.4 From time to time, the tenure and promotion process gives rise to disputes which are considered by an arbitrator appointed under the Collective Agreement, or by another adjudicative tribunal such as a human rights tribunal. Where that process results in a decision that concerns the interpretation of the Guide or the tenure and promotion process, the Guide may be amended to reflect the outcome of the decision.
- 1.5 Additional guidance is provided through workshops for faculty members and their administrators throughout the year at both UBCV and UBCO. See www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html for more information.
- 1.6 For the purpose of this document, please note the following:
 - “Head” includes all heads of departments, directors of institutes, schools and similar academic units;
 - “Department” includes all departments, institutes, schools and similar academic units;
 - “Faculty” includes all Faculties and equivalent academic units such as the College for Interdisciplinary Studies; and
 - “Dean” includes a Dean or Principal of a Faculty.

2 ABOUT THE PROCESS

2.1 Expectations

- 2.1.1. Given that the University strives to foster excellence in teaching, scholarly activity and service, the mandate of all involved in a reappointment, tenure and/or promotion review is to make recommendations which ultimately advise the President on individual cases, in accordance with:

- 1) the concepts of procedural fairness in the University context (often called natural justice);
- 2) UBC policy, the Guide, and the Collective Agreement with the Faculty Association; and
- 3) considerations on appropriate standards of excellence across and within faculties and disciplines

by:

- 1) objectively considering the merits of each specific case; and
- 2) examining the preceding deliberations to ensure that the procedures were consistent with UBC policy, the Collective Agreement and the concepts of procedural fairness.

2.1.2. It is expected that confidentiality will be respected by all those participating in the consultations (Article 5.01 (d) of the Agreement¹).

2.2 Timing

2.2.1 July 1st is the effective date for all reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions. The reappointment, tenure and promotion process typically spans the academic year leading up to July 1st. See the “Summary of the Tenure and Promotion Process at UBC” for a suggested timeline (www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/pdf_files/map.pdf).

2.2.2 Although different departments have different practices, the Agreement (Article 5.02) requires that the process begins with the Head’s meeting with the candidate at the beginning of the academic year (sometime around July).

2.2.3 Candidates must supply the necessary documentation by a date set by the Head, providing that date is not earlier than September 1st (although a candidate is welcome to submit her/his documentation earlier).

2.2.4 Heads should develop a list of external referees (see [Section 5.3](#)) as early as possible, so that materials can be sent to them soon after September 1 and departmental consideration of cases is not unduly delayed.

2.2.5 As a general guideline, Heads and Departments are encouraged to have their reports and recommendations to the Dean by November to allow for the Faculty Advisory Committee to meet in January and February.

2.2.6 The Deans are encouraged to send in their recommendations as soon as possible and preferably by the end of March to allow the President to receive SAC’s recommendations (where applicable) and to make his own decision well in advance of July 1st. See SAC’s Meeting Dates (see [Section 9.4](#)) to assist in your planning and preparation.

¹ Please note that the use of the term “Article” refers to the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty whereas “Section” refers to the Guide.

2.3 Tenure Clocks

Note: See Article 2.03 of the Agreement.

Tenure vs. Grant Tenure

Tenured and tenure track appointments are full-time appointments (unless agreed to be part-time) funded by University funds that cannot be terminated except for cause, financial exigency or redundancy.

Grant tenured and grant tenure track appointments are appointments funded by non-University funds and are subject to continued non-University funding.

The criteria for appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion are the same for both tenured and grant tenured appointments!

2.3.1 The tenure clock for instructors and professors always begins on July 1st of the calendar year in which s/he was hired, regardless of when s/he actually starts. Under the Leave of Absence section of the Collective Agreement, extensions to the tenure clock are granted for maternity and parental leaves (automatically) and medical leaves (on a case by case basis). Extensions must be confirmed in writing. An individual may only be reviewed one time for tenure in the instructor or professor stream. Please note that a tenure track Assistant Professor cannot be reviewed early for tenure; however, if s/he is promoted to Associate Professor prior to Year 7, tenure will be granted. All other ranks can be considered early for tenure.

| Rank | Mandatory Tenure Year |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Assistant Professor | Year 7 |
| Associate and Full Professor | Year 5* |
| Instructor I | Year 5 |

* Tenure track Associate and Professors are normally expected to be granted tenure by end of the 3rd year; however, if s/he is reappointed, the mandatory tenure review must take place in year 5.

Examples of Tenure Clock Scenarios:

- *Professor X is an Assistant Professor (tenure track). She has requested to be reviewed for tenure only in year 5. However, she can only be reviewed for tenure in year 7. She can be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor in year 5 and, if promotion is granted, tenure will be automatic.*

Examples of Tenure Clock Scenarios (con't):

- *Professor Y is an Instructor I (tenure track). He has requested to be reviewed early for tenure in year 4, rather than year 5. If positive, tenure will be granted at the rank of Senior Instructor. If negative, Professor Y will receive a terminal year.*
- *Professor Z is an Associate Professor (tenure track). She took a maternity and parental leave in year 2. She would now be expected to be granted tenure in year 4, rather than year 3. However, her mandatory tenure review year would now be in year 6, rather than year 5.*

2.4 Promotion Schedules

Note: See Article 9 of the Agreement and the UBCO MOA.

2.4.1 The following ranks are eligible to be reviewed for promotion:

- Assistant Professors can be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor.
- Associate Professors can be reviewed for promotion to Professor.
- Senior Instructors can request a review to be considered for promotion into the professoriate.

2.4.2 The University can conduct reviews or make recommendations for promotion at any time. Some reviews are periodic, while others are non-periodic. The differences between the procedure in the case of a periodic review and that of other reviews are set out below:

| Review | Scheduled? | Obligation to Initiate? | Who can stop the process? | Appeal of negative decision? |
|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Periodic | Yes | University | Candidate only | Yes |
| Non-Periodic | No | Candidate or University | Head, Dean or Candidate | No |

For assistance in determining whether a review will be periodic or non-periodic, please review the Promotion Review Map on Faculty Relations' website (www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/pdf_files/promotionreviewmap.pdf).

2.4.3 The following sets out the periodic review schedules for Assistant Professors and Associate Professors:

| Rank | Periodic Review Year |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Assistant Professor | Year 5 then every 2 years |
| Associate Professor | Year 5 then every 3 years |

2.4.4 A candidate eligible for a periodic review can waive her/his right to be reviewed. A faculty member who waives her/his right to a periodic review in writing can request a periodic review prior to the next scheduled review. That request must be in writing and must be received no later than May 15th of the year prior to the requested review.

2.4.5 If the review proceeds and does not result in a promotion, the faculty member is not entitled to another periodic review for another two years for Assistant Professors and three years for Associate Professors. However, the University and the candidate can agree to a non-periodic review in any year.

2.4.6 The time for a periodic review is calculated from the July 1st of the year of appointment at or of promotion to a rank at UBC, except as set out in the UBCO MOA.

2.4.7 In February of each year, Departments should identify those persons who are entitled to a periodic review under Article 9 of the Agreement. Contact Faculty Relations at UBCV or George Athans in Human Resources at UBCO for assistance.

2.4.8 It is the University's obligation to confirm whether an Assistant Professor or Associate Professor wishes to be reviewed. This request must be in writing between March 1st and May 15th prior to the scheduled periodic review year. A faculty member who is entitled to a review may request in writing that the review not proceed; accordingly, each faculty member should be asked whether s/he wishes the University to refrain from conducting the periodic review (see Sample Letter for Periodic Reviews Only – Appendix 1 and Sample Letter for 7th Year Cases – Appendix 2).

2.4.9 A Senior Instructor can request a review of her/his record during the fifth year after entry into that rank, or in subsequent years, provided that such reviews will not be conducted more frequently than every three years. Please note that where a Senior Instructor is promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, the promotion will be as a tenure track Assistant Professor (not tenured), but s/he will retain tenure as a Senior Instructor. A Senior Instructor promoted to Associate Professor or Professor is granted tenure at that rank.

2.4.10 In cases of periodic review, all recommendations, negative as well as positive, must be forwarded for consideration at the Faculty and presidential levels unless the candidate wishes to withdraw from the review. Please note that if a periodic review is initiated but the process is subsequently stopped by the candidate, it is still considered a periodic review for purposes of scheduling the next periodic review.

2.4.11 Where a promotion review is conducted during a reappointment year, the Department is encouraged to conduct both the review for reappointment and the review for promotion, in case the promotion is delayed or unsuccessful.

Examples of Promotion Review Scenarios:

- *Professor X is an Assistant Professor (tenure track). She was eligible for a periodic review in year 5, but she waived in writing her right to that review. She has requested in writing a periodic review in year 6 prior to May 15th, which is allowed. As this periodic review will occur during a mandatory reappointment review, the Department will need to conduct both reviews (reappointment and promotion) in case the promotion review is not successful.*
- *Professor Y is an Associate Professor with tenure. His last periodic review for promotion to Professor was in 2007/08. He has requested a promotion review in 2009/10. Since he is not entitled to a periodic review until 2010/11, this review would be a non-periodic review.*
- *Professor Z is an Associate Professor with tenure. She waived her right to a periodic review for promotion to Professor in 2007/08. She has requested a promotion review in 2009/10. Since she waived her right to a periodic review in 2007/08 and her next periodic review would normally be in 2010/11, the 2009/10 review for promotion would be a periodic review. If unsuccessful, her next periodic review would be in 2012/13.*

Note: A map of the Summary of the Tenure & Promotion Process is available on the Faculty Relations website (www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html).

3 THE CRITERIA

Note: Please review “The Professor Path: Criteria for Tenure and Promotion” and “The Instructor Path: Criteria for Tenure” for a summary of the criteria as they apply to each rank (available online at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html).

Note: Please also see Articles 3 and 4 of the Agreement.

3.1 Scholarly Activity

3.1.1 Under the Agreement, scholarly activity "means research of quality and significance, or, in appropriate fields, distinguished, creative or professional work of a scholarly nature; and the dissemination of the results of that scholarly activity."

3.1.2 Judgment of scholarly activity is based mainly on the quality and significance of an individual's contribution.

- 3.1.3 Evidence of scholarly activity varies among the disciplines. Scholarly activity can take three forms: (1) traditional scholarship; (2) scholarship of teaching; and/or (3) professional contributions. Cases can be based on one or a combination of these forms but the form of scholarly activity should be determined in advance in discussion between the Head and the candidate so that appropriate referees are chosen and appropriate criteria are applied at all stages of the review.
- 3.1.4 Where there has been a substantial amount of collaboration with the same individuals, it can be useful to have letters from collaborators outlining the contributions of the candidate to the collaborative effort. These letters should be solicited by the Head. These letters do not constitute letters of reference and should only provide information on the nature of the collaboration.

a) Traditional Scholarship

- 3.1.5 Published work is, where appropriate, the primary evidence in most cases. The expectations on published works will vary depending on the discipline. Consideration should be given to the quality of the journals and the impact of the work.

b) Scholarship of Teaching

- 3.1.6 Under Article 4.03 of the Agreement and the definition of “Scholarly Activity”, scholarship of teaching ranks equally with scholarly research. The following notes are offered in order to assist in assembling the evidence concerning the scholarship of teaching.
- 3.1.7 Scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. Rather, scholarship of teaching makes a broader contribution to the improvement of teaching and learning beyond one’s own teaching responsibilities.
- 3.1.8 For scholarship of teaching, scholarly activity may be evidenced by factors such as originality or innovation, demonstrable impact in a particular field or discipline, peer reviews of scholarly contributions to teaching, dissemination in the public domain, or substantial and sustained use by others. For example, textbooks and curriculum reform that changed academic understanding or made a significant contribution to the way in which a discipline or field is taught might constitute useful evidence of the scholarship of teaching, whereas textbooks or curriculum revision of a routine nature would not (from Art. 4.03(a) of the Agreement).
- 3.1.9 It must be demonstrated that an individual is a leader, or possesses outstanding stature or expertise, in the scholarship of teaching.
- 3.1.10 Evidence of assessment of the significance and impact of a candidate’s scholarship of teaching is essential. External peer evaluation is particularly important.
- 3.1.11 Work that is not published in a refereed system that makes a significant contribution should be specifically evaluated by the external referees.

c) Professional Contributions

- 3.1.12 Such evidence as distinguished architectural, artistic or engineering design, or distinguished performance in the arts or professional fields, shall be considered in appropriate cases.
- 3.1.13 Cases where scholarly activity is through professional contributions may arise in any Department or Faculty.
- 3.1.14 Under the Agreement's provisions on "Scholarly Activity", creative or professional work of distinction ranks equally with scholarly research. Since it is not always easy to assess the quality of this work, the following notes are offered in order to assist in assembling the evidence concerning it and in evaluating it.
- 3.1.15 To make a positive addition to a case for appointment, promotion or granting of tenure, professional contributions should not be of a routine or repetitive character. Merely practicing a profession as a typical consultant or professional might do is insufficient. Thus, consulting per se does not constitute a professional contribution of high quality.
- 3.1.16 Consider, for example, two extracts from submissions from Deans that give examples of professional activities that are not considered to be a form of scholarly activity:
- "We encourage all staff members to maintain strong professional interests, but discourage them from undertaking consulting work which can readily be handled by the many well-established and very good...consultants in the regions."
- "We would regard, for example, the work of individuals who offer income tax advice, set or mark professional examinations, offer legal advice, or appraise property values as essentially routine, in that:
- their work is routinely available for a fee from professionals operating within the existing body of knowledge and rules,
 - the work is unlikely to benefit substantially from the exercise of creative imagination."
- 3.1.17 A definition of a meritorious professional contribution is more difficult to agree upon. Creativity has been mentioned as the criterion of excellence, but creativity is difficult to define. Nevertheless, it is felt that a positive case has been made if it is shown that an individual is a leader in a field or possesses outstanding stature or rare expertise in a field.
- 3.1.18 For example, evidence that might be viewed as making a positive professional contribution includes advising on the drafting of new legislation or presenting an integrated and innovative summary of existing tax legislation and policy; providing technical advice important to the drafting of new legislation; or developing a new predictive model of property valuation whose predictive power has been empirically validated by market data.
- 3.1.19 A useful guideline for assessing the unique and significant stature and appropriate rank

of faculty members who are making professional or artistic contributions is the following: promotion to Professor should require the candidate to have achieved at least a national reputation, and promotion to Associate Professor should require the candidate to have made an impact and have achieved a reputation *at least* outside UBC.

3.1.20 Work that is not published in a refereed system that makes a significant contribution should be specifically referred to in referees' letters so that its merit is clearly apparent. Where possible, this work should be made available to referees.

3.1.21 Written work (arising, for example, from consulting or other professional activity) must be available for peer assessment if it is to form part of the case for appointment, promotion or tenure, and, as above, referees' reports should assess its merits. Reports that are strictly confidential should not be listed as publications, although the professional activity which led to them (e.g., membership on a Commission) may well be significant evidence of the professional stature of the candidate and should be presented as such.

3.2 Teaching

3.2.1 Teaching includes all activities by which students, whether in degree or non-degree programs sponsored by the University, derive educational benefit. This may include lectures, seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion, supervision of individual students' work, or other means.

3.2.2 An individual's entire teaching contribution should be assessed.

3.2.3 Evaluation of teaching should be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor. Indicators of effectiveness include: command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students, and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of the candidate to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction.

3.2.4 The methods of teaching evaluation may vary, but will normally include student opinion and peer assessment by colleagues of performance. Other methods may include outside references concerning teaching at other institutions, course material and examinations, the calibre of supervised essays and theses, and other relevant considerations. Please note UBC Vancouver's Senate Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching approved on May 16, 2007 (found online at www.senate.ubc.ca/vancouver/policies.cfm?ID=26).

3.2.5 When the opinions of students or of colleagues are sought, this should be done through formal procedures.

3.2.6 Where a candidate does not have a formal joint appointment but does a significant amount of teaching in another Faculty, the file should include at least a statement from the Dean of that Faculty providing a summary of teaching in that Faculty.

Note: See [Appendix 3](#) for Teaching Evidence.

3.3 Service

- 3.3.1 Service to the University and the community includes service performed for the benefit of Departments, Faculties, Continuing Studies, or other parts of the University (including the Faculty Association), and for professional organizations and the community at large.
- 3.3.2 Such service might include: administrative or supervisory work; service on committees and university bodies; all continuing education activity in the community including professional education; special work with professional, technical, scholarly or other organizations or with scholarly publications not falling within the definition of scholarly activity; membership on or service to governmental or public councils and boards; and other forms of academic, professional, and public service.
- 3.3.3 Where a candidate does not have a formal joint appointment but does a significant amount of service in another Faculty, the file should include at least a statement from the Dean of that Faculty providing a summary of contributions to that Faculty.

4 INFORMATION FOR THE CANDIDATE

4.1 Meetings with the Head

Note: see Article 5.05 of the Agreement.

- 4.1.1 The Head must meet annually with all faculty members who are in term appointments with review (i.e., tenure track) and following tenure, on a regular basis thereafter (see the Promotion Schedules in Section 2.4). The purposes of the meeting are to:
- i) review criteria and expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure;
 - identify areas of scholarly activity (i.e., traditional publications, scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions) that will be assessed and how those areas will be assessed.
 - ii) if the individual holds a joint appointment, clearly lay out the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion review be clearly laid out. See Section 8 on Joint Appointments;
 - iii) identify strengths and areas requiring improvement or presenting potential difficulties;
 - iv) assist the candidate with any concerns; and
 - v) when a review is pending, advise the candidate that it is his or her responsibility to provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae (see Section 4.2) and other relevant information to the Head, prior to a date set by the Head, provided that this date is no earlier than September 1 of the year in which the case is being considered.
- 4.1.2 The candidate may bring a colleague to each of the above meetings.

4.1.3 At the conclusion of each meeting, the matters discussed must be recorded in a memorandum prepared by the Head and agreed to by the candidate. The candidate and Head must agree on what was discussed, although they may or may not agree on evaluations or advice provided. Please note that email can be used to document the meeting.

4.2 Curriculum Vitae and Publication Record

4.2.1 The CV and Publications Record should be in the UBC format, found online at www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/ms_word_files/newcv6_0.doc. See [Appendix 4](#) for an annotated CV and Publications Record that includes helpful guidelines for ensuring a clear and comprehensive record.

4.2.2 The CV and Publications Record must be up-to-date and dated. Supplemental information that updates these documents can be added to the dossier, but it should be made clear at what stage of the review the information was added. The updates should provide only new or revised information with the effective date clearly indicated, rather than a full revised CV. All supplemental information should be sent to the Head if the review is still at the Department level or to the Dean if the review has progressed beyond the Department. The Dean will forward any supplemental information to the President, via the Assistant Manager responsible for SAC in Faculty Relations.

Common Problems with CVs and Publication Records:

- *Information (e.g., a paper presentation) is duplicated or repeated in different sections of the CV and publication record.*
- *CV is not up to date.*
- *There is a lack of clarity regarding the candidate's contributions to collaborative research.*
- *The teaching record is not filled out correctly.*
- *Fails to include the amount of grants or fails to indicate the proportion allocated to the individual in joint grants.*

4.3 Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

4.3.1 Evidence of teaching effectiveness will vary in departments and faculties as necessary to reflect the teaching styles and methods used. Candidates are encouraged to speak with their Head early about the requirements for their Department.

4.4 Selecting Referees

4.4.1 For the purpose of considering scholarly activity under Article 5.05 of the Agreement, letters of appraisal from external referees on the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements must be provided when considering:

- initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor or Professor;
- tenure; or
- reappointment, when the Head or the departmental standing committee considers

that they may recommend denial of reappointment due to a deficiency of scholarly work.

- Please see Sections 5.3.8 and 5.3.9 for referee qualifications.

- 4.4.2 External referees should be at arm's length; that is, persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. They are not normally expected to include such categories as relatives, close personal friends, clients, current or former colleagues, former thesis advisers, research supervisors, grant co-holders or co-authors. They can include such categories such as former instructors who were not supervisors or professional committee members. Please see Section 7 for exceptions allowed for new appointments.
- 4.4.3 The candidate will be asked to provide a list of at least four potential referees, of which at least two will be chosen by the Department for the final list of four referees (see also Section 5.3.7 of the Guide and Article 5.05 (b) of the Agreement).
- 4.4.4 The candidate should not communicate with potential referees about the matter in question, for doing so raises questions about their impartiality.
- 4.4.5 Referees' letters will be solicited by the Head.
- 4.4.6 The candidate will not be informed of the names of the referees from whom letters are solicited.
- 4.4.7 For the purpose of considering teaching, letters of appraisal on teaching effectiveness shall be obtained by the Head from evaluators from inside or outside the Department through formal procedures. Please see Appendix 3 for further information on teaching evidence.
- 4.4.8 For cases involving the granting of tenure at the rank of Senior Instructor, four letters of appraisal on the candidate's teaching are required. Such letters should be from referees with knowledge of the candidate's teaching contributions but not from someone with whom the candidate has co-taught; for example, a Senior Instructor or a Professor known for his or her outstanding teaching from another Department could be such a referee. It is recommended that referees outside the candidate's immediate department should be sought, if at all possible. Such letters do not need to be from external referees. If external referees are available, such letters will be welcome and may help strengthen a case.

4.5 Supplementing the File

- 4.5.1 Both the candidate and the University have the right, up to the stage of the President's decision, to supplement the file by the addition of new information that has not been solicited for this purpose by the candidate (e.g., a new set of student evaluations, the publication of an additional article, etc.) or a response to particular concerns that emerge in the relevant documentation. New information should clearly indicate the effective date. It should be noted that new solicited information should only be material that has been obtained following required or other recognized procedures (see Article 5.06 (e) in the Agreement). Please refer to Section 4.2.2 for information on updating the CV and Publication Record.

- 4.5.2 Any supplemental information should be sent to the Head if the review is still at the Department level or to the Dean if the review has progressed beyond the Department. The Dean will forward any supplemental information to the President, via Faculty Relations at UBC Vancouver.
- 4.5.3 Where there has been a substantial amount of collaboration with the same individuals, it can be useful to have letters from collaborators outlining the contributions of the candidate. These letters do not constitute letters of reference and should provide only information on the nature of the collaboration. It is recommended that the Head solicit this information. These letters shall either be added to the file per Article 5.03 or referenced in the Head's letter of recommendation to the Dean.

4.6 Communication from the Head

- 4.6.1 In all cases other than initial appointment, the Head must, when serious concerns about the candidacy arise in the departmental standing committee, provide the candidate with a summary of the discussion and a summary or copies of the external letters of reference modified to the extent necessary to protect confidentiality and to protect the identity of external referees. The candidate must be given the opportunity to (i) respond in writing and (ii) to introduce further relevant evidence before the vote is taken (see Article 5.06 of the Agreement).
- 4.6.2 In all cases other than an initial appointment, the Head must, at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the Dean, inform the candidate in writing of the recommendations being forwarded (Article 5.08 of the Agreement).
- 4.6.3 If the recommendation of either the Head or the departmental standing committee is negative, the Head must provide the candidate reasons in writing for the negative recommendation including the area(s) in which the candidate is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Where the Head's recommendation is negative but that of the standing committee is positive, the Head must also provide detailed and specific reasons for the positive recommendation (see Article 5.08 of the Agreement).
- 4.6.4 The Head may provide reasons by giving the candidate a copy of the letter of recommendation being forwarded to the Dean. However, if that is done, the letter will be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality and identity of the referees. The candidate should be invited to make a timely response to the Dean, which should be added to the file (see Article 5.08 of the Agreement).

4.7 Communication from the Dean

- 4.7.1 In all cases other than initial appointments, the Dean will inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation at the time the recommendations are being forwarded to the President (Article 5.12 (a) of the Agreement).
- 4.7.2 If the recommendation of the Dean is negative, in opposition to the recommendation of the Head or the departmental standing committee, or for reasons not raised by the Head or the departmental standing committee, the Dean will provide reasons in writing

to the candidate, including the area(s) in which he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria (Article 5.11 (b) of the Agreement).

4.7.3 Under Article 5.12 (c) of the Agreement, the Dean may provide detailed and specific reasons by giving the candidate a copy of the Dean's letter of recommendation to the President. However, if that is done, the letter will be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality and identity of the referees. The candidate will be invited to make a timely response to the Dean, which will be added to the file.

4.8 Communication from the President

4.8.1 Except in the case of initial appointments, the President will, at the time a decision is made on whether or not a recommendation is to be forwarded to the Board of Governors respecting a candidate, inform the candidate in writing of that decision with a copy to the Faculty Association.

4.8.2 If the recommendation of the President is negative, the President will provide reasons in writing to the candidate, including the respects in which he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria, and send a copy to the Association.

4.9 The Decision

4.9.1 July 1st of the following year of the review is the effective date for all reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions.

4.9.2 If the President makes a recommendation not to grant a tenured appointment, the candidate will normally be given a one-year terminal appointment. If the decision not to grant a tenured appointment is received after December 1 of the academic year following the review year, the period of notice of termination will include one complete academic year in addition to any months remaining in the academic year in which the notice of termination is received.

5 INFORMATION FOR THE HEAD AND THE DEPARTMENT

Note 1: Article 5.09 of the Agreement recognizes that some faculty members do not belong to Departments. Institutes, Schools and similar Academic Units are required to follow procedures consistent with Departments.

Note 2: A "Reappointment Checklist for Heads" and a "Tenure and Promotion Checklist for Heads" are available online at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html.

5.1 Meeting with the Candidate

5.1.1 The Head must meet annually with all faculty members in that Department who are in term appointments with review. The Head must meet regularly with all tenured faculty members in that unit who may be considered for promotion. The purposes of the meeting are to:

- i) review criteria and expectations for reappointment, tenure and promotion;
 - identify areas of scholarly activity (i.e. traditional publications, scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions) that will be assessed and confirm basis for review.
- ii) if the individual holds a joint appointment, clearly lay out the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion evaluation. See Section 8 on Joint Appointments;
- iii) identify strengths and areas requiring improvement;
- iv) assist the faculty member with any concerns;
- v) advise the candidate when a review is pending that it is his or her responsibility to provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae (see Section 4.2) and other relevant information to the Head, prior to a date set by the Head, provided that this date is no earlier than September 1 of the year in which the case is being considered; and
- vi) advise the candidate who is asked for a list of potential referees not to communicate with potential referees about the matter in question, for doing so might raise questions about their impartiality.

5.1.2 The Head should review the original letter of offer of appointment to the candidate to ensure that no special terms were agreed upon which might impact the consideration.

5.1.3 The candidate may bring a colleague to each of the above meetings.

5.1.4 At the conclusion of each meeting, the matters discussed must be recorded in a memorandum prepared by the Head and agreed to by the candidate. The candidate and Head must agree on what was discussed, although they may or may not agree on evaluations or advice provided. Please note that email can be used to document the meeting.

5.2 Promotions to Professor where the Department Head is an Associate Professor

5.2.1 Nothing in the Agreement precludes an Associate Professor from performing any of the duties assigned to the Head in relation to appointments, reappointments, appointments without review, and promotions. However, there may be good reasons why an Associate Professor who is Head of a Department should not be assigned the responsibility of performing the Head's duties relating to promotion to the rank of Professor.

5.2.2 If this is the case, the normal procedure is for the Dean to appoint a Professor to serve as Acting Head for the purpose of carrying out the duties assigned to the Head by the Agreement. Associate Professors who are being considered as candidates for Department Heads should be informed of this procedure.

5.3 Departmental Consultation

- 5.3.1 The Head must consult formally at meetings with eligible members of the Department in order to ascertain their views and to obtain their recommendation concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion in each case under consideration.
- 5.3.2 The eligible members of the Department will constitute the departmental standing committee. The committee will be composed of all the eligible members of the Department, or a subset of eligible members elected by eligible members of the Department. Members of faculty from outside the Department may be added to the standing committee when the number of eligible members (not including the Head) is fewer than three (3). These additional members shall be chosen by the eligible members of the Department and approved by the Dean. If there are no eligible members, the standing committee should be determined by the Dean in consultation with faculty members of the Department.
- 5.3.3 Faculty members eligible to be consulted are:
- i) In the case of initial appointments, those of a rank equal to or higher than the rank at which the appointment is to be made.
 - ii) In the case of reappointments and promotions, those higher in rank than the candidate, except that in the case of reappointment of a Professor those holding the rank of Professor are eligible to be consulted.
 - iii) In the tenure cases, those who are tenured and of equal or higher rank.

For UBCO, please review the UBCO MOA in [Appendix 10](#) for eligibility rules.

Note: "Eligibility to be Consulted" charts are available on the Faculty Relations website at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html.

Note: Eligibility to be consulted is also governed by UBC Policy 97 on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment. Eligible members who are in a conflict of interest with the candidate should not participate in the review. See www.universitycounsel.ubc.ca/policies/policy97.pdf.

Examples of Consultation and Voting Eligibility

- *An Assistant Professor (tenure track) is being reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. A Senior Instructor is not eligible to be consulted or vote on this case, but s/he could be a peer evaluator on teaching.*
- *An Associate Professor (tenure) is being reviewed for promotion to Professor. He has been collaborating with a Clinical Professor. Only faculty members who hold tenured appointments at the rank of Professor are eligible to be consulted or to vote on this case. Individuals who hold clinical faculty appointments, regardless of rank, are not.*

- 5.3.4 Consultation must be undertaken according to the terms and conditions of the Agreement. The procedures used should be agreed upon between the Head and the

eligible members of the Department and approved by the Dean. The Head should ensure that each faculty member in the Department is informed of the agreed procedures. The Dean should collect and maintain an open file of all such procedures in the Faculty.

a) Selecting Referees

Note: A “Letters of Reference Chart” is available on the Faculty Relations website at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html.

- 5.3.5 For the purpose of considering scholarly activity, as noted in Section 4.4.1, letters of appraisal from external referees on the quality and significance of the scholarly achievements of the candidate must be provided when considering:
- initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor or Professor;
 - tenure; or
 - reappointment, when the Head or the departmental standing committee consider that they may recommend denial of reappointment due to a deficiency of scholarly work.
- 5.3.6 External referees should be at arm’s length (except under the circumstances of Section 7 below); that is, persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. They are normally expected not to include such categories as relatives, close personal friends, clients, current or former colleagues, former thesis advisers, research supervisors, grant co-holders or co-authors. They can include such categories such as former instructors who were not supervisors or professional committee members. In determining the admissibility of a letter of reference, please take care in ensuring that referees do not have a potentially compromising relationship such that the referee might somehow benefit from or be harmed by the candidate's reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.
- 5.3.7 Under Article 5.05 of the Agreement, the Head must solicit letters of appraisal from at least four referees, of whom at least two should be taken from a list of names supplied by the candidate. If additional referees are required at any time, the number selected from the list supplied by the candidate must never be less than the number of referees selected from the list supplied by the Department (i.e. equal numbers from each list are required or more from the candidate’s list than from the Department’s). The candidate should, if need be, be asked to provide additional names so that there will always be at least one more potential referee on the candidate's list than the number of referees to be selected from the list. Please note that SAC normally requires at least four letters of appraisal from arm’s length referees. Please see Section 7 for exceptions allowed for new appointments.
- 5.3.8 Heads should take care in choosing referees who are qualified to render judgment on the quality and significance of a candidate’s scholarly achievements. If a candidate is involved in more than one area of scholarly activity (i.e. traditional scholarship, scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions), a reasonable number of referees should be chosen who can offer their opinion in each area. This may be accomplished by selecting referees who are able to evaluate more than one area or by choosing different referees for different areas. It is generally understood that the higher the profile of the referees, the more credible their appraisals. Referees are normally at

a rank above the candidate's current rank, except for the rank of Professors; however, it is understood that in some cases, it is appropriate to use referees at other ranks or in other professions. In those cases, the Head should provide a reasonably detailed statement of the reasons for selection of the referee and of his or her qualifications and accomplishments.

- 5.3.9 It is also generally understood that referees who are academics should be from universities of comparable or superior reputation to UBC. In instances where this is not the case, the Head should provide a reasonably detailed statement of the reasons for selection of the referee and of his or her qualifications and accomplishments. Heads should also consider a range of referees; particularly in the case of promotion to full professor, a Head should normally solicit letters from referees outside of Canada as well as from Canadian institutions.
- 5.3.10 Before selecting prospective referees for consideration, the Head must consult with the departmental standing committee about the choice of referees.
- 5.3.11 The candidate must not be informed of the names of the referees from whom letters are solicited.
- 5.3.12 Referees letters that are two or more years old should not be used unless up-dated by the same referee. When a letter from a previous year is included with a recommendation, all letters obtained that year must be included. It is suggested that letters obtained in a prior year not be used without contacting the writer and asking whether her/his old letter can stand as is or whether s/he would like to amend it.
- 5.3.13 For the purpose of considering teaching in review for granting tenure at the rank of Senior Instructor, letters of appraisal on teaching effectiveness shall be obtained from evaluators by the Head preferably from outside the Department through formal procedures. Four letters of appraisal on the candidate's teaching are required. Such letters should be from referees with knowledge of the candidate's teaching contributions but not from someone with whom the candidate has co-taught; for example, a Senior Instructor or a Professor known for his or her outstanding teaching from another Department could be such a referee. It is recommended that referees outside the candidate's immediate department should be sought, if at all possible. Such letters do not need to be from external referees (Article 5.05 in the Agreement). If external referees are available, such letters will be welcome and may help strengthen a case.

b) Letters of External Reference

Note: See Appendix 5 for a Sample Letter of Request for External Reference.

- 5.3.14 Letters requesting evaluation of the candidate's scholarly, professional or creative achievements should be worded to indicate that the referee's independent opinion of those achievements is sought, not support for a decision already reached.
- 5.3.15 Although Heads' letters to external referees will vary, they should include the following items:

- A request for the referee's independent opinion of the quality and significance of a candidate's scholarly achievements in the areas specified in the Agreement (including scholarship of teaching, professional and creative work). The Head should ensure referees are provided enough information to fully evaluate scholarly activity, given that the Agreement sets out that scholarly activity is demonstrated through traditional peer reviewed publications, the scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions. It may be appropriate to ask different referees different questions (as, for example, if one is to deal specifically with a professional contribution and another with a research contribution).
- A request for an explicit recommendation on promotion and/or tenure, in the context of the Agreement, based on the evidence available to the referee.
- A clear indication of the rank involved, and whether tenure is included. It is particularly important that referees be informed that promotion to Associate Professor at UBC includes the granting of tenure. It is also important that no distinction be made between grant tenure/ track and tenure/ track in the letter to the referees.
- A statement about the need for arm's length referees, and a request for the referee to indicate whether he or she knows the candidate, and if so in what capacity.
- An indication of whether or not a tenure case is a seventh-year consideration. When a candidate is considered for tenure and promotion in the seventh year of appointment as Assistant Professor, the recommendations are distinct and should be distinguished in letters soliciting the advice of external referees. In addition, the letter should explain the relationship at UBC between promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure - i.e., that someone can be given tenure in the seventh year without being promoted to Associate Professor, but that no one can be promoted to this rank without being given tenure at the same time. The letter should include a request, in a seventh year case, for separate recommendations on promotion and tenure. For a pre-seventh-year case, the letter should convey the fact that at UBC a negative decision on promotion would mean that final consideration of tenure would be postponed until a subsequent year.
- A statement about UBC's policy on confidentiality, such as the following: "It is the policy of the University to keep letters of reference confidential. However, under Freedom of Information legislation or the Collective Agreement, a candidate may be entitled to see the substance of any letter of reference, but only where this can be done without disclosing the identity of the writer."
- Samples of the candidate's scholarly work, unless the referee has alternative access to this work.

5.3.16 When the Head of the Department is a co-author with the candidate, another member of the Departmental Standing Committee should be delegated the task of writing to the referees.

5.3.17 Referees' letters must not be solicited by the candidate or addressed to the candidate.

5.3.18 Letters of reference must remain confidential. It is therefore recommended that:

- copies of letters of reference be made available to members of the Departmental Committee only at the meeting at which the matter is being considered and that these copies be recovered at the end of the meeting;
- members of the Departmental Committee be reminded that the authors and contents of the letters are not to be disclosed by them to anyone else in any circumstances; and
- after a decision has been made by the Departmental Committee, letters not be made available by the Head of the Department to any member of the Department or to any other person except the Dean of the Faculty or the President and their respective committees.

c) Meetings and Voting

5.3.20 The Head chairs the departmental standing committee but does not vote (Article 5.06 (d) of the Agreement).

5.3.21 Committee members at the Department level should not vote on a case unless able to participate in all substantive discussion of that case at the Department level. While physical presence is preferred, participation can include video or telephone conference. Eligible members who cannot participate can send a memorandum indicating their support (positive or negative) and the reasons for this position in a case. This memorandum should be considered by the standing committee members who are in attendance, but this will not constitute a vote (i.e. there is no voting in absentia or by proxy). (See Article 5.06 (c) of the Agreement.)

5.3.22 The departmental standing committee should, at formal meetings, consider all relevant information that is required to support the recommendation, including any information submitted by the candidate and any opinion submitted in writing by a member of the department standing committee who cannot participate in the consultations. Only material that has been obtained following recognized procedures should be considered. Other material, including that solicited by the candidate and unsolicited material such as letters from third parties, faculty members who are not official appraisers, or students, should **not** be considered. (See Article 5.06 of the Agreement.)

5.3.23 Serious Concerns: In all cases other than initial appointment, if serious concerns about the candidacy arise in the departmental standing committee, the Head must provide the candidate with a summary of the concerns in sufficient detail to enable the candidate to understand the concerns fully and with a summary or copies of the external letters of reference modified to the extent necessary to protect the identity of external referees. The candidate must be given the opportunity to (i) respond in writing and (ii) to introduce further relevant evidence before the vote is taken (Article 5.06 of the Agreement). After considering the candidate's response, the departmental standing committee will vote at a subsequent meeting.

5.3.24 Where a candidate is being considered for both tenure and promotion, the departmental standing committee must take separate votes on promotion and tenure, unless the initial vote on promotion to Associate Professor is unanimously positive. Note that this does

not apply to promotion cases before the seventh year. Where a candidate has declined to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, only tenure will be voted upon.

Note: Please see “Votes for Appointments, Tenure and Promotion Decisions” available on the Faculty Relations’ website at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/faculty.html.

5.3.25 The voting majority will form the recommendation of the departmental standing committee (Article 5.06 (g) of the Agreement). The number of votes for and against each recommendation should be recorded. Tied votes should be reported as such.

5.3.26 The Head will draft the departmental standing committee report that reflects both the majority and minority opinions discussed by the committee. Where the vote is not unanimous, the report should set out the nature of the differing opinions. The Head will share the draft report with the committee members and invite comments prior to finalizing the report (see Article 5.07 (b) of the Agreement).

5.4 Recommendation to the Dean

5.4.1 The Head must forward a recommendation to the Dean in all cases except when the Head’s recommendation is negative for any new appointments or any non-periodic reviews for promotion (Article 5.07 (a) of the Agreement).

5.4.2 Under Article 5.07 (a) of the Agreement, the Head will prepare a letter to the Dean which should include the Head’s recommendation, the basis of the recommendation, as well as the departmental standing committee’s report (either included as part of the Head’s letter or as an attachment to the letter). See [Appendix 6](#) for the Head’s Letter (Suggested Format) which will provide additional guidance for ensuring a clear and comprehensive letter.

5.4.3 The Head will then forward the recommendations to the Dean, including, at minimum, the following:

- a) The Head’s letter and departmental standing committee report (as set out in [Appendix 6](#)).
- b) A sample of the letter used to request a reference. If different referees have been asked different questions (as, for example, if one is to deal specifically with professional contributions and another with research contributions), a sample of each type of letter should be included as well as an indication of which referees are responding to which request.
- c) A list of and brief summary of qualification and justification for referees.
- d) The referees’ letters of evaluation.
- e) The candidate’s CV (originally sent to the referees) and any updates.
- f) Evidence regarding the candidate’s teaching (see [Appendix 3](#)).
- g) Where there has been a substantial amount of collaboration with the same individuals, letters from collaborators outlining the contributions of the candidate

to the collaborations. These letters should comment only on this issue and should not be regarded as letters of reference.

- h) Where a candidate does not have a formal joint appointment but does a significant amount of teaching or other work in another Faculty, a statement from the Dean of that Faculty.
- i) Letter(s) identifying serious concerns and the candidate's response(s), if any.
- j) If the recommendation of either the Head or the departmental standing committee is negative, a copy of the letter to the candidate from the Head informing him or her of the recommendation and the reasons for that recommendation (see Section 5.5 below), and the candidate's written response, if any.

The following should not normally be included in a file:

- a) Letters from individual members of the Departmental Standing Committee. Their inclusion gives undue prominence to the views of those members.
- b) Letters of reference that have not been solicited in accordance with the procedures set out in the Agreement.
- c) Page by page assessments of manuscripts of a sort more appropriate to the needs of a potential publisher.
- d) Samples of the candidate's publications.
- e) The full teaching dossier (unless for a Senior Instructor case).

5.5 Notification to the Candidate

Note: see Article 5.08 of the Agreement.

5.5.1 In all cases other than an initial appointment, the Head must, at the time the recommendation(s) is forwarded to the Dean, inform the candidate in writing of the recommendation(s) being forwarded.

5.5.2 If the recommendation of either the Head or the departmental standing committee is negative, the Head must provide the candidate detailed and specific reasons in writing for any negative recommendation, including respects in which the candidate is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Where the Head's recommendation is negative but that of the standing committee is positive, the Head must also provide detailed and specific reasons for the positive recommendation.

5.5.3 The Head may provide detailed and specific reasons by giving the candidate a copy of the letter of recommendation being forwarded to the Dean. However, if that is done, the letter must be modified to the extent necessary to protect the identity of the referees. The candidate should be invited to make a timely response to the Dean (e.g. 5-10 days), which should be added to the file.

6 INFORMATION FOR THE DEAN AND THE FACULTY

6.1 Dean's Review and Consultation

- 6.1.1 The Dean should review the recommendations received from the Head to ensure that proper procedures have been followed, that all relevant material has been considered, and that recommendations made are consistent with the evidence presented (Article 5.10 of the Agreement).
- 6.1.2 Deans of Faculties without departments shall ensure that recommendations for appointments, reappointments, tenure decisions and promotions are arrived at by procedures and arrangements consistent with those for Departments and Faculties. Units governed by Article 5.09 in the Agreement should seek advice on these procedures, and any changes to those procedures, to ensure consistency with the Agreement and to facilitate coordination with the provisions in this Guide. Where there is no Head's letter, such as when a Faculty does not have a departmental structure, the Dean's letter should include all matters ordinarily found in the Head's Letter.
- 6.1.3 Under Article 5.10 of the Agreement, in the case of recommendations concerning tenure or promotion, the Dean must consult with an advisory committee. The Dean must also consult with an advisory committee on recommendations concerning reappointment when s/he is considering not recommending in favour of reappointment. In the case of other recommendations, the Dean may consult with an advisory committee.

| Recommendation | Consult with Faculty Advisory Committee? |
|-----------------------|---|
| Tenure | Yes |
| Promotion | Yes |
| Reappointment | Yes, if negative; otherwise, may consult |
| New Appointment | Yes, if with tenure; otherwise, may consult |

- 6.1.4 Under Article 5.10 of the Agreement, the Dean's advisory committee should be composed of tenured full professors, one-half of whom should be elected by the faculty, and one-half of whom should be selected by the Dean. Heads who are tenured full professors will be eligible for selection by the Dean but will not vote on any cases involving candidates from their own department for whom a recommendation has already been made by that Head. In selecting members of the committee, the Dean should take into account the need for representation of disciplines within the Faculty, including emerging disciplines and multi-disciplinary activities, and the need to maintain gender balance. Sufficient members should be on the Committee to ensure that the Committee is able to fully and fairly assess the full range of scholarly activity and teaching within the Faculty. Please note that the UBCO MOA in [Appendix 10](#) provides for an exception to the above for reviews conducted at UBCO.
- 6.1.5 Advisory committee members at the Faculty level should not vote on a case unless they are able to participate in all substantive discussion of the case at that level. Eligible members who cannot participate can send a memorandum indicating their support (positive or negative) for a case and reasons. This memorandum can be considered by other members of the committee but will not constitute a vote (i.e., there is no voting in absentia or by proxy).

- 6.1.6 Where a candidate is being considered for both tenure and promotion, the Faculty advisory committee must take separate votes on promotion and tenure, unless the initial vote on promotion to Associate Professor is unanimously positive. Note that this does not apply to promotion/tenure cases before the seventh year. Where a candidate has declined to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, only tenure will be voted upon.
- 6.1.7 The Dean should review the original letter of offer of appointment to the candidate to ensure that no special terms were agreed upon which might impact the consideration.
- 6.1.8 The Dean may request further information from the Head and the departmental standing committee, and may also obtain such further information from the Head or candidate as is deemed appropriate (Article 5.10 of the Agreement).
- 6.1.9 It is recommended that where the Dean is considering a negative recommendation that is contrary to the recommendations from the Head and/or departmental standing committee, the Dean should provide the candidate an opportunity to respond to the serious concerns identified by the Dean prior to finalizing his or her decision.
- 6.1.10 It is recommended that where the Dean has received new information which gives rise to concern, the Dean should consider whether the candidate should be provided an opportunity to provide a written response to these concerns prior to finalizing his or her decision.
- 6.1.11 The Dean, after considering the advice of the advisory committee, may (i) refer the case back to the Head and the departmental standing committee for reconsideration; or (ii) make a recommendation to the President (Article 5.10 of the Agreement).

6.2 Recommendations to the President

- 6.2.1 The Dean's letter to the President about a case should
 - a) Clearly state the Dean's recommendation and the detailed reasons for that recommendation.
 - b) Provide a summary of the votes at each level.

| | |
|--|---|
| EXAMPLE: | |
| Dr. ABC: Promotion to Professor | |
| <i>Standing Committee</i> | <i>6-0-0 for promotion to Professor</i> |
| <i>Head's Recommendation</i> | <i>Promote to Professor</i> |
| <i>Dean's Advisory Committee</i> | <i>5-0-1 for promotion to Professor</i> |
| <i>Dean's Recommendation</i> | <i>Promote to Professor</i> |

- c) Clearly identify seventh-year tenure considerations as such.
- d) Clearly identify if a promotion review is periodic or non-periodic.

- e) Clearly identify the effective date of the recommended decision.
- f) Clearly acknowledge the scholarly activity track(s) to be assessed in this particular case (i.e. traditional scholarship, scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions).
- g) Make no distinction between grant tenure and tenure, or grant tenure track and tenure track.
- h) Summarize the reasons for the Faculty committee's vote and for the Dean's own recommendation.
- i) If the Dean's recommendation is different from that of the Head or that of the departmental standing committee (or both), inform the President of the reasons for this (Article 5.11 (b) of the Agreement).
- j) Indicate ways in which the academic culture of a particular discipline (or sub-discipline) bears on the recommendation.
- k) If the Head or departmental standing committee made a negative recommendation, and the candidate did not respond to notification by Dean and/or Head of this fact, confirm that that it was the candidate's decision not to respond.
- l) The Dean's letter should not repeat information provided by the Head, except as set out above, but it should include all relevant information not addressed by the Head and any new issues that arise.

6.2.2 The Dean should, except when his or her decision concerning an initial appointment or a non-periodic promotion review is negative, forward his or her recommendation to the President together with the recommendations received from the Department (Article 5.11 (a) of the Agreement).

6.2.3 For all recommendations except initial appointments and reappointments of tenure track Assistant Professors and Instructor I's, the Dean's office will provide 20 copies (double-sided) of the file plus the original to the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations responsible for SAC. The files will include the following documents in this order:

- a) SAC Cover Sheet* (see Appendix 7)
- b) Dean's letter to the President**
- c) Dean's letter to the candidate, if negative
- d) Candidate's response to the Dean's letter (c), if received prior to sending the file to SAC
- e) Any relevant correspondence between the Dean and the Department Head
- f) Head's letter to the Dean and the departmental standing committee report**
- g) Head's letter to the candidate, if negative

- h) Candidate's response the Head's letter (g)
- i) Head's letter to the candidate, if serious concerns
- j) Candidate's response to the Head's letter of serious concerns (i) (if applicable)
- k) Curriculum vitae and publication record (sent to referees)
- l) Curriculum vitae and publication record updates
- m) Evidence regarding teaching (see [Appendix 3](#))
- n) List of and brief summary of qualifications and justification for referees
- o) Head's sample letter(s) requesting the external referees' letters
- p) Letters of reference

* There is a Faculty-specific colour code for docket cover sheets available on the Faculty Relations website (www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/saccolourcode.html).

**Please note that in the case of joint appointments between Departments and/or Faculties, letters from both academic units in which the person holds an appointment should be included: see [Section 8](#).

For all recommendations of initial appointments and reappointments of tenure track Assistant Professors and Instructor Is, please review the documentation checklist available on Faculty Relations website for further instructions (www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/appointmentguide/checklists.html).

6.3 Notification of Dean's Decision

a) The Candidate

- 6.3.1 In all cases other than initial appointments, the Dean must, at the time the recommendations are being forwarded to the President, inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation (Article 5.12 (a) of the Agreement). The Dean should also remind the candidate of her/his right to supplement the file with new, unsolicited information (such as a new set of student evaluations, the publication of an additional book or article, the receipt of a grant, a published review of their work, etc.) up to the time of the President's decision. Supplemental information should be sent to the Dean who will forward it to the President via the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations.
- 6.3.2 If the recommendation of the Dean is negative in opposition to the recommendation of the Head or the departmental standing committee (or both), or for reasons not raised by the Head or the departmental standing committee, the Dean must provide detailed and specific reasons in writing to the candidate, including the respect in which he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria (Article 5.11 (b) of the Agreement). These reasons must be included with the recommendation.
- 6.3.3 Under Article 5.12 (c) of the Agreement, the Dean may provide detailed and specific reasons by giving the candidate a copy of the Dean's letter of recommendation to the

President. However, if this is done, the letter must be modified to the extent necessary to protect the identity of the referees. The candidate should be invited to make a timely response to the Dean, which will be added to the file.

b) Head and Departmental Standing Committee

6.3.4 If the Dean's recommendation goes against the recommendation of either the Head or the departmental standing committee (or both), the Dean must inform the Head of this fact and the reasons for it, and the Head should inform the members of the departmental standing committee (Article 5.13 of the Agreement).

7 NEW APPOINTMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY SAC

7.1 CVs for new appointees should, as far as possible, convey the same kind of information that is present in a UBC CV: e.g., documentation regarding scholarly contributions, records of research grants and teaching activities, etc. (see [Section 4.2](#)).

7.2 In the case of new appointments to be considered by SAC, as much evidence as possible should be included about teaching. For instance, a candidate can provide a statement of teaching philosophy in the CV. Peer and student evaluations from previous institutions can also be included. In the absence of information on formal teaching experience, evidence of the teaching potential could include information such as assessments of presentations given as part of the recruitment process, evaluation of conference presentations, mentoring relationships and team management. Note that candidates coming up for early promotion can also benefit from information on teaching in previous positions.

7.3 For all new appointments that are to be considered by SAC, there must be at least four external letters, of which at least two letters must be from arm's length referees. Please note that non-arm's length letters should be external to UBC and to the individual's current institution. Arm's length letters, even if they were requested by the candidate as part of the recruitment process, can be counted towards the 2 arm's length letters necessary. Please refer to [Appendix 5](#) for the Sample Letter of Request for Reference. In all cases, the Head should provide brief notes on the qualifications of the external referees and identify both arm's length and non-arm's-length referees that are included in a file for a new appointment.

7.4 It is recommended that Departments and Faculties putting forward nominations for Canada Research Chairs, LEEF Chairs or senior administrative positions should add the necessary information about the UBC rank and tenure in the request for reference letters. This will help facilitate a smooth and timely appointment process.

7.5 For new decanal appointments, the Provost will be responsible for obtaining the letters of reference, taking the case to the Department(s) for consultation and voting and then presenting the case to the Senior Appointments Committee.

8 JOINT APPOINTMENTS

- 8.1 If the candidate holds a joint appointment, the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion evaluation should be clearly laid out and confirmed in writing at the time of appointment (Article 5.01 (c) of the Agreement).
- 8.2 The procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion evaluation should be discussed with the candidate in the meetings with the Head concerning reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.
- 8.3 Letters from all academic units in which the person holds an appointment must be included in the dossier.
- 8.4 For more information about what is required of a joint appointment, please review the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures for Faculty Members Holding Appointments in more than One Academic Unit” available online at www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/appointmentguide/joint.html.

9 INFORMATION ABOUT THE SENIOR APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

9.1 Composition

- 9.1.1 The Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) is a standing advisory committee established by and making recommendations to the President (Article 5.14 (a) of the Agreement) on tenure and on initial appointments and promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. SAC does not review recommendations for appointment or reappointment to the rank of Assistant Professor or Instructor I or for promotion to Assistant Professor.
- 9.1.2 SAC consists of 20 Professors appointed by the President. A typical term for membership on SAC is 3 years.
- 9.1.3 Each year, the membership of SAC will be reviewed by the Provost and nominations for new members will be solicited from the Deans. The Faculty Association Executive also nominates one of the members (Article 5.14 (a) of the Agreement). All possible efforts will be made by the Provost and the Deans to ensure equitable representation of women and visible minorities, as well as of disciplines at both the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses.

9.2 Membership of SAC for 2009/10

1. Charlyn Black, School of Population & Public Health
2. Laurel Brinton, Department of English
3. Donald Brunette, Department of Oral Biological and Medical Sciences
4. Judith Daniluk, Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, and Special Education
5. Sian Echard, Department of English
6. Richard Froese, Department of Mathematics

7. Eric Hall, Department of Civil Engineering
8. Carl Hodge, Barber School of Arts and Sciences – UBCO
9. Murray Hodgson, School of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene
10. John Innes, Department of Forest Resources Management
11. Ian McKendry, Department of Geography
12. Thomas Oxland, Department of Orthopaedics
13. Kenneth Reeder, Department of Language and Literacy Education*
14. John Roeder, School of Music
15. Peter Soja, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
16. Martin Tanner, Department of Chemistry
17. Dan Weary, Faculty of Land and Food Systems
18. Susan Wells, Barber School of Arts and Sciences – UBCO
19. Ralph Winter, Sauder School of Business

Susan Boyd from the Faculty of Law is the Chair of SAC.

*Faculty Association representative

9.3 Criteria for Evaluation of the Candidate’s File

- 9.3.1 SAC will judge each candidate’s file on its merits. Such evaluation will take place within the context of its mandate to examine the achievements of the candidate with regard to teaching, research, and service to the University, to the discipline, and to the broader community.
- 9.3.2 Such deliberations will incorporate a consideration of general criteria of scholarship and scholarly and teaching excellence, particularly as these are identified and defined by the external reviewers, in prior reviews by the Department and Faculty Committee, and by the Dean of the Faculty as set out in his/her letter of recommendation and his/her presentation(s) to SAC during its meetings.
- 9.3.3 In evaluating a candidate’s scholarship and teaching contributions, SAC will accept and consider comparative information on the relative merits of the candidate’s achievements within the disciplinary background of the candidate.
- 9.3.4 In its consideration, SAC will assess the information contained in each candidate’s file in terms of the impartiality of prior judgments, particularly in terms of its obligation to ensure that criteria of fairness have been employed and that the rights of the candidate to fair and equitable treatment have been maintained.

See [Appendix 8](#) for SAC’s Procedures.

9.4 Schedule of SAC Meetings for 2009/10

| Date of Meeting | Time | Submission Deadline |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 2009 | | |
| Friday, September 11 | 2:30-5:00pm | |
| Friday, September 25 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, September 9 |
| Friday, October 9 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, September 23 |
| Friday, October 23 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, October 7 |

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Friday, November 6 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, October 21 |
| Friday, November 20 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, November 4 |
| Friday, December 4 | 3:00-5:00pm | Wednesday, November 18 |
| 2010 | | |
| Friday, January 8 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, December 2 |
| Friday, January 22 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, January 6 |
| Friday, February 5 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, January 20 |
| Friday, February 26 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, February 3 |
| Friday, March 12 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, February 24 |
| Friday, March 26 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, March 10 |
| Friday, April 9 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, March 24 |
| Friday, April 23 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, April 7 |
| Friday, May 7 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, April 21 |
| Friday, May 21 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, May 5 |
| Friday, June 4 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, May 19 |
| Friday, June 18 | 2:30-5:00pm | Wednesday, June 2 |

Note: See [Appendix 8](#) for SAC's procedures on voting during the summer months or when meetings are cancelled.

10 INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

- 10.1 Except in the case of initial appointments, the President will, at the time a decision is made on whether or not a recommendation is to be forwarded to the Board of Governors respecting a candidate, inform the candidate in writing of that decision with a copy to the Faculty Association.
- 10.2 If the recommendation of the President is negative, the President will provide detailed and specific reasons in writing to the candidate, including the respects in which he or she has failed to meet the applicable criteria, and send a copy to the Faculty Association. The final recommendation of the President will also be communicated to the SAC.
- 10.3 If the President makes a recommendation not to grant a tenured appointment, the candidate will normally be given a one-year terminal appointment. If the decision not to grant a tenured appointment is received after December 1 of the academic year following the review year, the period of notice of termination will include one complete academic year in addition to any months remaining in the academic year in which the notice of termination is received.
- 10.4 The President's decision to deny reappointment, tenure, or promotion may be appealed by the Faculty Association and referred to arbitration according to the procedures as provided in Article 13 of the Agreement. A decision may be appealed if there were procedural errors in the process that may have resulted in a wrong decisions or the decision was unreasonable.

10.5 Upon notice of appeal from the Faculty Association of a decision by the President to deny reappointment, tenure or promotion, the University will provide a copy to the Faculty Association of the candidate's file reviewed by the President. The file will be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality required under Article 5.01(d) of the Agreement and to protect the identity of referees.

11 CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE

| Campus | Name | Office | Phone Number | Email |
|--------|---------------|---|--------------|--|
| UBCV | TBD | Faculty Relations | TBD | fr@exchange.ubc.ca |
| UBCO | George Athans | Human Resources | 250-827-8622 | george@hr.ubc.ca |
| UBCV | Colette Hogg | Faculty Relations (assistant to SAC) | 604-827-4473 | chogg@exchange.ubc.ca |

APPENDIX 1 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR PERIODIC REVIEWS ONLY

(to be sent by the Head between March 1st and May 15th to those entitled to a periodic review in the next year, July 1-June 30)

Dear:

I am pleased to inform you that you are entitled to a periodic review of your record during the next year (July 1-June 30) under Article 9 of the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*.

If you do not wish to be reviewed at this time, please indicate so at the bottom of this letter and return it to me by [date]. Please note that the University reserves the right to review your record at any time for the purpose of promotion under Article 9.03. A periodic review of your record will be made at your written request in any subsequent year before the next periodic review due under Article 9.01 (a) or (b).

If you wish to be reviewed for promotion, please provide a list of at least four possible arm's length referees from which at least two referees will be asked to provide a letter of assessment of your work. Please do not contact any potential referees about this process. I will arrange for us to meet soon to discuss the review and the relevant documentation you will need to provide. Please note that it is your responsibility to ensure that your curricula vitae is up-to-date. This documentation must be provided to me no later than [date not earlier than September 1].

Yours sincerely,

- * I wish to be reviewed for promotion during the coming academic year in accordance with Article 9 of the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*? (Please check the appropriate box)
 Yes No

Signature: _____

If yes, please complete the following:

I wish a letter of appraisal to be obtained from at least two of the following external referees (name at least four).

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| a) _____ (Name, please print) | _____ |
| b) _____ | _____ |
| c) _____ | _____ |
| d) _____ | _____ |

APPENDIX 2 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 7TH YEAR CASES

(to be sent by the Head between March 1st and May 15th to those entitled to a periodic review in the next year, July 1-June 30)

Dear:

I am pleased to inform you that you will be reviewed for tenure and that you are also entitled to a periodic review of your record for promotion to Associate Professor during the next year (July 1-June 30) under Article 9 of the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*.

The tenure review is compulsory but you have the option to be reviewed for promotion under Article 9.01(c). It is anticipated, however, that you will also be reviewed for promotion at this time.

If you do not wish to be reviewed for promotion at this time, please indicate so at the bottom of this letter and return to me by [date]. Please note that the University reserves the right to review your record at any time for the purpose of promotion under Article 9.03. A periodic review of your record will be made at your written request in a subsequent year before the next periodic review due under Article 9.01 (a) or (b).

Please provide a list of at least four possible arm's length referees from which at least two referees will be asked to provide a letter of assessment of your work. Please do not contact any potential referees about this process. I will arrange for us to meet soon to discuss the review for tenure and promotion, if desired, and the relevant documentation you will need to provide. Please note that it is your responsibility to ensure that your curricula vitae is up-to-date. This documentation and your list of possible referees must be provided to me no later than [date not earlier than September 1].

Yours sincerely,

Please complete the following:

I wish a letter of appraisal to be obtained from at least two of the following external referees (name at least four).

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| a) _____ | _____ |
| (Name, please print) | (Contact Information) |
| b) _____ | _____ |
| c) _____ | _____ |
| d) _____ | _____ |

* I wish to be reviewed for promotion during the coming academic year in accordance with Article 9 of the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*? (Please check the appropriate box)

Yes No

Signature: _____

APPENDIX 3 – TEACHING EVIDENCE

It is important that all recommendations for initial appointments, promotion, or tenure be supported by detailed evidence about the quality of a candidate's teaching. The amount of evidence will vary according to the circumstances of an individual case (e.g. the extent to which a recommendation rests on the teaching record), but there is a minimum necessary for all cases. There needs to be enough evidence so that committees beyond the Department can be confident that the University's standards for teaching performance have been met. Note that in the case of Senior Instructors, the standard for teaching performance is excellence.

The complete teaching dossier is often an important factor in assessment for promotion and tenure by a candidate's Department, School or Faculty. However, the teaching dossier is less useful to the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) because SAC lacks detailed knowledge of each academic unit's standards and expectations with respect to teaching for those in the professorial ranks. Full teaching dossiers should not be forwarded to SAC except in cases of reviews for tenure at the rank of Senior Instructor where more evidence may be required in order to demonstrate the candidate has met the standard of excellence in teaching.

SAC therefore requests that, instead of a complete teaching dossier, each candidate's file include a summative assessment of the teaching portfolio and other appropriate evidence of performance as a university teacher and educator. Typically 2-3 pages in length, the assessment should include:

- A quantitative summary of the amount of teaching of all kinds performed by the candidate at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, and a statement regarding how the amount of teaching compares to the expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty. If the amount of teaching in one or more particular areas does not meet the expected norms, an explanatory statement or comment should also be included.
- A quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations, and a statement regarding how these evaluations compare to the expected norms in the Department, School or Faculty. This information should be provided, if possible, for all levels and formats in which the candidate teaches. If the candidate's student evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the expected norms, a comment or explanatory statement should also be included.
- A summary of qualitative peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, and a statement regarding how these assessments compare to the expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty. If the candidate's peer evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the normally expected standard, a comment or explanatory statement should also be included. Charts may be helpful in setting out the summary, for example, giving average percentile rankings. Information about peer evaluations is provided by the Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth (TAG) (www.tag.ubc.ca/resources/evaluation/guidelines.php).
- A statement regarding the candidate's performance as a graduate student supervisor in terms of the students' degree completion, publications, research awards, and subsequent professional success.

- A description of any other major teaching or educational activities performed by the candidate, along with statements supported by summarized evidence regarding the candidate's effectiveness and the importance of these activities to the Department, School or Faculty. Included should be such activities as curriculum development, programme or course direction, or development of instructional materials or websites.
- A list and brief description of any awards or other recognition of teaching excellence the candidate has received.
- A list and brief description of any special or remedial efforts undertaken by the candidate to improve teaching performance.
- A summary of any other evidence that bears upon the effectiveness or quality of the candidate's teaching. This might include, for example, national professional accreditation of a training programme the candidate directs or recognition by a scholarly society of the candidate's educational contributions to the field.
- An overall summary of the candidate's performance as a university teacher and educator, and a statement describing how this compares to the expected norm for the Department, School or Faculty.

APPENDIX 4 – ANNOTATED CV

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Curriculum Vitae for Faculty Members

Date:

Initials:

Notes:

- Commentary and suggestions regarding CV and publication record entries are shown throughout this document in bold underlined italics.
- Close attention to detail (e.g. page numbers of all papers, accurate, clear and complete) is needed.
- Information (e.g. paper presentations) should not be duplicated or repeated in different sections of the CV and publication record. For example, if two (or 10) different presentations all have the same title, they should be listed as separate presentations, differentiated by location and date or publication details.
- Please retain section headings even when there are no entries within that section.
- Acronyms that are not known outside a specific discipline should be avoided.
- If this CV format does not provide the right categories for your discipline, categories can be added as long as the information is placed in a logical place (publications with publications, presentations with presentations, teaching with teaching, service with service) and is clearly labeled.
- Avoid subjective comments.

1. SURNAME:

FIRST NAME:
MIDDLE NAME(S):

2. DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL: (for joint appointments, give both departments with % appointment in each)

3. FACULTY:

4. PRESENT RANK:

SINCE:

5. POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

| University or Institution | Degree | Subject Area | Dates |
|---------------------------|--------|--------------|-------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

As an option, include in a footnote: Title of Dissertation, and Research Supervisor

Special Professional Qualifications

6. **EMPLOYMENT RECORD**

(a) *Prior to coming to UBC*

| University, Company or Organization | Rank or Title | Dates |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

(b) *At UBC*

| Rank or Title | Dates |
|---------------|-------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Check start date and rank to ensure that without review appointments are noted appropriately

(c) *Date of granting of tenure at U.B.C.:*

7. **LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

| University, Company or Organization at which Leave was taken | Type of Leave | Dates |
|--|---------------|-------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

8. **TEACHING**

(a) *Areas of special interest and accomplishments*

Candidates are encouraged to provide a concise statement of teaching philosophy or approach to teaching (not exceeding 150 words), especially where such statements affect the way student or peer evaluations could be interpreted.

(b) *Courses Taught at UBC (both undergraduate & graduate)*

| Session | Course Number | Scheduled Hours | Class Size | Hours Taught | | | |
|---------|---------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|-----------|------|-------|
| | | | | Lectures | Tutorials | Labs | Other |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Notes:

- Entries should be in chronological order (2007W, 2008W), listing all courses taught each year (even if this means repeating course entries for different years)
- For “Scheduled Hours”, provide the total number of formal contact hours for the relevant course section in which you were involved.
- For “Total Hours Taught”, provide the number of formal contact hours applicable to you.

(c) *Graduate Students Supervised*

| Student Name | Program Type | Year | | Supervisory Role (supervisor, co-supervisor, committee member) |
|--------------|--------------|-------|--------|---|
| | | Start | Finish | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Notes:

- Entries should be in chronological order of "Finish" date.
- Graduate students who are no longer "active" may be included, but they should be so identified.
- As options, footnotes to the table may include thesis titles, current positions of graduated students, and awards attained by former graduate students.
- Postdoctoral Fellows can be included (or a new section called "Postdoctoral Fellows Supervised" can be created).

(d) Continuing Education Activities

(e) Visiting Lecturer (indicate university/organization and dates)

(f) Other

9. SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

(a) Areas of special interest and accomplishments

Please include a clear and concise statement of your contributions to scholarship and the criteria that you deem to be appropriate in assessing your contributions (not to exceed 150 words).

(b) Research or equivalent grants (indicate under COMP whether grants were obtained competitively (C) or non-competitively (NC))

| Granting Agency | Subject | COMP | \$ Per Year | Year | Principal Investigator | Co-Investigator(s) |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

- It should be made clear whether a dollar amount is annual or not.

- *In cases of multiple recipients of grants, please indicate your specific role and if necessary, add a footnote to provide additional information.*

(c) *Research or equivalent contracts (indicate under COMP whether grants were obtained competitively (C) or non-competitively (NC)).*

| Granting Agency | Subject | COMP | \$ Per Year | % \$ to Candidate | Year | Principal Investigator | Co-Investigator (s) |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

(d) *Invited Presentations*

(e) *Other Presentations*

(f) *Other*

(g) *Conference Participation (Organizer, Keynote Speaker, etc.)*

10. SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

(a) *Areas of special interest and accomplishments*

(b) *Memberships on committees, including offices held and dates*

(c) *Other service, including dates*

- *Such as thesis examination committees.*

11. **SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY**

- (a) *Memberships on scholarly societies, including offices held and dates*
- (b) *Memberships on other societies, including offices held and dates*
- (c) *Memberships on scholarly committees, including offices held and dates*
- (d) *Memberships on other committees, including offices held and dates*
- (e) *Editorships (list journal and dates)*
- (f) *Reviewer (journal, agency, etc. including dates)*
- (g) *External examiner (indicate universities and dates)*
- (h) *Consultant (indicate organization and dates)*
- (i) *Other service to the community*

12. **AWARDS AND DISTINCTIONS**

- (a) *Awards for Teaching (indicate name of award, awarding organizations, date)*
 - ***Awards received by graduate students or postdoctoral fellows under your supervision may be included.***
- (b) *Awards for Scholarship (indicate name of award, awarding organizations, date)*

(c) *Awards for Service (indicate name of award, awarding organizations, date)*

(d) *Other Awards*

13. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION (Maximum One Page)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Publications Record

SURNAME:

FIRST NAME:

Initials:

MIDDLE NAME(S):

Date:

Notes:

- Publications should be listed in the standard bibliographical form (with first and last page indicated and the order of authorship clear). Publications that are considered to be of primary importance are to be marked with an asterisk.
- Where there is multiple authorship of papers or books, please make the precise role of the candidate clear. The candidate might include a statement of "policy on authorship" in the CV that indicates the significance of first author, last author, etc., or might specify the contribution made to each publication. Alternatively, the head's letter might contain this information.
- For co-authored papers, it is helpful to have a code that indicates the status and role of other authors, e.g., which co-authors are a candidate's own former supervisors or current or former graduate students or postdoctoral fellows.
- While the headers must be maintained, the order can be changed to reflect importance within that discipline (for example, "Books" can be first in the Humanities).

1. REFEREED PUBLICATIONS

(a) *Journals*

(b) *Conference Proceedings*

(c) *Other*

2. NON-REFEREED PUBLICATIONS

(a) *Journals*

(b) *Conference Proceedings*

(c) *Other*

3. **BOOKS**

(a) *Authored*

(b) *Edited*

(c) *Chapters*

4. **PATENTS**

5. **SPECIAL COPYRIGHTS**

6. **ARTISTIC WORKS, PERFORMANCES, DESIGNS**

7. **OTHER WORKS**

8. **WORK SUBMITTED** (including publisher and date of submission)

9. **WORK IN PROGRESS** (including degree of completion)

APPENDIX 5 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE

1. It is recommended that Head's contact potential referees to determine whether the referee is willing to provide a letter of assessment and if so, to do so by the deadline provided, using the following:

[Date]

Dear **[referee name]**:

RE: **[candidate name]**

The University of British Columbia is considering **[candidate name]** for **[decision option]**¹ in the Department of _____. On behalf of **[candidate name]**, I am writing to ask if you are willing to provide an arm's length assessment of **[candidate name's]** scholarly activity with particular emphasis on the significance of her/his scholarly work in this field.

Referees are not normally expected to include relatives, close personal friends, clients, current or former colleagues, former thesis advisors, research supervisors, grant co-holders, or co-authors. If you should feel that your relationship to the candidate is such that it might affect your ability to evaluate him/her effectively, please feel free to decline to write an assessment.

We rely heavily on outside letters in making decisions of this nature. I realize that the effort required to write such letters is significant and that the rewards are very limited. I would therefore like to emphasize our deep gratitude for your assistance in this important task.

Please advise within the next week whether you are willing and able to provide us with this assessment and if yes, whether you can do so by **[deadline]**. If so, I will forward **[candidate name]**'s curriculum vitae, and selected publications to you as soon as possible. You can contact me at **[email]** or by fax at **[fax #]**.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

2. If the potential referee is willing to provide a letter of assessment by the deadline, then the following letter can be used:

[Date]

Dear **[referee name]**:

RE: **[candidate name]**

The University of British Columbia is considering **[candidate name]** for **[decision option]**¹ in the Department of _____. On behalf of **[candidate name]**, I am writing to ask you to provide an arm's length assessment of **[candidate name's]** scholarly activity with particular emphasis on the significance of her/his scholarly work in this field. **[Phrase options depending on year of decision]**.ⁱⁱ Please indicate in your letter whether you know the candidate, and if so, in what capacity.

I would ask that you please make an explicit recommendation concerning [**decision option**], in the context of the UBC Collective Agreement, and based on the evidence made available to you. I have enclosed an excerpt from the Collective Agreement that discusses the criteria for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion at UBC. [**For professional cases:** I have also provided an excerpt of our Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC, and I would ask that you address the specific points in this article in evaluating this candidate's professional contributions. **For scholarship of teaching cases:** I have also provided an excerpt of our Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC, and I would ask that you address the specific points in this article in evaluating this candidate's scholarship of teaching contributions.]

We would appreciate your providing succinct comments on each of the questions below, but we hope you will also refer to any other matters you believe will assist in evaluating the candidate (e.g. direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, administrative performance, etc.). We would be grateful for candid and specific comments about all aspects of the candidate's scholarly and professional achievements.

- (a) Were you aware of the candidate's publications before now? Had you read any of them? In what ways are they referred to in other literature in the field?
- (b) On the basis of the information available to you, how do you compare the candidate as a scholar and researcher to others you know in his/her general field?
- (c) To what degree is the candidate's work original and creative? To what degree is it marked by industry and thoroughness? How significant is it as a contribution to knowledge in his/her specific area and in his/her subject more generally?
- (d) Apart from his/her scholarly work, do you know of any contributions the candidate has made to the development of his/her subject in Canada or elsewhere, e.g. through activities in learned societies, organizing conferences, and so forth? In your opinion how significant have these activities been from the standpoint of promoting teaching and scholarship in his/her subject?
- (e) Please add any further comments you think might be useful in assessing the candidate.

It is the policy of the University to treat as confidential letters of reference which it receives. It can, however, be required under Freedom of Information legislation to disclose the substance of any letter of reference but only where that can be done without disclosing the identity of the writer. In addition, if in the course of consideration of a candidate a negative recommendation is made within the University, the candidate is entitled to see a summary or an edited version of letters, but again the summary or editing is done so as not to disclose the identity of the writer. To facilitate this, you may precede your evaluation with a letter of transmittal such that the evaluation itself does not identify you or your institution. The letter of transmittal will be included as part of the evaluation file but excluded from a requested summary.

We rely heavily on outside letters in making decisions of this nature. I realize that the effort required to write such letters is significant and that the rewards are very limited. I would therefore like to emphasize our deep gratitude for your assistance.

I will look forward to receiving your letter of assessment by [deadline]. You can contact me at [email] or by fax at [fax #].

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Enclosures

1. Excerpt from the Agreement
 - a. Professor
(www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/ms_word_files/EXCERPT_FROM_THE_AGREEMENT_FOR_PROFESSORS.doc)
 - b. Associate Professor
(www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/ms_word_files/EXCERPT_FROM_THE_AGREEMENT_FOR_ASSOCIATE_PROFESSORS.doc)
 - c. Senior Instructor
(http://www.hr.ubc.ca/files/faculty_relations/ms_word_files/EXCERPT_FROM_THE_AGREEMENT_FOR_SENIOR_INSTRUCTORS.doc)
 2. Professional Contributions (if applicable) [attach a copy of [Section 3.1 \(c\)](#)]
 3. Scholarship of Teaching (if applicable) [attach a copy of [Section 3.1 \(b\)](#)]
 4. Samples of the candidate's scholarly work, unless the referee has alternative access to this work
 5. Curriculum Vitae
-

- i
 1. Tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor
 2. Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor
 3. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor which comes with tenure
 4. Promotion to the rank of Professor
 5. Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
 6. Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor (tenure track)
 7. Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure
 8. Appointment to the rank of Professor with tenure
- ii
 1. Include for pre-7th year decision regarding promotion to Associate Professor:
“At UBC, a successful decision would result in promotion and tenure. A negative decision would mean that final consideration of tenure would be postponed until a subsequent year.”
 2. Include for 7th year tenure decisions for Assistant Professors or 3rd or 5th year tenure decisions for Associate Professors:
“I should point out that this is a mandatory tenure review and is the only time when **[candidate name]** will be reviewed for tenure.”
 3. Include for 7th year tenure and promotion decisions for Assistant Professors:
“Tenure will be automatically granted if promotion occurs, but it is possible to recommend tenure in the current rank without promotion.”

4. Include for 7th year tenure decisions for Assistant Professors and 5th year tenure decisions for Associate Professors where a tenure clock extension has been granted:

“Please note that [**candidate name**]'s tenure clock has been extended by one year in recognition of [**reason for tenure clock extension**]; this will be a mandatory tenure review and is the only time when [**candidate name**] will be reviewed for tenure.”

APPENDIX 6 – HEAD’S LETTER (SUGGESTED FORMAT)

Dear Dean XXXX:

Re: **Consideration of Dr. XXXX for [XXXX]**

- Clearly indicate Head’s recommendation and the basis for the recommendation.
- Clearly identify a seventh-year tenure consideration
- If a 7th year tenure cases waives the right to a periodic review, please indicate this in the letter. While the candidate has the right to waive this review, it would be helpful for SAC to set out the circumstances leading to the waiver.
- Clearly identify promotions as either periodic or non-periodic
- Make no distinction between grant tenure, and tenure or grant tenure track and tenure track.
- Provide information on special conditions of the candidate's appointment, including, but not limited to, reduced teaching or administrative responsibilities, unusually extensive teaching or administrative responsibilities, protected time for research or scholarly activity, medical, maternity or parental leaves or responsibilities in more than one unit.
- Provide information on Department norms at the rank being considered with regard to teaching load, graduate supervision, administrative responsibilities, dissemination of research or other scholarly work and external funding.
- Provide any relevant contextual information about how factors such as race, sex, disability or Aboriginal status should affect assessment of the candidate’s performance. For example, some candidates who are members of historically disadvantaged groups, or under-represented groups at the university, may spend more time than is normally expected in mentoring students and junior colleagues. Note if and how any agreements have been made between the University and the Faculty Association governing the consideration of the case.
- Provide a report of the departmental committee’s deliberations including a full statement by the Head of the majority and any minority opinions.
- Ensure that the evidence supports the recommendation(s).
- Address all relevant concerns raised by referees.

Background and Process

- date of Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings at which a vote was taken
- summary of what occurred at each meeting
- if serious concerns, confirm that the candidate was given the opportunity to respond prior to the vote
- number of members eligible to vote
- number present at a meeting
- explanation of absences of eligible members
- number of votes for and against--and abstentions (with an explanation of the latter); unexplained abstentions are usually to be treated as tantamount to a negative vote

Teaching

- See Article 4.02 in the Agreement
- See also Appendix 3 on Teaching Evidence
- The peer evaluations should normally consist of reports from at least 2 colleagues who have each attended at least 2 lectures or other teaching activity. Deviations from these norms should be explained in the Head's letter.

Undergraduate Teaching

Graduate Teaching

Graduate Student Supervision

Scholarly Activity

- See Article 4.03 in the Agreement
- Where a candidate's scholarly activities involve more than one area (traditional publications, scholarship of teaching, professional contributions), ensure that consideration is given to all of the active areas.
- Conventions on the order of authorship vary widely and it is helpful to SAC to be informed of the convention in use.

Traditional Publications

- It is useful to have an indication of the stature of journals and status of publishers (such as its acceptance rate) in which a candidate has published.
- Where there is multiple authorship of papers or books, make the precise role of the candidate clear unless this information is already provided in the CV.

Scholarship of Teaching

- See Article 4.03 (a) in the Agreement
- See also Section 3.1 (b)

Professional Contributions

- See Article 4.03 b) in the Agreement
- See also Section 3.1 (c)

Referees Comments.

- Provide brief notes on the qualifications of the external referees. This can be a separate page in the dossier. Especially in professional cases, it is urged that the qualifications of referees to render judgment on the quality of a candidate's work be made as clear as possible. Although the qualifications of academic referees are often apparent from their rank and the name of their Department/ Faculty/Institute, it is unlikely that this will be equally true for non-academic referees even though their title and the letterheads under which they write lie before one. Referees at academic institutions who have had experience evaluating professional contributions in respect to promotion and tenure and/or whose own professional contributions were so evaluated should be included in the selection of external referees, if at all possible. A reasonably detailed statement of the reasons for selection of a referee and of his or her accomplishments could often be of great value to members of the Committee.
- The dossier should NOT indicate which referees were proposed by the candidate, and which by the Department.

Service to the University and the Community

- See Article 4.04 in the Agreement

Closing Paragraph

Sincerely,

xxxx
Professor and Head

Attachment: Report of the Departmental Standing Committee (unless included in the Head's Letter)

APPENDIX 7 – SAC COVER SHEET

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(date)

To: The Senior Appointments Committee

From: Dean _____, Faculty of _____
If a joint appointment, please list both Deans and Faculties

Re: The following Faculty Member:

Dr/Prof/Mr/Ms _____

Department(s) of _____
If a joint appointment, please list both Departments

1) I recommend I do NOT recommend

| |
|--|
| NEW APPOINTMENT AS: Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|

| |
|---|
| PROMOTION TO: Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|

2) I recommend I do NOT recommend

| |
|---|
| TENURE: Tenure Only (including new appointments) <input type="checkbox"/> Automatic Tenure linked to Promotion <input type="checkbox"/> Tenure Track <input type="checkbox"/> <i>For new non-tenured appointments at the rank of Associate Professor & Professor</i> Tenure as Senior Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|

Revised October 2008

APPENDIX 8 – SAC’S PROCEDURES

1. Subcommittees

There are two Subcommittees, with two co-chairs for each, who share the screening and classification of all cases.

2. Subcommittee screening

- All promotion and tenure cases and initial appointments are normally screened by one of the Subcommittees.
- Subcommittee members are expected, whenever possible, to participate in the screening of cases assigned to that Subcommittee, by attendance at meetings in person or by conference call (for members at UBCO) or through e-mail correspondence coordinated by the Subcommittee co-chairs or designate.
- If the subcommittee finds that the file is missing information that could easily be supplied by the Faculty, they can request the additional information be provided before they classify the case as “A” or “B”.
- Subcommittees should classify cases as “A” or “B”. A case is automatically rated “B” if 1) recommendations at previous levels were mixed (some positive and some negative) or 2) it is a tenure case with a negative recommendation from the Dean. A case can also be rated “B” if one or more members of the Subcommittee believe that the case warrants discussion by the full committee on documentation and/or substance, and their concerns cannot be addressed by requesting additional information by correspondence with the Faculty. In the event that this view has been presented by Subcommittee member(s) only through e-mail correspondence, classification of the case as a “B” rating should be delayed until members have had the opportunity to discuss the case at a Subcommittee meeting.
- The rating of a case as a “B” does not necessarily imply any weakness in it, but may just mean that discussion by the full Committee, for a variety of possible reasons, is warranted.
- The Subcommittee co-chair will convey to the Dean, via the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations, the specific concern(s) of the Subcommittee regarding the case, as well as specific questions to be raised before the full Committee.
- In the absence of concerns from other members, the recommendation of SAC for cases rated “A” by the Subcommittee will be taken to be the same as the recommendation of the Dean. Such cases are voted on by the full Committee. If an issue in an “A” case is raised in the full Committee, the case will be reconsidered by the other Subcommittee and re-ranked as A or B. Requests for additional information by one or more members in the full Committee will also be conveyed by the Chair to the Dean.

3. Agenda

- There is an agenda for each meeting of SAC, which is prepared by Colette Hogg, the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations. Normally rank and tenure for such cases are considered together.
- It is the responsibility of the Subcommittee chairs to inform the Assistant Manager and the SAC Chair of the Subcommittee ratings, of the cases which may be placed on the agenda, and of any cases that need to be delayed to obtain additional information from the Dean. The SAC Chair and the Assistant Manager must also be provided with a copy of the letter sent to a Dean in "B" cases.
- The Subcommittee shall present a report listing "A" cases for approval by SAC.
- In cases involving both promotion and tenure, promotion is considered first and then (if necessary) tenure. In seventh-year cases involving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, SAC will take separate votes on promotion and tenure, unless the initial vote on promotion is unanimously positive.
- 'A' cases are normally dealt with when time is available during the meeting.
- 'B' cases are dealt with in the order set by the scheduling of the Deans' attendance.

4. UBCO Representation for UBCO Cases

- Consideration of B-cases involving UBCO faculty members requires the presence (either physical or by videoconference) of at least one of the UBCO SAC representative. UBCO SAC members should be given adequate notice that a B-case involving a UBCO faculty member is being scheduled so that the UBCO SAC members have sufficient opportunity to arrange to attend the SAC meeting in Vancouver in person if they choose to do so.

5. Introduction of supplemental information

- Whenever possible, supplemental information from the Dean should be circulated in advance through the Assistant Manager. Such written material should be limited to information that updates the file, or information that has been requested by a SAC subcommittee. In addition, both the candidate and the University have the right to supplement the file with relevant information, as described in Art. 5.03 of the Agreement. Any supplementary information from the candidate should be sent to both the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations and to the Dean.
- Supplemental information given to SAC by the Dean during the meeting can be provided in writing. This may include additional information obtained through consultation with the Head, which may assist in responding to questions and

concerns raised by the SAC subcommittee. This may be added to the file as appropriate.

- Members with discipline-related expertise in a case may provide simple, factual information in response to specific questions, such as "This journal is peer reviewed." Such members should not introduce personal opinions or provide academic judgment expected of disciplinary colleagues or referees.
- The Chair should remind members to disregard information that has been introduced but that does not adhere to these principles.

6. Temporary withdrawal of a case

A case may be withdrawn by the Dean, either upon consideration of recommendations of SAC or at the discretion of the Dean, in order to obtain and provide additional specific information to SAC concerning the case.

7. The role of Deans at full SAC meetings

- Deans are invited to attend meetings of SAC at which one or more "B" cases from their Faculties are on the agenda. A Dean is there to answer questions about his or her case(s).
- At the Dean's request, a Dean may also attend a meeting of SAC to discuss issues concerning the tenure and promotion process.
- Where a candidate in a "B" case has a formal joint appointment in more than one Faculty, Deans from each Faculty may be present for the SAC deliberations or one Dean may represent both if they so agree.
- When discussion of a Dean's case(s) is completed, the Dean withdraws from the meeting so that a vote can be taken.
- SAC will not discuss a "B" case in the absence of the relevant Dean(s), apart from a brief in camera discussion after the Dean has withdrawn to determine whether SAC requires further information.
- The Chair of SAC communicates the results of the voting to the Dean in a timely manner using means arranged with the Dean in advance. In turn, the Dean can, on a confidential basis, notify the relevant Department Head. However, SAC recommendations to the President are confidential, and others, including the candidate and members of the Faculty and Departmental committees, should *not* be informed of the SAC recommendation or vote.

8. The role of SAC members at full SAC meetings

- SAC members may ask questions to clarify the Dean's responses to questions about his or her case(s) or to seek information clarifying the criteria for evaluation.

- SAC members with relevant expertise may provide discipline-related factual information pertinent to understanding the context of a case (see Section 4 in this document, "Introduction of supplemental information").

9. Voting

- Quorum: The quorum is 60% of committee members.
- The Chair does not normally vote..
- Members of SAC are usually expected to refrain from voting on a case until it is considered at the SAC level. If circumstances dictate that a member vote at a previous level (Department or Faculty), s/he may not cast a vote or participate in the deliberations at the SAC level.
- Members who have a conflict of interest in a case (e.g., spouse or family member, co-author, grant co-holder) should neither vote nor participate in the deliberations at the SAC level. In the case of a spouse or family member, members should not participate in any way in that case, including seeing the documentation.
- All questions are put in the affirmative.
- Committee recommendations are determined by a simple majority (>50%).
- SAC will take separate votes on promotion and tenure in seventh-year cases, where applicable, unless the initial vote on promotion to Associate Professor is unanimously positive.
- During the summer months or when a meeting is cancelled, SAC may consider new appointments by e-mail. The full dossier is distributed, and all members rank the case as "A" or "B". In this instance, "A" means that the member has no concerns about the case and agrees with the Dean's recommendation for appointment. "B" means that the member believes that the case requires discussion by a SAC subcommittee. If the case receives unanimous "A" rankings by a quorum of SAC members, it is forwarded to the President by the SAC Chair as unanimously approved by the committee. If the case does not receive unanimous "A" rankings by a quorum of SAC members, it is held for full consideration by a subcommittee when SAC reconvenes normally in the fall.

10. Reconsideration

The Committee must reconsider at a subsequent meeting cases that have received either all positive or all negative recommendations at previous levels when SAC recommends a contrary decision.

11. The Role of SAC Chair

- The SAC Chair is expected to be familiar with the following:
 - 1) SAC procedures, noting in particular the stated roles of the SAC Chair.
 - 2) Relevant sections of the Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures and the Collective Agreement.
 - 3) Robert's Rules of Order
- The SAC Chair is expected to do the following:
 - Subcommittees:
 - 1) Appoint subcommittee chairs.
 - 2) Appoint SAC members to subcommittees, assuring appropriate balance with respect to disciplines and other factors of importance (UBC-O, gender equity, etc.).
 - 3) Be a reference point for the subcommittee chairs and other committee members regarding relevant policies and procedures
 - 4) Vet any questions arising from the subcommittees prior to asking the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations responsible for SAC to send the questions to the Deans.
 - 5) Meet with the subcommittee chairs ½ hour before each SAC meeting if there are any matters to discuss.
 - 6) Maintain communication with and oversight of subcommittees to make certain that they function effectively and use similar standards in making their assessments.
 - Consultation & Communication:
 - 1) Consult with the Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations as necessary regarding scheduling of meetings and scheduling of time for Deans.
 - 2) Communicate the results of the votes for each meeting to the President following a prescribed format. Where B cases requiring substantial discussion exist, prepare objective/factual notes for the President, remembering that these notes will form part of the file in the event of an appeal.
 - 3) Consult with Faculty Relations, as required, on procedural matters
 - 4) Ensure effective communication between the Provost, President and Faculty Relations on one hand and the Senior Appointments Committee on the other regarding issues of concern.
 - Service to the University
 - 1) Be available to speak at a variety of workshops/panels on tenure and promotion matters
 - 2) Review and revise presentation materials as necessary (as provided by the previous Chair)

12. Confidentiality

SAC files and proceedings are completely confidential, except that the SAC recommendation is conveyed to the Dean, who may in turn convey it to the Head. Files that are no longer needed should be left after meetings of SAC to be destroyed. Should members be questioned by non-members about meetings of SAC, no comment should be made about any case or about which members were present or absent from the meeting.

13. Grant Tenure

In SAC's deliberations, no distinction is made between "grant tenure" and "tenure", in that "grant tenure" is a financial or budgetary consideration and not an academic consideration.

14. Communication with the President

- The Chair of SAC, on behalf of the full committee, provides a written summary of the votes to the President and Provost, along with a recommendation on each case and notes on the discussion of each 'B' case.
- The President or, where the President so indicates, the Provost may request to meet with the Chair of SAC or with the full committee to gain a fuller appreciation of the issues in a case.
- Should the President or Provost wish to meet with the full committee regarding a case, the item will be placed on the agenda of the next available meeting. In preparation for such a meeting SAC members will be provided with a copy of the full dossier for the case, the notes stemming from SAC's deliberations over the case, and any specific questions that need to be addressed to clarify the case.
- If the President's decision is not in accord with SAC's recommendation, the President will inform SAC of this fact and the reasons for it.
- The Assistant Manager in Faculty Relations responsible for SAC will regularly provide SAC with a summary of the decisions made by the President and any arbitration awards impacting the work of SAC.

APPENDIX 9 – EXCERPT FROM THE AGREEMENT ON CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY

The University of British Columbia and the Faculty Association of The University of British Columbia have agreed on the following conditions of appointment for faculty members at The University of British Columbia.

Article 1. Interpretation

1.01 For the purpose of this Agreement:

...

"Scholarly activity" means research of quality and significance, or, in appropriate fields, distinguished, creative or professional work of a scholarly nature; and the dissemination of the results of that scholarly activity; and

....

Article 2. Types of Appointments

2.01 Every appointment shall be one of the following types. The term of every appointment, and the termination date, shall be clearly stated on the appointment notice received by the appointee.

2.02 Term Appointments without Review

a) Appointments without review are full-time or part-time appointments for a specified limited term. There is no implication that the appointee will be considered for any further appointment of this or any other kind on the expiration of the specified term.

b) Term appointments without review are governed by regulations of the Board of Governors set forth in UBC Policy Number 42 (www.universitycounsel.ubc.ca/policies/policy42.pdf).

2.03 Term Appointments with Review

a) Term appointments with review are full-time appointments for a specified term of at least twelve (12) months other than term appointments without review.

b) For the purpose of calculating years of service, all appointments shall be deemed to have commenced on July 1 of the calendar year in which the appointment began.

c) These appointments carry no implication of automatic renewal but imply that the appointee will be considered for further appointment. They are to be reviewed before expiration of the specified term in accordance with the criteria and procedures prescribed below.

d) Subject to Article 2.03(f), any person holding a term appointment with review is eligible for consideration for a tenured appointment.

e) By the end of an appointee's fifth year of continuous service in a term appointment with review, a recommendation must be made to the President either to grant a tenured appointment or not to renew the appointment, except as provided in Article 2.03(f). In exceptional cases a recommendation may be made before the end of the fifth year, or in the case of an Associate Professor or Professor, before the time when it would normally be made; in particular an early recommendation to grant a tenured appointment may be made when a candidate has had academic, professional, or other comparable experience before being appointed by the University.

f) In the case of an Assistant Professor

- i) if at any time before, or if in, the seventh year of service an Assistant Professor is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, a tenured appointment will also be granted;
- ii) if an appointee is not granted a tenured appointment pursuant to (i) above, then in the seventh year of service a recommendation either to grant a tenured appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor or otherwise, or not to renew the appointment, must be made;
- iii) during the pre-tenure period an Assistant Professor who has been reviewed for but denied promotion to the rank of Associate Professor has the right of appeal which would normally arise from a decision following a periodic review.

g) A decision not to grant a tenured appointment on the expiry of the maximum period for a term appointment with review will normally be followed by a one-year terminal appointment. If the decision not to grant a tenured appointment is received after December 1 of the academic year following the review year, the period of notice of termination will include one complete academic year in addition to any months remaining in the academic year in which the notice of termination is received. If, however, the current term appointment with review has one year or longer to run at the date of the decision not to grant a tenured appointment, notice of intention not to renew the appointment shall be given at least twelve (12) months prior to termination date of the current appointment and this notice shall be sufficient to comply with Article 7.01 below.

h) The maximum period of a term appointment with review is:

- i) in cases of Assistant Professor eight (8) years; and
- ii) in cases other than Assistant Professor six (6) years;

The sixth or eighth year, in appropriate cases, shall be the terminal year.

i) No person will acquire a tenured appointment by reason only of holding a term appointment with review that extends beyond the maximum period of such appointments.

2.04 Tenured Appointments

Tenured appointments are full-time appointments except when the University and a faculty member have agreed to change a full-time tenured appointment to a part-time tenured appointment. They cannot be terminated before normal retirement age except in accordance with Article 10 below or for financial exigency or redundancy. Termination for financial exigency or redundancy shall be in accordance with any applicable criteria and procedures established under Article 12 below.

Article 3. Titles and Ranks

3.04 Senior Instructor

The rank of Senior Instructor is for those individuals who are given a tenured appointment and are not expected to proceed through the professorial ranks. It is normally awarded only to those who are excellent teachers. Persons appointed to this rank may subsequently be promoted to professorial rank.

3.05 Assistant Professor

- a) Appointment at or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor normally requires completion of academic qualifications, and evidence of ability in teaching and scholarly activity. Evidence will ordinarily be required to demonstrate that the candidate for an appointment or promotion is involved in scholarly activity, is a successful teacher, and is capable of providing instruction at the various levels in his or her discipline, but it is sufficient to show potential to meet these criteria. The evidence may include the opinion of scholars familiar with the candidate's work and capability.
- b) Initial appointments at this rank are normally for a term of three years, but in exceptional circumstances may be for a lesser period. Renewal of an individual's appointment is for a term of three years. If an additional renewal is granted, it is for two years.
- c) Decisions on the award of tenured appointments are made in accordance with the provisions of Article 2.03. In special cases an Assistant Professor may be given the rank of Senior Instructor and a tenured appointment.

3.06 Associate Professor

- a) Appointment at or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor normally requires evidence of successful teaching and of scholarly activity beyond that expected of an Assistant Professor. The candidate for appointment or promotion will be judged on teaching as defined in Article 4.02, on sustained and productive scholarly activity, on ability to direct graduate students, and on willingness to participate and participation in the affairs of the Department and the University. Promotion to this rank is not automatic or based on years of service and it is expected that some persons who may be granted tenured appointments will not attain this rank. In exceptional circumstances, initial appointment at this rank may be based upon evidence of the candidate's potential to meet these criteria, including the opinion of scholars or other qualified persons familiar with the candidate's work and capability.
- b) Initial appointments at this rank are normally for a term of three years, with review, but in exceptional circumstances may be for a lesser period or tenured. Renewal of these appointments that have been made for a term of three years will normally be tenured but if the initial term was made for less than three years, a tenure decision will not usually be made until the appointee is in the third year of service at the rank of Associate Professor.

3.07 Professor

- a) Appointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor is reserved for those whose contributions (judged by the criteria as set out in Article 4) are considered outstanding.
 - b) These persons will have met appropriate standards of excellence and have wide recognition in the field of their interest. They must have shown high quality in teaching and sustained and productive scholarly activity, have attained distinction in their discipline, and have participated significantly in academic and professional affairs. Promotion to this rank is not automatic nor based on years of service and it is expected that some persons will not attain this rank.
 - c) Initial appointments at this rank may be term appointments or tenured appointments. Renewal of term appointments will normally be made without term.
-

Article 4. Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

4.01

- a) Candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure or promotion, other than those dealt with in paragraph (b), are judged principally on performance in both teaching and in scholarly activity. Service to the academic profession, to the University, and to the community will be taken into account but, while service to the University and the community is important, it cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching and in scholarly activity. Competence is required both in teaching and in scholarly activity, provided that a candidate who does not meet the criterion of scholarly activity but who is judged to be an excellent teacher may be given a tenured appointment as Senior Instructor when, in the view of the University, its needs will be best served by that appointment. Appointments without term are granted to individuals who have maintained a high standard of performance in meeting the criteria set forth below and show promise of continuing to do so.
- b) Candidates for appointment or reappointment to the rank of Instructor I are judged principally on performance in teaching. Service to the academic profession, to the University, and to the community may be taken into account. Instructors I who are candidates for a tenured appointment are judged on the ground of excellence in teaching.
- c) Judgments of an individual should be made objectively.
- d) The decision to grant a tenured appointment shall take into account the interests of the Department and the University in maintaining academic strength and balance but no person holding a term appointment with review shall be denied reappointment or a tenured appointment on the ground that the University has established quotas in a Department or Faculty for those holding a tenured appointment.
- e) A person holding a term appointment with review may be denied reappointment or a tenured appointment on the grounds of financial exigency or redundancy. This shall be

done in accordance with any applicable criteria and procedures established under Article 12 below.

4.02 Teaching

Teaching includes all presentation whether through lectures, seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion, supervision of individual students' work, or other means by which students, whether in degree or non-degree programs sponsored by the University, derive educational benefit. An individual's entire teaching contribution shall be assessed. Evaluation of teaching shall be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor, as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. The methods of teaching evaluation may vary; they may include student opinion, assessment by colleagues of performance in university lectures, outside references concerning teaching at other institutions, course material and examinations, the caliber of supervised essays and theses, and other relevant considerations. When the opinions of students or of colleagues are sought, this shall be done through formal procedures. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of the candidate to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction.

4.03 Scholarly Activity

Judgement of scholarly activity is based mainly on the quality and significance of an individual's contribution.

Evidence of scholarly activity varies among the disciplines. Published work is, where appropriate, the primary evidence. Such evidence as distinguished architectural, artistic or engineering design, distinguished performance in the arts or professional fields, shall be considered in appropriate cases.

a) For the scholarship of teaching, scholarly activity may be evidenced by originality or innovation, demonstrable impact in a particular field or discipline, peer reviews, dissemination in the public domain, or substantial and sustained use by others. For example, textbooks and curriculum reform that changed academic understanding or made a significant contribution to the way in which a discipline or field is taught might constitute useful evidence of the scholarship of teaching whereas textbooks or curriculum revision of a routine nature would not.

b) In professional or clinical studies scholarly activity may be evidenced by research on or the creation of:

- i) significant applications of fundamental theory; or
- ii) significant forms and applications of professional or clinical practice.

Work with professional, technical, scholarly or other organizations or with scholarly publications which falls within the definition of scholarly activity may also be considered.

4.04 Service to the University and the Community

This includes service performed for the benefit of Departments, Faculties, the Centre for Continuing Education, or other parts of the University (including the Faculty Association), and for professional organizations and the community at large. Such service might include administrative or supervisory work, service on committees and university bodies, all continuing education activity in the community including professional education, special work with professional, technical, scholarly or other organizations or with scholarly publications not falling within the definition of scholarly activity, membership on or service to governmental or public councils and boards, and other forms of academic, professional, and public service.

Article 5. Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

5.01 General Provisions

- a) Appointments, reappointments, tenure decisions and promotions are made by the Board of Governors upon the recommendation of the President.
- b) The procedures in this section govern initial appointments at the ranks of Instructor I, Instructor II, Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor; renewal or non-renewal of term appointments with review; recommendations for or against the award of tenure; and promotions.
- c) Where there is a joint appointment, procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion evaluation will be clearly laid out at the time of appointment.
- d) It is expected that confidentiality will be respected by all those participating in consultations.

5.02 Meetings with the Head

- a) At the beginning of the academic year preceding the year in which a faculty member may be considered for promotion under Article 9 below, or will be considered for reappointment, or for tenure, the Head shall meet with the faculty member. The purpose of the meeting is to identify any potential difficulties with the candidature and to assist the candidate with any concerns.
- b) When a faculty member is to be considered for promotion under Article 9 below, or for reappointment, or for tenure, the Head shall meet with the candidate before the submission by the candidate of information to be supplied by the candidate. The purpose of this meeting is:
 - i) to advise the candidate that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and other relevant information to the Head, prior to a date set by the Head, provided that this date is no earlier than September 1; and

- ii) to identify any potential difficulties with the candidature and to assist the candidate with any concerns.
- c) The faculty member may bring a colleague to each of the above meetings.
- d) At the conclusion of each of these meetings the matters discussed should be recorded in an agreed memorandum. Any concerns or opinions of the Head are his or her own views.

5.03 Recommendations: Supplementing Files

In the case of recommendations on reappointment, promotion or tenure the candidate or the University has the right, up to the stage of the President's decision, to supplement the file by the addition of new, unsolicited information (such as a new set of student evaluations, the publication of an additional book or article, the receipt of a grant, a published review of the candidate's work, etc.) or a response to particular concerns that emerge in the relevant documentation.

5.04 Departmental Consultation: Committees

- a) The Department Head shall consult formally at meetings convened for that purpose with eligible members of the Department in order to ascertain their views and to obtain their recommendation concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion.
- b) Faculty members eligible to be consulted are:
 - i) In the case of initial appointments, those of a rank equal to or higher than the rank at which the appointment is to be made.
 - ii) In the case of reappointments and promotions, those higher in rank than the candidate, except that in the case of reappointment of a Professor those holding the rank of Professor are eligible to be consulted.
 - iii) In the tenure cases, those who are tenured and of equal or higher rank.
- c) Consultation shall be achieved through standing committees. These committees shall be composed of all the eligible members of the Department, or of eligible members elected by the eligible members of the Department. Members of faculty from outside the Department may be added to the standing committee when the number of eligible members (not including the Head) is less than three (3). These additional members shall be chosen by the eligible members of the Department and approved by the Dean.

5.05 Departmental Consultation: Letters of Reference

- a) Letters of appraisal from external referees on the quality and significance of the scholarly (including professional, and/or creative) achievements of the candidate shall be obtained when consideration is being given to:

- i) initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor or Professor;
- ii) tenure; or
- iii) reappointment, when the departmental standing committee considers that it, or the Head considers that he or she, may recommend denial of reappointment, and a deficiency in scholarly work is a reason.

For purposes of clarification, in the case of promotion to Senior Instructor, letters of appraisal do not need to be from external referees.

- b) The Head shall solicit letters of appraisal from four referees, of whom at least two shall be taken from a list of names supplied by the candidate. If additional referees are required at any time, the number selected from the list supplied by the candidate shall never be less than the number otherwise selected. If additional referees are required the candidate shall, if need be, provide additional names so that there shall always be one more referee on the candidate's list than the number of referees to be selected from the list.
- c) Before selecting prospective referees for consideration the Head shall consult with the departmental standing committee about these referees.

5.06 Departmental Committee: Meetings

- a) Consultation shall be conducted according to procedures agreed upon between the Head and the eligible members of the Department and approved by the Dean. The Head shall ensure that each faculty member in the Department is informed of the agreed procedures. The Dean shall collect and maintain an open file of all such procedures.
- b) Consultation shall include consideration of all relevant information, including any information submitted by the candidate as provided for in 5.02(b)(i) or 5.03 above, at formal meetings.
- c) Members of the departmental standing committee who cannot participate in the consultations may submit opinions in writing to the committee.
- d) The Head shall chair the departmental standing committee but shall not vote.
- e) Normally, the only material which will be considered is material that has been obtained following required or other recognized procedures. Material which will not normally be considered includes material solicited by the candidate and unsolicited material such as letters from third parties, faculty members who are not official appraisers, or students. If any material that would normally not be taken into account is considered and it is not supportive of the candidate, the contents of the material shall be revealed to the candidate. The candidate shall be given a reasonable opportunity to rebut or explain the contents, and this rebuttal or explanation shall be added to the file.

- f) When serious concerns about the candidacy arise in the departmental standing committee, the Head shall inform the candidate of that fact and the reasons therefore with sufficient particularity to enable the candidate to have a meaningful opportunity to respond either orally or in writing at the option of the committee and to introduce further relevant evidence. The candidate shall be provided with a summary of the referees' opinions, the summary to be prepared by a member of the departmental committee selected by the committee. The summary shall be prepared in such a way that the identities of the referees are not disclosed.
- g) The recommendation of the departmental standing committee shall be that of a majority.

5.07 Head and the Department Recommendations

- a) When a Department has considered a reappointment, a tenure decision, or a promotion resulting from a periodic review under Article 9 below, the Head shall forward the following to the Dean:
 - i) the Head's recommendation with the basis for it;
 - ii) the recommendation, a record of the vote and the full report of the departmental committee;
 - iii) letters of appraisal from external referees;
 - iv) unsolicited information from faculty members or students that qualifies for consideration under Article 5.06(e); and
 - v) information submitted by the candidate pursuant to Article 5.02(b)(i) or 5.03.
- b) The Head shall prepare the report of the departmental committee. The report shall contain a full statement of the reasons of the committee including a full statement of the majority and any minority opinions. Before sending the report to the Dean the Head shall circulate a draft to the committee and shall invite comments on the draft.

5.08 Notification of Departmental Recommendations to Candidate

- a) In all cases other than an initial appointment, the Head shall, at the time the recommendations are forwarded to the Dean, inform the candidate in writing of the recommendations being forwarded.
- b) If the recommendation of either the Head or the standing committee is negative, the Head shall provide detailed and specific reasons in writing for any negative recommendation including respects in which the candidate is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Where the Head's recommendation is negative but that of the standing committee is positive the Head shall also provide detailed and specific reasons for the positive recommendation.

- c) The Head may provide detailed and specific reasons by giving to the candidate a copy of the recommendation being forwarded to the Dean but if that is done the recommendations shall be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality required under Article 5.01(d) and to protect the identity of referees.
- d) The candidate shall be invited to make a timely response, which shall be added to the file pursuant to Article 5.03.

5.09 Procedures for Institutes, Schools and Faculties without Formal Departments

- a) Institutes and similar Academic Units shall follow the procedures consistent with those for Departments.
- b) Schools and similar Academic Units shall follow the procedures consistent with those for Departments or Faculties, depending on what is appropriate in the circumstance.
- c) In a Faculty not having formal departmental organization, the Dean shall ensure that recommendations for appointments, reappointments, tenure decisions, and promotions are arrived at by procedures and arrangements consistent with those for Departments and Faculties.

5.10 Review by the Dean

The Dean shall review the recommendations received from the Head to ensure that proper procedures have been followed, that all relevant material has been considered, and that recommendations made are consistent with the evidence presented.

In the case of recommendations concerning tenure, promotion, or reappointment (when the Dean is considering not recommending in favour of reappointment) the Dean shall consult with an advisory committee. In the case of other recommendations the Dean may consult with an advisory committee.

The advisory committee shall be composed of tenured full professors, one-half of whom shall be elected by the faculty, and one-half of whom shall be selected by the Dean. Heads who are tenured full professors shall be eligible for selection by the Dean. In selecting members of the committee the Dean, having regard to the members who have been elected, shall take into account the need for representation of disciplines within the Faculty, including emerging disciplines and multi-disciplinary activities, and the need to maintain gender balance.

- a) The Dean may request further information from the Head and the departmental standing committee, and may also obtain such further information as is deemed appropriate.
- b) The Dean, after considering the advice of the advisory committee, (i) may refer the case back to the Head and the departmental standing committee for reconsideration; or (ii) make a recommendation to the President pursuant to 5.11.

5.11 Dean: Recommendation to the President

- a) The Dean shall, except when his or her decision concerning an initial appointment or a promotion not arising out of a periodic review under Article 9 below is negative, forward his or her recommendation to the President together with the recommendations received from the Department.
- b) If the Dean's recommendation is different from either that of the Head or that of the departmental standing committee, the Dean shall inform the President of the reasons for this.

5.12 Dean: Informing the Candidate

- a) In all cases other than initial appointments, the Dean shall, at the time the recommendations are being forwarded to the President, inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation.
- b) If the recommendation of the Dean is negative, in opposition to the recommendation of the Head or the departmental standing committee, or for reasons not raised by the Head or the departmental standing committee, the Dean shall provide detailed and specific reasons in writing to the candidate including the respect in which he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria.
- c) The Dean may provide detailed and specific reasons by giving the candidate a copy of the Dean's recommendation to the President but if that is done the recommendation shall be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality under Article 5.01(d) and to protect the identity of referees.
- d) The candidate shall be asked to make a timely written response, which shall be added to the file pursuant to Article 5.03.

5.13 Dean: Informing the Head and Department

If the Dean's recommendation is not in accord with the recommendation of either the Head or the departmental standing committee, the Dean shall inform the Head of this fact and the reasons for it and the Head shall inform the members of the departmental standing committee.

5.14 Review by President

- a) All recommendations to the President concerning initial appointments at or promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, or concerning tenure decisions, shall be reviewed by the Senior Appointments Committee, which is a standing advisory committee established by and making recommendations to the President. The Faculty Association shall nominate a member of the Committee. A Dean whose recommendations are being considered by the committee may participate in the deliberations of the committee but shall not vote on the recommendations.

- b) The President may request a further review of a case by the Dean.
- c) If the President's decision respecting a candidate is not in accord with the recommendation of a departmental standing committee or the Senior Appointments Committee, the appropriate committee shall be informed of this fact and the reasons for it.

5.15 President: Informing the Candidate

- a) Except in the case of initial appointments, the President shall, at the time a decision is made on whether or not a recommendation is to be forwarded to the Board of Governors respecting a candidate, inform the candidate in writing of that decision with a copy to the Faculty Association.
- b) If the recommendation of the President is negative, the President shall provide detailed and specific reasons in writing to the candidate including the respects in which he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria and send a copy to the Faculty Association.

5.16 Arbitration

- a) The President's decision to deny reappointment, tenure, or promotion may be subject to arbitration following the procedures as provided in Article 13 of this Agreement.
- b) Upon notice of appeal of a decision by the President to deny reappointment, tenure or promotion, the University will provide a copy to the Faculty Association of the candidate's file reviewed by the President. The file shall be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality required under Article 5.01(d) and to protect the identity of referees.

Article 9. Periodic Review for Promotion

9.01

- a) A review of the record of each Associate Professor shall be conducted during the fifth year after appointment at or promotion to that rank, and every third year thereafter.
- b) A review of the record of each Assistant Professor shall be conducted during the fifth year after appointment at or promotion to that rank, and every second year thereafter.
- c) When a review is due under paragraph (a) or (b), the University shall, subject to 9.03 below, refrain from conducting that periodic review if requested to do so in writing by the faculty member concerned.

- d) When a faculty member has requested under paragraph (c) that a review not be conducted, the University shall conduct a periodic review in a subsequent year, before the next review is due under paragraph (a) or (b), if requested to do so in writing by the faculty member concerned. Such request shall be made to the Department Head no later than May 15 of the academic year preceding that in which the review is to be undertaken.
- e) When a review, undertaken at the request of the faculty member in accordance with paragraph (d), does not result in a promotion, the faculty member concerned shall not be entitled to a further periodic review until the third year (in the case of an Associate Professor) or the second year (in the case of an Assistant Professor) after the year in which the review was conducted.

9.02 A review of the record of a Senior Instructor shall be conducted at his or her request, during the fifth year after appointment at or promotion to that rank, or in subsequent years, provided that such reviews shall not be conducted more frequently than every three years.

9.03 The provisions of this section do not preclude the University from conducting reviews or making recommendations for promotion at any time.

APPENDIX 10 – MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT RE REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AT UBC OKANAGAN IN 2009/10

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

AND

THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Re: Review for Promotion at UBC Okanagan in 2009/10

The parties agree that, in reviewing applications for promotion, tenure or re-appointment at UBC Okanagan in 2009/10, the procedures used for such a review will be in accordance with Articles 5 and 9 of the *Agreement on the Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*, with the changes outlined in this Memorandum of Agreement.

This Memorandum of Agreement applies only to faculty members at UBC Okanagan who will be reviewed for promotion, tenure or re-appointment before July 1, 2010.

1. Periodic vs. Non-Periodic Review

For the purposes of Article 9, where the faculty member is either a tenure track Assistant Professor transferred from OUC on July 1, 2005 or a tenured Associate Professor transferred from OUC on July 1, 2005 the periodic review schedule will be considered to begin as of their start date in their current rank at OUC.

2. Departmental Standing Committee

Amend Article 5.04 to read:

a) The Department Head shall consult formally at meetings convened for that purpose with eligible members of the Department in order to ascertain their views and to obtain their recommendation concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion.

b) Faculty members eligible to be consulted are:

i) In the case of initial appointments, all those who are tenured, and those who are untenured but of a rank equal to or higher than the rank at which the appointment is to be made.

ii) In the case of reappointments and promotions, all those who are tenured, and those who are untenured but are higher in rank than the candidate.

iii) In the tenure cases, all those who are tenured.

c) Consultation shall be achieved through standing committees. These committees shall be composed of all the eligible members of the Department, or of eligible members elected by the eligible members of the Department. Members of faculty from outside the Department may be added to the standing committee when the number of eligible members (not including the Head) is less than three (3). These additional members shall be chosen by the eligible members of the Department and approved by the Dean.

3. Dean's Advisory Committee

Amend Article 5.10 to read:

5.10 Review by the Dean

The Dean shall review the recommendations received from the Head to ensure that proper procedures have been followed, that all relevant material has been considered, and that recommendations made are consistent with the evidence presented.

In the case of recommendations concerning tenure, promotion, or reappointment (when the Dean is considering not recommending in favour of reappointment) the Dean shall consult with an advisory committee. In the case of other recommendations the Dean may consult with an advisory committee.

The advisory committee shall be composed of tenured members of the professoriate, one-half of whom shall be elected by the faculty, and one-half of whom shall be selected by the Dean. Heads shall be eligible for selection by the Dean. In selecting members of the committee the Dean, having regard to the members who have been elected, shall:

- i) ensure that at least two members of the committee are tenured full professors,
- ii) take into account the need for representation of disciplines within the Faculty, including emerging disciplines and multi-disciplinary activities, and
- iii) take into account the need to maintain gender balance,

In order to ensure that the above criteria are taken into account, the Dean may select members of the committee from outside the Faculty,

- a) The Dean may request further information from the Head and the departmental standing committee, and may also obtain such further information as is deemed appropriate.
- b) The Dean, after considering the advice of the advisory committee, (i) may refer the case back to the Head and the departmental standing committee for reconsideration; or (ii) make a recommendation to the President pursuant to 5.11.