



a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC

2016/17

FOREWORD

We are pleased to introduce the 2016/17 edition of the *Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC*.

Reappointment, tenure and promotion reviews are among 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 her or his peers, Head, Dean and the President. A vigorous assessment is warranted given the significant publicly funded support a tenured faculty member receives over the course of a long career and the role they are expected to play in shaping the University for students in the future. Likewise, promotion to Professor is not automatic and reflects an outstanding contribution to teaching and research; promotion to Professor of Teaching requires an outstanding contribution to teaching, learning and educational leadership. 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.

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 that 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. 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, 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.

Angela Redish
Interim Provost and Vice-President Academic Designate
UBC Vancouver

Cynthia Mathieson
Provost and Vice-Principal Academic
UBC Okanagan

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	11
3.1	SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY.....	11
3.2	TEACHING	14
3.3	SERVICE	15
3.4	EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP	15
4	INFORMATION FOR THE CANDIDATE.....	16
4.1	MEETINGS WITH THE HEAD.....	16
4.2	CURRICULUM VITAE AND PUBLICATION RECORD.....	17
4.3	EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	18
4.4	EVIDENCE OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP	18
4.5	SELECTING REFEREES.....	19
4.6	CANDIDATE’S FILE FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION OR TENURE.....	21
4.7	COMMUNICATION FROM THE HEAD	21
4.8	COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEAN	22
4.9	COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT	23
4.10	THE DECISION	23
5	INFORMATION FOR THE HEAD AND THE DEPARTMENT	23
5.1	ROLE OF THE HEAD	24
5.2	MEETING WITH THE CANDIDATE.....	24
5.3	PROMOTIONS TO PROFESSOR WHERE THE DEPARTMENT HEAD IS AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....	25
5.4	DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION.....	25
5.5	RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN.....	33
5.6	NOTIFICATION TO THE CANDIDATE.....	35
6	INFORMATION FOR THE DEAN AND THE FACULTY	36
6.1	DEAN’S REVIEW AND CONSULTATION	36
6.2	RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.....	38
6.3	NOTIFICATION OF DEAN’S DECISION.....	40
7	NEW APPOINTMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY SAC	41
8	STREAMLINED PROCESS FOR NEW SENIOR APPOINTMENTS.....	42
9	JOINT APPOINTMENTS	43
10	INFORMATION ABOUT THE SENIOR APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE.....	43
10.1	COMPOSITION.....	43
10.2	MEMBERSHIP OF SAC FOR 2016/17	44
10.3	CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S FILE	44
10.4	SCHEDULE OF SAC MEETINGS FOR 2016/17	45
11	INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRESIDENT’S DECISION.....	46

11.1 PROCEDURES FOR THE PRESIDENT’S DECISION	46
11.2 APPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT’S DECISION.....	46
12 CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.....	47
APPENDIX 1 – GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OF TEACHING AND SENIOR INSTRUCTOR	48
APPENDIX 2 – TEACHING EVIDENCE – SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING FOR REVIEW BY SAC AND THE PRESIDENT	53
APPENDIX 3 – ANNOTATED CV FOR THE PROFESSORATE STREAM.....	57
APPENDIX 4– ANNOTATED CV FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP STREAM.....	66
APPENDIX 5 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR PERIODIC REVIEWS ONLY	75
APPENDIX 6 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 7TH YEAR CASES PERIODIC REVIEW OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TENURE (AND PROMOTION).....	77
APPENDIX 7 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 5TH YEAR CASES PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURE/PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR.....	79
APPENDIX 8 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE FOR REVIEW OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY (FOR PROFESSORATE STREAM)	81
APPENDIX 9 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE FOR REVIEW OF TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP (FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP STREAM)	85
APPENDIX 10 – HEAD’S LETTER (SUGGESTED FORMAT).....	89
APPENDIX 11 – SAC COVER SHEET.....	92
APPENDIX 12 – SAC’S PROCEDURES.....	93
APPENDIX 13 – EXCERPT FROM THE AGREEMENT ON CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT FOR FACULTY.....	101
APPENDIX 14 - LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING RE FACULTY MEMBERS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	118

1 ABOUT THE GUIDE

- 1.1 The Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC (the “Guide”) is intended to summarize and supplement Part IV of the Collective Agreement **Conditions of Appointment for Faculty** (the “Agreement”). Unless otherwise noted, references in the Guide to articles in the Agreement refer to the articles found in Part IV of the Agreement, while any references in the Guide to sections refer to sections within this Guide.

The substance of this document has been agreed to by the Senior Appointments Committee (“SAC”) and the Committee of Deans at both UBC Vancouver (“UBCV”) and UBC Okanagan (“UBCO”). 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 13). Note that The Memorandum of Agreement re Review for Promotion at UBC Okanagan in 2015/16 (the “UBCO MOA”) in Appendix 14 of the 2015/2016 SAC Guideline has been removed as it is currently under review – please check the HR website for updates. Remember, if there is a conflict or inconsistency between the Guide and what is in the **Agreement**, the latter prevails.

- 1.2 Each year, this document will be reviewed by the Provosts and the Chair of SAC, who will consult as needed 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 UBCV in care of the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations at: fr.sacassistants@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 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 the **Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment for Faculty Members** on the Faculty Relations’ website for more information.
- 1.6 For the purpose of this document, please note the following:
 - “Head” includes heads of departments, directors of institutes, schools and similar academic units;
 - “Department” includes departments, institutes, schools and similar academic units; and
 - “Faculty” includes Faculties and equivalent academic units.

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 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 Agreement).

2.2 Timing

2.2.1 July 1 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 1. See the **Summary of the Tenure and Promotion Process at UBC** available on Faculty Relations' website for a suggested timeline for a suggested timeline.

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, which must occur prior to June 30 of the academic year preceding the year of review.

2.2.3 Candidates must supply her/his file to be reviewed no later than September 15 of the year in which the review takes place unless otherwise agreed to by the Head. A candidate is welcome to submit her/his file earlier.

2.2.4 Consistent with Section 5.4 in the Guide, Heads should contact and confirm the external referees prior to September 15 to ensure that materials may be sent to external referees shortly after receipt of the candidate's file. This will help prevent any departmental delays.

2.2.5 **Heads and Departments are encouraged to have their reports and recommendations to the Dean by November** to allow for the Dean's Advisory Committee to meet in December, 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 her/his own decision well in advance of July 1st. See **SAC's Meeting Dates** (Section 10.4) to assist in your planning and preparation.

2.3 Tenure Clocks

Note: See Article 2.03 of the Agreement.

Tenure vs. Grant Tenure

Tenured and tenure track appointments are appointments funded by University funds and 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 tenure track faculty begins on July 1 regardless of when she/he actually starts.

Tenure track faculty members may only be reviewed one time for tenure in the Professoriate or Educational Leadership stream. A failure to achieve tenure will result in the faculty member being given a terminal year. Different ranks face the mandatory tenure review year at different times.

A leave of absence may result in an extension to the tenure clock as outlined in **Leave of Absence** (Part III of the Agreement). Extensions to the tenure clock for maternity leaves are automatically granted unless the candidate declines the extension (Part III, Article 1.03 of the Agreement). Extensions to the tenure clock for parental leave will be granted upon request and the candidate must inform their Head in writing no later than 6 months after they become a parent (Part III, Article 1.03 of the Agreement). Extensions to the tenure clock for medical leave will be considered on a case by case basis depending on the circumstances of each case.

When a tenure track faculty member is granted an extension to the tenure clock due to a leave of absence, the member may also request to shift the schedule for periodic review or only shift the schedule for mandatory review (i.e. the mandatory review year shifts from Year 7 to Year 8 while leaving the first periodic review year in Year 5). Any shifts in review years from the normal schedule must be confirmed in writing with the Head and the Dean's office. Once the faculty member has chosen to shift review schedules, it will not be varied.

Candidates for tenure and promotion may wish to be considered early for tenure. All ranks may be considered early for tenure except a tenure track Assistant Professor. However, a tenure track Assistant Professor may be considered early for promotion, and if a tenure track faculty member is promoted to Associate Professor prior to Year 7 or at Year 7, tenure will be granted at the rank of Associate Professor.

The University does not have tenured Instructor or untenured Senior Instructor or Professor of Teaching appointments (unless the candidate receives a new Senior Instructor or Professor of Teaching appointment). An Instructor may wish to be considered early for tenure, but that review will constitute the one-time tenure and promotion review. If an

Instructor is promoted to Senior Instructor, tenure will be granted at the rank of Senior Instructor.

Rank	Mandatory Tenure Review Year
Assistant Professor	Year 7
Associate Professor and Professor	Year 5*
Instructor	Year 5
Senior Instructor and Professor of Teaching	Year 5*

* Tenure track Associate Professors, Professors, Senior Instructors and Professors of Teaching are normally expected to be granted tenure by the end of their 3rd year; however, if she/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.*
- *Candidate Y is an Instructor (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 leave in year 2. She would now be expected to be reviewed for 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 **Periodic Review for Promotion** (Article 9 of the Agreement, Appendix 13).

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

- 1) In the Professoriate Stream:
 - Assistant Professors can be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor. A successful promotion of this kind is also accompanied by a grant of tenure.
 - Associate Professors can be reviewed for promotion to Professor.
- 2) In the Educational Leadership Stream:
 - Instructors can be reviewed for promotion to Senior Instructor. A successful promotion of this kind is also accompanied by a grant of tenure.
 - Senior Instructors can be reviewed for promotion to Professor of Teaching.

Note: For more information about the Professor of Teaching rank, please see **Guidelines for Promotion to Professor of Teaching** (Appendix 1).

2.4.2 When a candidate becomes entitled to a periodic review, the University will contact the candidate in writing.

The differences between the procedure in periodic reviews and non-periodic 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*

*Note: Article 2.03(f)(iii) of the Agreement provides that an Assistant Professor has the right of appeal if during the pre-tenure period they have been reviewed for but denied promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in a decision made by the President. For more information, see Section 11.2.1.

For assistance in determining whether a review will be periodic or non-periodic, please review **Promotion Reviews for Faculty – Process and Timing** available on the Faculty Relations' website.

If a candidate stops the process, the candidate should inform the Head in writing. If a Head or Dean decides to stop the process of a non-periodic review, they must provide detailed and specific reasons to the candidate in writing including which respects the candidate is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria (See Articles 5.07 and 5.11 of the Agreement). As set out in Article 13 of the Agreement, their decision is not subject to appeal.

2.4.3 The following sets out the periodic review schedules for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Instructor and Senior Instructors:

Rank	Periodic Review Year
Assistant Professor	Year 5 then every 2 years
Associate Professor	Year 5 then every 3 years
Instructor	Year 5
Senior Instructor	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 non-periodic review prior to the next scheduled review. That request must be in writing and must be received normally no later than May 15 of the year prior to the requested review year.

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 and Senior Instructors. In the case of pre-tenure reviews that do not result in promotion, the Head and the candidate can then agree to a non-periodic review in any year.

2.4.6 For post-tenure promotion reviews, if a non-periodic review results in a recommendation by the Dean, the review will be deemed to be a periodic review for the purpose of determining the timing of the next periodic review (See Article 9.01 of the Agreement).

In the case of post-tenure reviews that do not result in promotion, the Head and the candidate can then agree to a non-periodic review providing that this will not result in back to back reviews. In other words, post-tenure reviews cannot be conducted in consecutive years.

2.4.7 The time for a periodic review is calculated from July 1st of the year of appointment, promotion or tenure at UBC. For UBCO, please check the HR website for updates.

2.4.8 In February of each year, Departments should identify those faculty members who are entitled to a periodic review, as outlined under **Periodic Review for Promotion** (Article 9 of the Agreement). Contact Faculty Relations at UBCV or Human Resources at UBCO for assistance.

2.4.9 It is the University's obligation to confirm whether an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Senior Instructor wishes to be reviewed for promotion. This request must be made in writing normally between March 1 and May 15 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 she/he wishes the University to refrain from conducting the periodic review (see **Sample Letter for Periodic Reviews Only** (Appendix 5) and **Sample Letter for 7th Year Cases** (Appendix 6) available on Faculty Relations' website).

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.

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 non-periodic review in year 6 prior to May 15, which is allowed. As this non-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. Her last periodic review for promotion to Professor was in 2011/12. She has requested a promotion review in 2013/14. Since she is not entitled to a periodic review until 2014/15, this review would be a non-periodic review.*
- *Professor Z is an Associate Professor with tenure. He is in the process of a non-periodic promotion review in 2013/14. Requests for external letters of reference*

have been sent out by the Head. However, at this point he has second thoughts about the success of his review and requests that the review be halted. In this situation, the halted review is a periodic review for the purpose of timing because the review went past the point of the Head requesting external letters of reference. As such, his next periodic review will be in 2016/17.

Note: A **Map of the Summary of the Tenure & Promotion Process** is available on the Faculty Relations' website.

3 THE CRITERIA

In considering the criteria for tenure and promotion, the following should be noted:

- **The Professoriate Stream: Criteria for Tenure and Promotion** and **The Educational Leadership Stream: Criteria for Tenure and Promotion** provide a summary of the criteria as they apply to each rank, which are available on Faculty Relations' website. For more information, see Articles 3 and 4 of the Agreement.
- The timing of the review does not affect the criteria against which a case is assessed; that is, whether a case is an "early" review or whether it is a mandatory 7th year review is not a relevant consideration but rather, each case will be judged solely on the merits of the candidate's record as assessed against the relevant criteria, with an emphasis on the candidate's record since her or his appointment or last promotion.

a) For Candidates in the Professoriate Stream

Note: Competence is required in *both* scholarly activity and teaching. A particular strength in one of these areas cannot compensate for a deficiency in the other. Service is also important; however, again, it cannot compensate for a deficiency in teaching or scholarly activity.

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. The Agreement gives consideration to different pathways to academic and scholarly excellence. Diverse substantive contributions to knowledge and methods of dissemination, as recognized within the field of inquiry, will be valued (see Article 4.03). 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 when substantial collaboration is evident. These letters do not constitute letters of reference and should only provide information on the nature of the collaboration, including whether the collaborator is part of a collaboration team or a teacher/student collaboration. When soliciting these letters, the Head should outline the reasons they are being requested. The letters providing this input should be placed in the dossier immediately following the Head's letter.

3.1.5 It is anticipated that candidates being considered for promotion to Professor will have achieved an international reputation, and candidates being considered for promotion to Associate Professor will have made an impact and have achieved a reputation well beyond UBC and preferably a national reputation.

i) Traditional Scholarship

3.1.6 Published work is, where appropriate, the primary evidence. Substantive external peer reviews of published work are important. The expectations of published works will vary depending on the discipline. The candidate's published work should be examined with three related considerations in mind: the quality of the venues in which the candidate's published work appears; the quantity of the candidate's published work; and the overall impact of the candidate's work on their field or discipline.

ii) Scholarship of Teaching

3.1.7 Under **Scholarly Activity** (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.

3.1.8 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.

3.1.9 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 (Article 4.03(a)).

3.1.10 It must be demonstrated that an individual is a leader, or possesses outstanding stature or expertise, in the scholarship of teaching.

3.1.11 Evidence of assessment of the significance and impact of a candidate's scholarship of teaching is essential. External peer evaluation is particularly important.

3.1.12 Work that is published without peer review that makes a significant contribution should be specifically evaluated by the external referees.

iii) Professional Contributions

- 3.1.13 Such evidence as distinguished architectural, artistic or engineering design, or distinguished performance in the arts or professional fields, shall be considered in appropriate cases.
- 3.1.14 Cases where scholarly activity is through professional contributions may arise in any Department or Faculty.
- 3.1.15 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.
- 3.1.16 To make a positive addition to a case for reappointment, 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.
- 3.1.17 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."
- 3.1.18 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.
- 3.1.19 For example, evidence that might be viewed as demonstrating the leadership, rare expertise or outstanding stature expected in a professional contribution includes work with significant impact such as advice or policy analysis that results in: the drafting or implementation of new and significant legislation; an integrated and innovative summary of existing legislation and policy; or developing a new predictive model of property valuation whose predictive power has been empirically validated by market data.
- 3.1.20 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 an international

reputation, and promotion to Associate Professor should require the candidate to have made an impact and have achieved a reputation well beyond UBC and preferably a national reputation.

- 3.1.21 Work that is not published in a refereed system that is relied on as making 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.
- 3.1.22 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 reappointment, 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.

b) For Candidates in the Professoriate or Educational Leadership Streams

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 (undergraduate and graduate), or other means. In assessing a candidate's ability to direct graduate students it is appropriate to also consider contributions to the training of all post-graduate trainees, including medical residents and fellows.
- 3.2.2 An individual's entire teaching contribution should be assessed within the context of disciplinary norms, but also with regard to interdisciplinary approaches, as appropriate.
- 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, student engagement, responsiveness/accessibility to students, influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students, assessment and evaluation practices pertaining to student learning, and demonstration of a scholarly approach to teaching. 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 in face-to-face, online and blended formats, but will normally include Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT – UBCV) or scores from the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire (TEQ – UBCO) and a Summative Peer Review of Teaching. The summative review will normally be based on an examination of the following: quantitative Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT) – the University module questions, and in particular Q6 (UBCV) or Q20 (UBCO), with comparative Departmental/Faculty norms; qualitative comments from SEoTs about classroom teaching practices; the candidate's course materials, assignments and grading practices; the caliber of supervised essays and theses; peer reviews of teaching; and other relevant considerations. Please note **UBC Vancouver's Senate Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (SEoT)** (approved on May 16, 2007) is available on Vancouver Senate's website.

- 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.
- 3.2.7 Drawing on appropriate criteria and consideration for multiple data sources over time (evidence of effective teaching) as indicated in Sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4, the Dean's Advisory Committee and Summative Peer Reviews of Teaching Reviewers may employ criteria-driven, rubric standards as a best practices procedure to articulate the extent to which a candidate meets, does not meet or exceeds departmental norms for effective teaching.

Note: See **Appendix 2** for Teaching Evidence.

3.3 Service

- 3.3.1 Service to the academic profession, to the University, and to the community is a core duty that will be taken into account. However, while service to the University and the community is important, it cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching and in scholarly activity.
- 3.3.2 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. Specifically for Associate Professors; service is judged on willingness to participate and participation in the affairs of the Department and the University (Article 3.07 of the Agreement).
- 3.3.3 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.
- 3.3.4 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.

c) For Candidates in the Educational Leadership Stream

3.4 Educational Leadership

- 3.4.1 Educational leadership is activity taken at UBC and elsewhere to advance innovation in teaching and learning with impact beyond one's classroom. (Article 4.04 of the Agreement).

Evidence of educational leadership is required for tenure/promotion in the Educational Leadership stream. This evidence will vary in departments and Faculties to reflect

different contexts and educational leadership needs/opportunities within the department/unit, university and academic/professional communities within the candidates' discipline. It can include, but is not limited to:

- Innovation and enhancements to teaching, learning and assessment that has impact beyond the candidate's classroom, department, discipline and / or institution as appropriate.
- Significant contributions to curriculum development and renewal
- Activities to advance interdisciplinary, inter-professional and inter-institutional collaborations in teaching and learning.
- Application of / engagement with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
- Contributions to the practice and theory of teaching and learning literature, including publications in peer-reviewed and professional journals, conference publications, book chapters, textbooks and open education repositories / resources.
- Organization of, and contributions to conferences, programs, symposia, colloquia, workshop and other teaching and learning events, to a local, provincial, national and international audience, as appropriate.
- Securing funding / additional resources for teaching and learning innovation or enhancements, and leading the implementation of funded initiatives or activities.
- Recognition and distinction in the form of awards, fellowships and other recognition for teaching and learning related activities (internal to UBC and beyond).
- Capacity building for excellence in education, including mentoring and inspiration of colleagues, supervision of undergraduate research projects in discipline-based pedagogies.
- Activities undertaken as part of formal educational leadership responsibilities within the candidate's Department / School / Program area / Faculty / UBC.

Please see Appendices 1, 2, and 4 for more information on educational leadership and the associated materials required for a candidate's teaching dossier and CV.

4 INFORMATION FOR THE CANDIDATE

4.1 Meetings with the Head

Note: See Article 5.02 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 5.4). It is the Candidate's responsibility to provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae using the **UBC Format** (Article 5.02(a) of the Agreement). This meeting must occur no later than June 30 of the academic year preceding the year of review and earlier meetings are encouraged. The purposes of the meetings are to:

- Review the expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure as applicable;
- Determine the timing of the next review;
- For candidates in the professoriate stream, identify areas of scholarly activity (i.e., traditional publications, scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions) and teaching that will be assessed and how those areas will be assessed;

- For candidates in the professoriate stream, identify if the case will be considered under more than one area of scholarly activity (i.e. a blended case) and what type of evidence of scholarship will be sent to referees. It is important to discuss and confirm with the Head how scholarly activity will be assessed. For example, a case may have elements of both traditional scholarship and professional contributions, or it may have elements of all three areas of scholarly activity - traditional scholarship, scholarship of teaching and professional contributions;
- For candidates in the Professor of Teaching stream, identify areas of educational leadership and how those areas will be assessed;
- If the individual holds a joint appointment, clearly lay out the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion. For more information, please see **Joint Appointments** (Section 9);
- Discuss the faculty member's record and identify strengths as well as those areas requiring improvement or presenting potential difficulties;
- Assist the candidate with any concerns;
- When a review is pending, advise the candidate that it is her or his responsibility to provide an up-to-date file (**Section 4.2**) and other relevant information to the Head, **no later than September 15** of the review year (unless the Head agrees to a later date) of the year in which the case is being considered; and
- Identify where relevant, the information and documents required for the review to proceed.

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 written 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. While the UBC format is recommended, it is recognized that the CV needs to accommodate a wide range of scholarship and can be adapted as needed to most effectively reflect the candidate's scholarship. Both the **Annotated CV for the Professoriate Stream** (Appendix 3) and the **Annotated CV for the Educational Leadership Stream** (Appendix 4) contain helpful guidelines for ensuring a clear and comprehensive record. Both the **CV for the Professoriate Stream** and **CV for the Educational Leadership Stream** can be found on the Faculty Relations' website.

4.2.2 For faculty in the Educational Leadership stream, a Publications Record is not required, but it should be included if the candidate wishes to present publications as evidence supporting her or his contributions to teaching, educational leadership, or maintaining currency in the field where appropriate.

4.2.3 The CV and Publications Record must be up-to-date and dated. Addendums to the CV and Publications Record, such as updated information on new publications, grants and awards, or recent teaching evaluation results, can be added to the dossier. Addendums must be

dated to make it clear when 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. CV and Publications Record addendums 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 addendums to the President through the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations at: fr.sacassistants@ubc.ca.

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 or is not dated.*
- *There is a lack of clarity regarding the candidate's contributions to publications, grants or collaborative research.*
- *The teaching record is incomplete.*
- *The candidate's role in supervising graduate students, residents or post docs is not clear (primary supervisor; co-supervisor; committee member).*
- *CV fails to properly distinguish between peer-reviewed publications and those not peer-reviewed.*
- *CV fails to include the dollar value of grants or fails to indicate the proportion allocated to the individual in joint grants.*
- *For tenure/promotion cases in the Professor of Teaching stream, educational leadership is not addressed*
- *Full information is not provided on publications - page numbers, etc.*

4.3 Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

4.3.1 **Evidence of Teaching** (Appendix 2) will vary in departments and faculties as necessary to reflect the teaching styles and methods used. At least a year prior to being considered for promotion, candidates are encouraged to speak with their Head about the peer review requirements for their Department. Information gathered through Peer Review of Teaching and Student Evaluation of Teaching should be considered as part of the submission.

4.4 Evidence of Educational Leadership

4.4.1 Evidence of educational leadership is required for tenure/promotion in the Educational Leadership stream. This evidence will vary in departments and Faculties to reflect different contexts and educational leadership needs/opportunities within the department/unit, university and academic/professional communities within the candidates' discipline. It can include, but is not limited to:

- Innovation and enhancements to teaching, learning and assessment that has impact beyond the candidate's classroom, department, discipline and / or institution as appropriate.
- Significant contributions to curriculum development and renewal.
- Activities to advance interdisciplinary, inter-professional and inter-institutional collaborations in teaching and learning.
- Application of / engagement with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- Contributions to the practice and theory of teaching and learning literature, including publications in peer-reviewed and professional journals, conference publications, book chapters, textbooks and open education repositories / resources.
- Organization of, and contributions to conferences, programs, symposia, colloquia, workshop and other teaching and learning events, to a local, provincial, national and international audience, as appropriate.
- Securing funding / additional resources for teaching and learning innovation or enhancements, and leading the implementation of funded initiatives or activities.
- Recognition and distinction in the form of awards, fellowships and other recognition for teaching and learning related activities (internal to UBC and beyond).
- Capacity building for excellence in education, including mentoring and inspiration of colleagues, supervision of undergraduate research projects in discipline-based pedagogies.
- Activities undertaken as part of formal educational leadership responsibilities within the candidate's Department / School / Program area / Faculty / UBC.

4.4.2 Evidence of educational leadership is not required in the Professorial stream, but aspects of educational leadership can be used in this stream as supporting evidence for teaching and service contributions.

4.4.3 Drawing on appropriate criteria and consideration for multiple data sources over time (evidence of educational leadership) as indicated in Section 4.4.1, the Dean's Advisory Committee and Summative Peer Reviews of Teaching Reviewers may employ explicit criteria-driven rubric standards as a best practices procedure that clearly articulate the extent to which a candidate meets, does not meet or exceeds departmental norms for effective educational leadership.

4.5 Selecting Referees

a) For Candidates in the Professoriate Stream

- 4.5.1 For the purpose of considering scholarly activity under Article 5.05 of the Agreement, substantive letters of appraisal from external referees regarding 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, Professor or Professor of Teaching;
 - 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.

Note: Referees should be explicitly informed of the basis for assessment (traditional scholarship, scholarship of teaching, professional contributions, blended case, etc.)

Please see Sections 5.4.7 and 5.4.10 to 5.4.12 for referee qualifications.

4.5.2 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 5.4.8 and Article 5.05(b) of the Agreement).

Note: Candidates considered at the rank of Assistant Professor will be asked to provide at least three references with their application. It is recommended, but not required, that referees be external and at arm's length.

b) For Candidates in the Educational Leadership Stream

- 4.5.3 For cases involving initial appointment or the granting of tenure at the rank of Senior Instructor, the candidate must provide a list of at least four potential referees, of which at least two will be asked to provide letters of appraisal. Four letters of appraisal on the candidate's teaching and learning and educational leadership 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 her or his outstanding teaching from another Department could be such a referee. **Letters of appraisal should be from referees outside the candidate's immediate department.** Such letters do not need to be from referees external to UBC. If external referees are available, such letters will be welcome and may help strengthen a case.
- 4.5.4 For cases involving an appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching, the candidate must provide a list of at least four potential referees, of which at least two will be asked to provide letters of appraisal regarding the candidate's accomplishments. At least two of the candidate's referees should be external to UBC and the remaining should be external to their unit or department. For more information, see the **Guidelines for Promotion to Professor of Teaching** (Appendix 1) about the requirements for letters of appraisal for promotion to this rank.

c) For Candidates in the Professoriate or Educational Leadership Streams

- 4.5.5 Referees should be at arm's length; that is, referees should be persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. They may not include such categories as relatives, close personal friends, clients, former graduate thesis advisers, research supervisors, and should not include current or former colleagues where conflict of interest cannot be managed, grant co-holders or co-authors. They can include, for example, former instructors who were not supervisors or professional committee members. In the Educational Leadership stream, arm's length colleagues from within the University may be appropriate. Please see Section 7 for exceptions allowed for new appointments.
- 4.5.6 Where there has been a substantial amount of collaboration with the same individuals, it can be useful to have letters from the collaborator(s) 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 including whether the collaborator is part of a collaboration team or a teacher/student collaboration.** It is recommended that the Head solicit this information. These letters shall either be added to the file per Article 5.03 of the Agreement or referenced in the Head's letter of recommendation to the Dean. When soliciting these letters, the Head should outline the reasons they are being requested. The letters providing this input should be placed in the dossier immediately following the Head's letter

- 4.5.7 The candidate must not communicate with potential referees about any aspect of the letter of appraisal or the tenure and/or promotion review; doing so raises questions about their impartiality.
- 4.5.8 Referees' letters will be solicited by the Head unless the Head has published or received research funding with the candidate, in which case an Acting Head should be appointed for the entire case to perform all the roles normally undertaken by the Head, including soliciting the referee letters, chairing the department meeting, communicating with the candidate if concerns are raised at the department level or additional information is required, and writing the recommendation letter to the Dean.
- 4.5.9 The candidate will not be informed of the names of the referees from whom letters are solicited.

4.6 Candidate's File for Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure

- 4.6.1 It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide their file to the Head for the purposes of review, **no later than September 15 of the year of review**, unless otherwise agreed by the Head.
- 4.6.2 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, receipt of a grant or award, new significant contribution to educational leadership, etc.) or a response to particular concerns that emerge in the relevant documentation (Article 5.03(b) of the Agreement). New information should be in the form of an addendum and should clearly indicate the date of the submission. **It should be noted that new solicited information should only be material that has been obtained following required or other recognized procedures (Article 5.06(e) of the Agreement).** For more information on updating contributions, please refer to **CV and Publication Record** (Section 4.2.3).
- 4.6.3 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. If the review has progressed past the stage of the SAC recommendation, then any supplemental information should be sent directly to the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations at: fr.sacassistants@ubc.ca.
- 4.6.4 The Head or Dean (depending on the review level the file is currently at) will review the supplemental information to ensure it is appropriate to add to the file (Articles 5.03(b) and 5.06(e) of the Agreement). If the information is not appropriate, the Head or Dean should return it to the candidate advising that the material is not appropriate supplemental information and provide reasons for that conclusion. Appropriate supplemental information will be added to the file and reviewed by Committee members prior to the vote.

4.7 Communication from the Head

- 4.7.1 When serious concerns about the candidacy arise in the departmental standing committee in all cases other than an initial appointment, the Head must provide the candidate with a

summary of the concerns and a summary or copies of the external letters of reference modified to the extent necessary to ensure confidentiality and to protect the identity of external referees. Such a summary or copies of the external letters is provided to the candidate regardless of the nature of the serious concern. The candidate must be given the opportunity to:

- Respond in writing; and
- Introduce further relevant evidence before the department vote is taken (Article 5.06(f) of the Agreement).

4.7.2 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).

4.7.3 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 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 (Article 5.08 of the Agreement).

4.7.4 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 written response to the Dean, which will be added to the file (Article 5.08(d) of the Agreement). The form of the candidate's response should be guided by Section 4.5 above.

4.7.5 In the case of a non-periodic review, if the Head decides to stop the process, the Head will provide detailed and specific reasons to the candidate in writing including in which respects she or he is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria (Article 5.07(c) of the Agreement). Such a recommendation is not subject to appeal as set out in Article 13 of the Agreement.

4.8 Communication from the Dean

4.8.1 In all cases other than initial appointments, the Dean will inform the candidate in writing of her or his recommendation at the time the recommendation is being forwarded to the President (Article 5.12(a) of the Agreement).

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

4.8.3 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 this letter, which should be addressed to the President and added to the file (Article 5.12(d) of the Agreement). The form of the candidate's response should be guided by Section 4.5.2 above. **It is important that this response be filed quickly so it can be included in the dossier and considered when the Dean meets with the Senior Appointments Committee.**

4.8.4 In the case of a non-periodic review, if the Dean decides to stop the process, the Dean will provide detailed and specific reasons to the candidate in writing including in which respects she or he is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria (Article 5.11(c) of the Agreement). Such a recommendation is not subject to appeal as set out in Article 13 of the Agreement.

4.9 Communication from the President

4.9.1 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.

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

4.10 The Decision

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

4.10.2 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 (Article 2.03(g) of the Agreement).

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. Nevertheless, Institutes, Schools and similar Academic Units are required to follow these procedures consistent with Departments.

Note 2: A **Reappointment Checklist for Heads** and a **Tenure and Promotion Checklist for Heads** are available on the Faculty Relations' website.

Note 3: In the case where a Head has been a co-author or received research funds with the candidate, an Acting Head should be put in place for the entire review process and will perform all tasks normally undertaken by the Head, including soliciting the referee letters, chairing the department meeting, communicating with the candidate if concerns are raised at the department level or additional information is required, and writing the recommendation letter to the Dean.

Note 4: Reviews must be completed in a reasonable time frame to ensure that the reviews accurately reflect the candidate's work.

5.1 Role of the Head

- 5.1.1 Heads provide the intellectual and administrative leadership for their Department. Among other things, they assign teaching to faculty and are responsible for overseeing the reappointment, tenure and promotion process for their Department.

5.2 Meeting with the Candidate

- 5.2.1 The Head must meet annually with all faculty members in that Department who are in term appointments with review (i.e., tenure track) and following tenure, on a regular basis thereafter, in accordance with the **Promotion Schedules** (Section 2.4). The purposes of the meetings are to:

- Review the expectations for reappointment, promotion and tenure;
- For candidates in the Professoriate stream, identify areas of scholarly activity (i.e., traditional publications, scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions) and teaching that will be assessed and how those areas will be assessed;
- For candidates in the Professoriate stream, identify if the case will be considered under more than one area of scholarly activity (i.e. a blended case) and what type of evidence of scholarship will be sent to referees. **It is important that this be confirmed in writing in accordance with Article 5.02 of the Agreement.** For example, a case may have elements of one or more of traditional scholarship, professional contributions and the scholarship of teaching;
- For candidates in the Educational Leadership stream, identify areas of educational leadership and how those areas will be assessed;
- If the individual holds a joint appointment, clearly lay out the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion as outlined in **Joint Appointments** (Section 9);
- Discuss the faculty member's record and identify strengths as well as those areas requiring improvement or presenting potential difficulties;
- Assist the candidate with any concerns;
- When a review is pending, advise the candidate that it is her or his responsibility to provide an up-to-date dossier as outlined in **CV and Publications Record** (Section 4.2) and other relevant information to the Head, **no later than September 15** of the year in which the case is being considered (unless the Head agrees to a later date);
- Identify the information and documents required for the review to proceed;

- Advise the candidate who is asked for a list of potential referees not to communicate with potential referees about any aspect of the letter of appraisal or the tenure and promotion review, for doing so invites questions about their impartiality; and
- Determine the timing of the next review.

5.2.2 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.

5.2.3 The candidate may bring a colleague or representative from the Faculty Association to each of the above meetings.

5.2.4 At the conclusion of each meeting, the matters discussed, as outlined above in Section 5.2.1, must be recorded in a written 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.

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

5.3.1 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.

5.3.2 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.

5.4 Departmental Consultation

5.4.1 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. Departmental colleagues are generally not bound to the same degree by the conflict of interest cautions that apply to external referees and the Head – that is, colleagues may vote on a tenure or promotion decision where they have collaborated with a colleague.

5.4.2 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.

5.4.3 At UBCV, the Faculty members eligible to be consulted for 2015/2016 are:

For initial appointments, all tenured and tenure-track members of the Department are eligible to vote.

Eligible members for votes regarding reappointment (Appendix 14):

Rank/Decision being considered	“eligible member”
Reappointment of Instructor	Associate Professor; Professor; Senior Instructor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Senior Instructor	Associate Professor; Professor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Professor of Teaching	Professor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Assistant Professor	Associate Professor; Professor; Senior Instructor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Associate Professor	Professor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Professor	Professor; Professor of Teaching

Eligible members for votes regarding tenure and promotion (Appendix 14):

Rank/Decision being considered	“eligible member”
Tenure and promotion to Senior Instructor (from Instructor)	Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Senior Instructor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Promotion to Professor of Teaching (from Senior Instructor, which is a tenured position)	Professor; Professor of Teaching
Tenure – at rank of Assistant Professor	Tenured Assistant Professor; Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Tenure – at rank of Associate Professor	Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Tenure – at rank of Professor or Professor of Teaching	Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (from Assistant Professor)	Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Promotion to Full Professor (from Associate Professor)	Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching

For UBCO, please check the HR website for updates.

Note: Eligibility to be consulted is also governed by the University's policy on **Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment** policy available on University Counsel's website. Eligible members who are in a conflict of interest with the candidate should not participate in the review. **If you have any questions regarding eligibility of a Faculty Member to vote, contact Faculty Relations (UBCV) or Human Resources (UBCO).**

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 she/he could be a peer evaluator on teaching. A tenured Assistant Professor is an eligible member for the tenure vote; but not the promotion vote.*
- *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.*
- *A Senior Instructor is being reviewed for promotion to Professor of Teaching in 2016/17. Only faculty members who hold tenured appointments at the rank of Associate Professor, Professor or Professor of Teaching are eligible to be consulted or to vote on this case.*

5.4.4 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.

5.4.5 Before selecting prospective referees for consideration, the Head must consult with the departmental standing committee about the choice of referees. The Head solicits the reviewers for the four letters of appraisal except as noted in Note 3 above. In the case that the Head has a research affiliation with the candidate (i.e. shared publications or grants), an acting Head will be put in place for the entirety of the review process and will perform all tasks normally undertaken by the Head.

i) For Candidates in the Professoriate Stream

5.4.6 For the purpose of considering scholarly activity, as noted in **Evidence of Educational Leadership** (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 considers

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

5.4.7 Heads should take care in choosing referees who are qualified to render substantive judgment on the quality and significance of a candidate's scholarly achievements. Referees should normally be chosen from universities of comparable or superior stature to UBC or if referees are from institutions of a lesser stature, an explanation should be provided for choice of referee. **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. **In such a case where referees are chosen to evaluate several areas of scholarly activity, the Head should notify these referees that the case is 'blended' and direct them to comment on the particular area of scholarly activity for which their expert opinion is being solicited.**

ii) For Candidates in the Educational Leadership Stream

5.4.8 For the purpose of considering teaching and educational leadership in review for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor with tenure, letters of appraisal assessing the candidate's excellence in teaching, educational leadership, involvement in curriculum development and innovation, and other teaching and learning initiatives shall be obtained by the Head from referees outside the candidate's 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. Such letters do not need to be from referees external to UBC, but **should be from referees outside the candidate's Department** (Article 5.05 of the Agreement). If letters from referees external to UBC are available, such letters will be welcome and may help strengthen a case.

5.4.9 For the purpose of considering a promotion from Senior Instructor to Professor of Teaching, four letters of appraisal assessing the candidate's achievements in teaching and educational leadership shall be obtained by the Head. The Head consults with the Department Standing Committee and selects at least two referees from the Candidate's list (Section 4.5.5). Two of the four referees should be external to the unit and two should be external to UBC.

iii) For Candidates in the Professoriate or Educational Leadership Streams

5.4.10 Referees should be at arm's length (except under the circumstances of **New Appointments to be Considered by SAC** (Section 7)); that is, referees should be persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. They may not include such categories as: relatives, close personal friends, clients, former thesis advisers, research supervisors, and normally should not include current or former colleagues, grant co-holders or co-authors. They can include, for example, former instructors who were not supervisors or members of a

professional committee who served together. This means that a referee could be a former instructor, but not a former instructor who was a supervisor, nor a former instructor who served together with the candidate on a professional committee. In rare situations where a referee has only served on a professional committee with the candidate, consider whether the nature of the arm's length relationship by questioning how often the committee met and whether the purpose of nature of the committee could lead to a conflict of interest.

In the Educational Leadership stream, arm's length colleagues from within the University may be appropriate. In determining the admissibility of a letter of reference, please take care to ensure 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.

- 5.4.11 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 detailed statement of the reasons for selection of the referee and of her or his qualifications and accomplishments.
- 5.4.12 It is also generally understood that referees who are academics should be from universities or units of comparable or superior reputation to UBC. The Head should provide a reasonably detailed statement of the reasons for selection of each referee and of her or his qualifications and accomplishments. Heads should also consider a range of referees. Particularly in the case of promotion to Professor, a Head should solicit letters from referees outside of Canada as well as from Canadian institutions.
- 5.4.13 Referees in the Professor of Teaching Stream should be well apprised of the different criteria that apply to this rank; in particular they should be aware that a record of scholarly publications is not required for tenure/promotions within this stream but may be included if the candidate wishes to present publications as evidence supporting her or his contributions to teaching, educational leadership or maintaining currency in the field where appropriate.
- 5.4.14 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 necessary, 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.
- 5.4.15 The candidate must not be informed of the names of the referees from whom letters are solicited.
- 5.4.16 Referees letters that are two or more years old should not be used unless updated 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 or his old letter can stand as is or whether she/he would like to amend it.

b) Letters of External Referees

Note: See **Sample Letter of Request for External Referees for Review of Scholarly Activity** (Appendix 7) and **Sample Letter of Request for Referees for Review of Teaching and Educational Leadership** (Appendix 8).

5.4.17 Letters requesting evaluation of the quality and significance of a candidate's scholarly, professional, educational leadership, 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.

5.4.18 Although Heads' letters to external referees will vary, they should include the following items:

1) For the Professoriate Stream:

- 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 publications, scholarship of teaching, professional or creative work). **The Head should specifically clarify if the case will be considered under more than one area of scholarly activity (i.e. a blended case).** The Head should ensure referees are provided enough information to fully evaluate the candidate's 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).
- **If the promotion in question is to Associate Professor, the referee should be made aware that at UBC this promotion includes the granting of tenure.**
- **It should be clearly indicated when a candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion in the seventh year of appointment as Assistant Professor, that the recommendations for tenure and promotion are distinct.** 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 Associate Professor without being given tenure at the same time. In a seventh year case the letter should include a request for separate recommendations on promotion and tenure. For a pre-seventh-year case, the letter should request a recommendation only on promotion, and 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.
- Samples of the candidate's scholarly work. Samples may be provided as a hard copy, electronic copy or where appropriate via citation.

2) For the Educational Leadership Stream:

- A request for the referee's independent opinion of the candidate's teaching effectiveness and his/her educational leadership. In particular, the Head should request from reviewers (as appropriate, noting the external referees may not be able to address all of these areas), a review of the candidate's command over the relevant subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in their field, general preparedness, course presentation, accessibility to students, influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students, evidence of commitment to scholarly teaching and learning, and ability and willingness to teach a range of subject matter at various levels of instruction and diverse pedagogical contexts. Reviewers should be specifically asked to comment on the candidate's contributions to educational leadership, including curriculum development/redesign, pedagogical innovation, use of learning technology, application of scholarly approaches to teaching and learning, leadership and contribution to teaching and learning initiatives and programs; grants obtained for educational improvement, involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning and dissemination of best practice through conference presentations, poster sessions, etc. Reviewers should be informed that active contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning and publications are not required for tenure/promotion in this stream, but that they can be used as evidence of educational leadership if the candidate has engaged in such activities. Similarly, publications from traditional scholarly activity within the discipline are not evidence of educational leadership, but may be used as evidence of maintaining currency in the discipline, if appropriate.
- If the promotion in question is to Senior Instructor, then the referee should be made aware that at UBC this promotion includes a grant of tenure. In a 5th year case, the referee should be informed that if promotion is unsuccessful, this is the final consideration for promotion and tenure at UBC.

3) For Candidates in the Professoriate or Educational Leadership streams:

- In the case of initial appointments that involve an award of tenure, the referees should be asked for explicit recommendations on both rank and tenure, in the context of the criteria set out in the Agreement, based on the evidence available to the referee.
- A clear indication of the rank involved, and whether tenure is included. 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 she or he knows the candidate, if so in what capacity, and whether she/he is in a position to make an objective assessment of the candidate's contributions.
- 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."

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

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

- Copies of letters of reference will 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 must 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.

Note: For more information about the confidentiality of letters of reference in a faculty member's personnel file, please see **Guidelines for Personnel Files** available on Faculty Relations' webpage.

5.4.21 In the event that a Letter of Reference is received from a referee who is subsequently determined to be not at arm's length (Section 5.4.10), the Letter of Reference will be removed from the file. If the required number of Letters of Reference have not been received, an additional letter of reference will be sought from a new referee keeping in mind that equal numbers from each list are required or more from the candidate's list than from the department's list (Section 5.4.14).

c) Meetings and Voting

5.4.22 The Head chairs the departmental standing committee but does not vote (Article 5.06(d) of the Agreement). In the case where a Head may be in conflict (i.e. was the candidate's doctoral supervisor, has been or is engaged in research with the candidate, is a co-author or has received research funds with the candidate), an Acting Head should be put in place for the entire review.

5.4.23 Members of the committee should be reminded that confidentiality is expected of all those participating in the review. Discussions should be collegial and respectful per the University's **Discrimination and Harassment Policy** and the **UBC Statement on Respectful Environment for Students, Faculty and Staff** available on University Counsel's website.

5.4.24 Committee members should be prepared to share their opinions of the file enabling the Head to provide a report of the departmental committee's deliberations, including a full statement by the Head of the reasons for the majority and any minority opinions.

5.4.25 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**) (Article 5.06(c) of the Agreement).

- 5.4.26 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 included in the dossier or considered (Article 5.06 of the Agreement).**
- 5.4.27 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 written 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.
- 5.4.28 **Where a candidate is being considered for both tenure and promotion, the departmental standing committee must take separate votes on promotion and tenure, except in the case of promotion to Associate Professor in year 7, where it is not necessary to take a separate vote on tenure IF the vote on promotion to Associate Professor is unanimously positive. Note that this does not apply to promotion cases before the seventh year, where a positive recommendation on promotion automatically results in tenure.** Where a candidate has declined to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, only tenure will be voted upon. Tenured Assistant Professors participate in the review for tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor, but do not participate in the review for promotion to Associate Professor. Note: for promotion to Senior Instructor, there is only one vote taken for promotion (and if successful, tenure is also granted).
- 5.4.29 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.
- 5.4.30 The Head (or Acting Head if one has been appointed) will draft the departmental standing committee report to reflect both the majority and minority opinions of 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 (Article 5.07(b) of the Agreement).

5.5 Recommendation to the Dean

- 5.5.1 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). Thus, in the case of a non-periodic review (Article 9 of the Agreement for guidelines on periodic versus non-periodic review), the Head

may stop the review process and not forward a recommendation to the Dean. Under Article 5.07(c), a Head who decides to stop the non-periodic review will provide detailed and specific reasons to the candidate in writing including in which respects she or he is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Such a recommendation is not subject to Appeal as set out in Article 13 of the Agreement.

Under Article 5.07(a) of the Agreement, the Head (or Acting 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). An important function of the Head's letter is to provide context for the candidate's activities to higher-level committees, who may not be familiar with expectations for teaching, scholarly activity, and/or graduate supervision in the discipline. See the **Head's Letter (Suggested Format)** (Appendix 9) that will provide additional guidance for ensuring a clear and comprehensive letter. The Head's recommendation should also address:

- In the case of candidates in the professoriate stream, information on the nature of the venues in which the candidate has published, the impact of the work, and the norms within the field concerning scholarship and publication;
- Evidence regarding the candidate's teaching (Appendix 2);
- In the case of Professor of Teaching faculty, evidence regarding the candidate's educational leadership; and
- Any relevant contextual factors which the President may consider in assessing the merits of the candidate's teaching, scholarly activity, educational leadership and service, as appropriate to the stream (Article 5.14(f) of the Agreement). For example:
 - Maternity or parental leaves;
 - Delays due to set up requirements for research or any other relevant information which may provide insight into timing issues;
 - The candidate's personal circumstances if relevant;
 - Any agreements that have been made between the University and the Faculty Association governing the consideration of the case; and/or
 - In case of Educational Leadership stream, opportunities for educational leadership.

5.5.2 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 10. The letter should clearly identify the effective date of the decision in question (e.g. July 1, 2016).
- b) The report of the departmental committee's deliberations including a full statement by the Head of the majority and any minority opinions. This report should also

contain a record of the vote. Prior to this report being forwarded to the Dean, it should be circulated to the committee for comments.

- c) Summary of Teaching evidence (see Evidence of Teaching in Appendix 2) if included separately from the Head's letter.
- d) 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 published contributions), a sample of each type of letter should be included as well as an indication of which referees are responding to which request.
- e) A list and brief summary of the qualifications and justification for referees.
- f) The referees' letters of evaluation.
- g) The candidate's CV (as originally sent to the referees) and any updates.
- h) 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.
- i) 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.
- j) Letter identifying serious concerns and the candidate's response, if any.
- k) 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 (Section 5.6 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.
- 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 or Professor of Teaching case). See **Evidence of Teaching** (Appendix 2).

5.6 Notification to the Candidate

Note: See Article 5.08 of the Agreement.

- 5.6.1 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.
- 5.6.2 If the recommendation of either the Head and/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.
- 5.6.3 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 written 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 of 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 the Dean's Advisory Committee ("Committee"). The Dean must also consult with the Committee on recommendations concerning reappointment when she/he is considering not recommending in favour of reappointment. In the case of other recommendations, the Dean may consult with the Committee.

Recommendation	Consult with Dean's 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 Committee should be composed of tenured Professors and Professors of Teaching, one-half of whom should be elected by the faculty, and one-half of whom shall be selected by the Dean. Heads who are tenured full Professors

or Professors of Teaching shall 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** is currently under review and so please check the HR website for updates.

- 6.1.5 Members of the Committee should be reminded that confidentiality is expected of all those participating in the review. Discussions should be collegial and respectful per the University's **Discrimination and Harassment Policy** and the **UBC Statement on Respectful Environment for Students, Faculty and Staff** available on University Counsel's website. For further information on the University's policies surrounding the use of personal information, please see the **Access and Privacy at UBC Guide**.
- 6.1.6 Committee members should be prepared to share their opinions of the file.
- 6.1.7 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).
- 6.1.8 **Where a candidate is being considered for both tenure and promotion, the Committee must take separate votes on promotion and tenure, except in the case of promotion to Associate Professor in year 7, where it is not necessary to take a separate vote on tenure IF the vote on promotion to Associate Professor is unanimously positive. Note that this does not apply to promotion cases before the seventh year, where a positive recommendation on promotion automatically results in tenure.** Where a candidate has declined to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, only tenure will be voted upon. Note for promotion to Senior Instructor, there is only one vote taken for promotion (and if successful, tenure is also granted).
- 6.1.9 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.
- 6.1.10 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).
- 6.1.11 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 her or his decision.
- 6.1.12 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 her or his

decision.

6.1.13 The Dean, after considering the advice of the Dean's 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). In the case of a non-periodic review (see Article 9 of the Agreement for guidelines on periodic versus non-periodic review), the Dean may stop the review process and not forward a recommendation to the President. Under Article 5.11(c) of the Agreement, if the Dean decides to stop the process of a non-periodic review, they will provide detailed and specific reasons to the candidate in writing including in which respects she or he is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Such a recommendation is not subject to Appeal as set out in Article 13 of the Agreement. The candidate's next review would then be a periodic review as prescribed by their appointment type. Please contact Faculty Relations in this event for procedural guidance.

6.1.14 If the Dean refers the file back to the department for reconsideration, the Dean should consult with the Dean's Advisory Committee upon subsequent receipt of the file prior to making her or his own recommendation.

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:	
<i>Dr. ABC: Promotion to Professor</i>	
<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) In the case of a professorial stream candidate, 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 Dean's Advisory 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) or the interdisciplinary record 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 the Dean and/or Head of this fact, confirm that that it was the candidate's decision not to respond; and
- l) Not repeat information provided by the Head, except as set out above, but includes all relevant contextual information not addressed by the Head and any new issues that have arisen.

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

6.2.3 All electronic files should be bookmarked and word searchable. The files should include the following documents in this order:

- a) **SAC Cover Sheet*** (Appendix 11) and make sure to fill out all relevant boxes, including whether it is a Seventh (7th) Year Mandatory Review for tenure;
- 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) Clearly dated updates to curriculum vitae and publication record, starting with the most recent;

- l) Clearly dated original curriculum vitae in UBC format and publication record (as sent to referees);
- m) Evidence regarding teaching (Appendix 2);
- n) List and brief summary of qualifications and justification for referees;
- o) Head's sample letter(s) requesting the external referees' letters; and
- p) Letters of reference.

*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 (Section 9).

For all recommendations of initial appointments and reappointments of tenure track Assistant Professors and Instructors, please review the **Documentation Checklist** available on Faculty Relations' website.

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 her or his recommendation (Article 5.12(a) of the Agreement). The Dean should also remind the candidate of her or 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 through the SAC Assistants 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 she or he is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria (Article 5.12(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 this recommendation in a letter to the President, 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

Note: In accordance with Section 5.01(b) of the Agreement all the provisions in this Guide apply to new appointments, unless otherwise stated.

- 7.1 SAC must consider new appointments to the rank of Senior Instructor, Associate Professor, Professor, or Professor of Teaching, whether full-time or part-time.
- 7.2 CVs for new appointees should, as far as possible, convey the same kind of information that is present in a UBC CV: e.g., indication of previous academic appointments and dates, documentation regarding scholarly contributions, records of research grants and teaching activities, etc. Please review the **Curriculum Vitae and Publication Record** (Section 4.2) for more information.
- 7.3 In the case of new appointments to be considered by SAC, as much evidence as possible should be included about teaching effectiveness. For instance, a candidate can provide a statement of teaching philosophy in their CV. Peer and student evaluations from previous institutions should also be included if available. Not including these evaluations may result in delays in the review process. 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.
- 7.4 For new appointments that are to be considered by SAC, there must be at least four arm's length letters of reference external to UBC and to the individual's current institution with the exception of the scenario outlined below for the Educational Leadership stream. A maximum of two arm's length letters requested by the candidate as part of the recruitment process can be counted towards the four arm's length letters necessary. In the event letters of reference are used from the recruitment process, and tenure is a subject of the appointment, the referees will need to be further consulted and provide their recommendation on the specific question of tenure. Please refer to **Sample Letter of Request for Reference for Review of Scholarly Activity** (Appendix 8). In all cases, the Head should provide notes on the qualifications of the external referees that are included in a file for a new appointment.
- 7.5 In the Educational Leadership stream (particularly in the case of the appointment of a Senior Instructor, see Section 5.4.10), it may be appropriate for some of the letters of reference to come from within the previous institution of the candidate, so long as they are from arm's length reviewers. Please refer to the **Sample Letter of Request for Reference for Review of Teaching and Educational Leadership** (Appendix 9).
- 7.6 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.
- 7.7 For new decanal appointments, please contact the Provost's office and Faculty Relations for procedural guidance.

- 7.8 When voting at the Department and Faculty level on new appointments, if the recommendation is for a tenured appointment, two votes must be taken irrespective of the rank of the appointment – one vote on the rank of the appointment and a separate vote on whether the appointment should come with tenure.

8 STREAMLINED PROCESS FOR NEW SENIOR APPOINTMENTS

Note: See Article 5.14(e) of the Agreement.

- 8.1 The streamlined process is intended for use in extraordinary circumstances only. It is designed to facilitate exceptional new senior appointments to UBC. Senior appointments include:
- i) Associate Professors with tenure;
 - ii) Professors of Teaching with tenure; or
 - iii) Professors with tenure.

In particular, the streamlined process may be used to appoint candidates to the above named ranks, normally, where the candidate is being considered for a senior administrative position (i.e. Head, Dean, or Associate Dean).

In exceptional circumstances, where the University may benefit from the appointment of an exceptionally distinguished scholar, the streamlined appointment process may be available. Please contact Faculty Relations for procedural guidance.

- 8.2 Unless otherwise provided in Article 5.14(e) of the Agreement, the standard appointment process applies. Heads considering using the streamlined process must first consult with a Faculty Relations Senior Manager (UBCV) or Human Resources (UBCO) to confirm that the streamlined process is appropriate for the candidate being considered. Once confirmation is received, the procedures below apply.
- 8.3 The streamlined process requires: (1) the departmental standing committee, including, the Head, and a representative of the Dean's Advisory Committee, (2) a representative of SAC, and (3) the Dean each to make a recommendation to the President. Upon receipt of the above three recommendations and the candidate's file, the President will consider the case and confirm or deny the candidate's appointment.
- 8.4 The candidate's dossier should be prepared as per the recommendations contained in Section 7.
- 8.5 The SAC Assistant in Faculty Relations (UBCV) and, as appropriate, the Manager of Employee Relations (UBCO) will arrange for one member from both SAC and the Dean's Advisory Committee to join the Head and the departmental standing committee. The SAC Chair will be consulted on the selection of the SAC representative in order to ensure an equitable number of requests to each SAC member. The departmental standing committee, with the SAC member and the member from the Dean's Advisory Committee, will review the candidate's file. The SAC member will recuse him or herself from the meeting prior to a vote being taken, and will submit a separate recommendation letter to

the President. The letter from the SAC representative is forwarded directly to the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations (UBCV) and added to the file (dossier) when it goes to the President. The voting majority will form the recommendation of the departmental standing committee. The Head confirms the decision in a letter of recommendation. The letter from the Head is placed in the candidate's dossier and forwarded to the Dean. The Head's letter should document the positive and negative votes and the reasons for both. Note that the voting at this meeting will be the only set of votes for the case in question. Neither the full Dean's Advisory Committee nor the SAC will meet or vote on the case.

- 8.6 The Dean should review the candidate's dossier, including the recommendation from the Head, and make her or his own recommendation. The Dean shall have their recommendation added to the candidate's dossier and forwarded to the President through the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations.
- 8.7 Upon review of the entire file, the President will confirm or deny the recommendation and inform the candidate of her or his decision in writing with copies to the Dean and Head.

9 JOINT APPOINTMENTS

- 9.1 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).
- 9.2 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.
- 9.3 Letters from all academic units in which the person holds an appointment must be included in the dossier.
- 9.4 For more information about what is required of a joint appointment, please review **Joint Appointments** on the Faculty Relations' website.

10 INFORMATION ABOUT THE SENIOR APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

10.1 Composition

- 10.1.1 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, Professor, Senior Instructor and Professor of Teaching. SAC does not review recommendations for appointment or reappointment to the rank of Assistant Professor or Instructor.
- 10.1.2 SAC consists of 20 Professors appointed by the President. A typical term for membership on SAC is three years.
- 10.1.3 Each year, the membership of SAC will be reviewed by the Provosts 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 Provosts and the Deans to ensure equitable representation of women and visible minorities, as well as of disciplines at both the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses. At least ten percent of the members will hold appointments from UBC Okanagan.

10.2 Membership of SAC for 2016/17

1. Lesley Andres, Faculty of Education
2. Heinz Bauschke, Irving K. Barber School of Arts and Sciences (UBCO)
3. Mary Berbee, Faculty of Science
4. Thomas Chang, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
5. Stephen Chatman, Faculty of Arts
6. Margery Fee, Faculty of Arts
7. Margot Filipenko, Faculty of Education
8. Adlai Fisher, Sauder School of Business
9. Robert Guy, Faculty of Forestry
10. Murray Isman, Faculty of Land and Food Systems
11. Arminee Kazanijian, Faculty of Medicine
12. Philippe Krutchen, Faculty of Applied Science
13. Deborah Roberts, Faculty of Applied Science (UBCO)
14. Mark Schaller, Faculty of Arts
15. Reza Vaziri, Faculty of Applied Science
16. Steven Vincent, Faculty of Medicine
17. Will Welch, Faculty of Science
18. Edwin Yen, Faculty of Dentistry
19. Margot Young, Peter A. Allard School of Law*
20. TBD, Faculty of Arts
21. TBD, Faculty of Medicine

Mark Schaller from the Faculty of Arts at UBC is the Chair of SAC.

*Faculty Association Representative

10.3 Criteria for Evaluation of the Candidate's File

- 10.3.1 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, in the case of professorial stream candidates, teaching, research, and service; and in the case of Educational Leadership stream candidates, teaching, educational leadership and service to the University, to the discipline, and to the broader community.
- 10.3.2 Such deliberations will incorporate a consideration of relevant general criteria of scholarship and scholarly teaching and education leadership excellence, as appropriate to the stream, particularly as these are identified and defined by the reviewers, in prior reviews by the Department and Faculty Committee, and by the Dean of the Faculty as set out in her or his letter of recommendation and if required, in her or his presentation(s) to SAC during its meetings.

10.3.3 In evaluating a candidate's scholarship, teaching and educational leadership contributions, as appropriate to the stream, SAC will accept and consider comparative information on the relative merits of the candidate's achievements within the disciplinary or interdisciplinary background of the candidate.

10.3.4 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.

Note: See **SAC's Procedures** (Appendix 12).

10.4 Schedule of SAC Meetings for 2016/17

Date of Meeting	Time	Submission Deadline	Time
2016			
Friday, September 16	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, September 14	12:00 pm
Friday, September 30	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, September 28	12:00 pm
Friday, October 14	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, October 12	12:00 pm
Friday, October 28	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, October 26	12:00 pm
Friday, November 25	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, November 23	12:00 pm
Friday, December 9	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, December 7	12:00 pm
2017			
Friday, January 6	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, January 4	12:00 pm
Friday, January 20	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, January 18	12:00 pm
Friday, February 3	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, February 1	12:00 pm
Friday, February 17	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, February 15	12:00 pm
Friday, March 4	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, March 2	12:00 pm
Friday, March 17	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, March 15	12:00 pm
Friday, April 14	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, April 12	12:00 pm
Friday, April 28	2:00 – 5:00 pm	Wednesday, April 19	12:00 pm
Friday, May 12	2:00 – 5:00 pm		12:00 pm
Friday, May 26	2:00 – 5:00 pm		12:00 pm
Friday, June 9	2:00 – 5:00 pm		12:00 pm
Friday, June 23	2:00 – 5:00 pm		12:00 pm

Note 1: SAC sub-committees typically meet on the Fridays alternating with full SAC meetings.

Note 2: See **Appendix 12** for SAC's procedures on voting during the summer months or when meetings are cancelled.

Note 3: The last submission deadline for consideration in 2016/2017 year is Wednesday, April **19 2017**.

11 INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

11.1 Procedures for the President's Decision

11.1.1 In his or her deliberations, the President may only consult or request further information from the Senior Appointments Committee, the Dean, the Provost or the Deputy Vice Chancellor regarding the decision she or he proposes to make. If the Provost or Deputy Vice Chancellor raise any new negative information or serious concerns are introducing during the consultation, the candidate shall be informed in writing and given an opportunity to respond in writing prior to the President making his or her decision (See Article 5.14(c) of the Agreement).

11.1.2 Except in the case of initial appointments, the President will inform the candidate in writing of her or his decision with a copy to the Faculty Association.

11.1.3 If the decision of the President is negative, the President will provide detailed and specific reasons in writing to the candidate, including the respects in which she or he has failed to meet the applicable criteria, and send a copy to the Faculty Association. The final decision of the President, along with reasons, will also be communicated to SAC and the departmental standing committee if the President's decision is different from the committee in question. If the decision of the President is positive, the appointment, reappointment, tenure or promotion shall take effect on July 1 following the calendar year in which the review or appointment was initiated.

11.1.4 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.

11.2 Appeal of the President's Decision

11.2.1 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. Please note that the decision must have emanated from a periodic review and not a non-periodic review. A decision may be appealed on the grounds that there were procedural errors in the process that may have resulted in a wrong decision or that the decision was unreasonable.

However, as per Article 2.03(f)(iii) of the Agreement, during the pre-tenure period an Assistant Professor who has been reviewed for but denied promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in a decision made by the President has the right of appeal **This right of appeal following a non-periodic review only applies in the case that the non-periodic review makes it to the level of the President and is not stopped earlier by either the Department Head or the Dean.**

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.

12 CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE

Campus	Name	Office	Phone Number	Email
UBCV	Mark Trowell	Faculty Relations	604-822-9725	mark.trowell@ubc.ca
UBCO	George Athans	Human Resources	250-807-8622	george.athans@ubc.ca
UBCV	SAC Assistants	Faculty Relations		fr.sacassistants@ubc.ca

APPENDIX 1 – GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OF TEACHING AND SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Effective July 1, 2011, the rank of Professor of Teaching has been introduced into the Educational Leadership stream. This rank reflects the commitment of the University to recognize and reward educational leadership and outstanding teaching. The rank is relatively new and while the criteria are in place, there has not been a long history of interpreting and applying those criteria. These guidelines are provided to offer assistance in helping faculty and academic units anticipate what is expected of the new rank, both in terms of meeting the criteria and understanding the procedures for review for promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching. **The guidelines are suggestive in nature and not intended to be exhaustive or directive.** Evidence and interpretation of the criteria for promotion will vary, depending on the discipline and the Faculty. Candidates are responsible for preparing their own teaching dossiers accordingly. The candidate's Head or Summative Peer Review Committee will then provide an independent assessment of teaching and leadership, to be added to the candidate's dossier (Appendix 2). It is anticipated that the expectations for this new rank will evolve and develop as cases come forward and are considered.

1. Introduction

The rank of Professor of Teaching is the highest academic rank for the Educational Leadership stream (which includes Instructors and Senior Instructors), and it is designed to mirror the position of Professor, which is the highest academic rank for the research stream (which includes Assistant Professors and Associate Professors). In both cases, outstanding achievement is required.

Specifically, appointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching requires:

... evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, distinction in the field of teaching and learning, sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, course design and other initiatives that advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandate. Initial appointments at this rank are normally tenured appointments (Article 3.05 of the *Agreement on Condition of Appointment for Faculty*) (the "Agreement").¹

Candidates will also be assessed on their service to the academic profession, the Department, the University and the community (Articles 4.01 and 4.04 of the Agreement).

The rank signifies a level of excellence that goes beyond the normal requirements of excellent teaching. It is intended for individuals whose outstanding accomplishments in teaching and educational innovation have impact beyond their classrooms, improving students' learning environments at UBC and beyond. The Professor of Teaching rank does not require achievement in the scholarship of teaching and learning (which is recognized as a form of research within the Professorial stream) but scholarly teaching (i.e., teaching informed by research /scholarship of teaching and learning) is expected of this rank. Although not required,

¹ www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/collective-agreements/.

contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning can serve as evidence of educational leadership and/or teaching excellence. Traditional scholarship in areas other than teaching and learning is not considered evidence of educational leadership and/or teaching excellence. Such contributions do not weigh negatively in consideration of a candidate's dossier, but it is anticipated that where significant time and effort is spent on research by a candidate in this stream, it will be focused primarily on teaching and learning in order for the candidate to meet the criteria for excellence in educational leadership.

Similarly, appointment at or promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor requires evidence of excellence in teaching, demonstrated educational leadership, involvement in curriculum development and innovation, and other teaching and learning initiatives. It is expected that Senior Instructors will keep abreast of current developments in their respective disciplines, and in the field of teaching and learning.

2. Eligibility

Senior Instructors are eligible for a periodic review for promotion to Professor of Teaching beginning in the fifth year of appointment at or promotion to this rank (Article 9.01(c) of the Agreement). Candidates may request to be reviewed for promotion earlier than five years in the rank of Senior Instructor, (i.e. a non-periodic review) with the approval of the Head and the Dean. The case will be reviewed on the candidate's (1) achievements in teaching, learning and educational leadership and (2) service to the academic profession, the Department, the University and the community.

An Instructor I who is in the fifth year of appointment shall be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor and if successful shall be granted tenure in that year (Article 3.02 of the Agreement).

3. Timeline and Process for Promotion within the Educational Leadership Stream

a. Article 5.02 of the Agreement requires that the promotion review begins with the Head's meeting with the candidate, no later than June 30 of the academic year preceding the year of review.

b. The Head schedules summative peer reviews to take place before the end of the academic semester preceding the review for promotion. The Head will appoint members to a committee for a Summative Peer Review of Teaching, if this is the standard practice in the Department or Unit.

c. Candidates must supply the necessary documentation to the Head, no later than September 15th of the review year. The documentation will include:

- i) A *curriculum vitae* in the UBC format as outlined in the **Annotated CV in the Educational Leadership Stream** (Appendix 4).
- ii) A dossier of materials demonstrating educational leadership, teaching distinction and curriculum development, maintaining currency in the field, and service. For further information regarding the file, see item 4 below.

- iii) For promotion to Professor of Teaching, a list of at least four potential (arm's length) referees. At least two of the candidate's referees should be external to UBC and the remaining should be external to his/her unit.
- iv) For promotion to Senior Instructor, a list of at least four potential (arm's length) referees. In the case of promotion to Senior Instructor, letters of appraisal do not need to be from external referees.

d. The Department Head consults with the Departmental Standing Committee and selects at least two referees from the candidate's list to provide letters of appraisal regarding the candidate's accomplishments.

e. The case will proceed through the promotion process as set out in Article 5 of the Agreement (see also the Guide for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC²).

4. Candidate's File

The candidate will supply a file to the Head that demonstrates and profiles their record of educational leadership and teaching. Candidates for Professor of Teaching will provide evidence of distinction in these areas. The file should also document service contributions and provide evidence of maintaining currency in the discipline and in the field of teaching and learning. Depending on the practice of the Department and Faculty, the complete file will be considered by the candidate's department, Faculty, and external referees.

At a minimum, the file to be used by SAC for both promotion to Senior Instructor or Professor of Teaching must include³:

(1) Evidence of Educational Leadership.

Definition of Educational Leadership: Activity taken at UBC and elsewhere to advance innovation in teaching and learning. The impact of the innovations must reach beyond the classrooms of the instructor. Contributions beyond excellent teaching with impact beyond one's own classroom are required for promotion.

To document educational leadership in the CV and dossier, consideration should be given to including materials that:

- Summarize leadership contributions and their impact, offering examples of leadership taken at UBC and elsewhere to advance innovation and excellence in teaching.
- Are examples of sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, curriculum renewal, course design, pedagogical innovation and other initiatives that extend beyond the candidate's classroom and advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandates.

² <http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/files/SAC-Guide.pdf>

³ Much of this list has been taken from the Guidelines for Promotion to Professor of Pedagogy, Practice, or Performance, developed by Emory University, January 22, 2009, revised May 2010.

The following list, which is not exhaustive, includes points that candidates may develop, where applicable, to document educational leadership:

- Innovation and enhancements to teaching, learning and assessment that has impact beyond the candidate's classroom, department, discipline and / or institution as appropriate.
- Significant contributions to curriculum development and renewal
- Activities to advance interdisciplinary, inter-professional and inter-institutional collaborations in teaching and learning.
- Application of / engagement with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
- Contributions to the practice and theory of teaching and learning literature, including publications in peer-reviewed and professional journals, conference publications, book chapters, textbooks and open education repositories / resources
- Organization of, and contributions to conferences, programs, symposia, colloquia, workshop and other teaching and learning events, to a local, provincial, national and international audience, as appropriate.
- Securing funding / additional resources for teaching and learning innovation or enhancements, and leading the implementation of funded initiatives or activities.
- Recognition and distinction in the form of awards, fellowships and other recognition for teaching and learning related activities (internal to UBC and beyond).
- Capacity building for excellence in education, including mentoring and inspiration of colleagues, supervision of undergraduate research projects in discipline-based pedagogies.
- Activities undertaken as part of formal educational leadership responsibilities within the candidate's Department / School / Program area / Faculty / UBC.

(2) *Evidence of outstanding and innovative achievement in the field of teaching and learning.* Evidence that supports reflective teaching and learning practices, creating awareness, facilitating discourse, and encouraging collegial and community commitment to teaching and learning will be useful. Also useful will be evidence demonstrating that the candidate is able to work individually and collaboratively to enhance teaching and learning within their unit/the University and perhaps through larger collaborative initiatives.

The teaching dossier should include the following:

- Reflective statement regarding the candidate's teaching accomplishments.
- List of courses taught.
- Information on courses, pedagogies, and course content (including samples of course outlines/assignments, etc.).

The following list, which is again not exhaustive, includes points that candidates may develop, where applicable, to document outstanding teaching:

- Development of new and innovative approaches to education.
- Work on interdisciplinary courses.
- Mentoring of students, including supervising honors theses, internships, etc.
- Participation in the pedagogical training of other faculty and graduate students.
- Contributions to course design.
- Examples of syllabi, lectures or presentations.
- Evidence of professional development in teaching.

- Teaching recognition and/or awards received, or nominations for such awards.
- Informal advising time with students, and its evaluation.
- Additional information related to student evaluations of teaching. (*Although the candidate has the right to add all the student comments to the dossier, providing they were obtained through formal procedures (Article 4.02 of the Agreement), an alternative that produces a more reasonable file size is to request that the Head or the Summative Peer Review of Teaching Committee select representative comments for inclusion in the dossier (Appendix 2). The candidate may not select from among the comments for inclusion.*)

(3) *Service*

- Service to the academic profession, the Department, the University and the community.

In addition to the material supplied by the candidate, as listed above, each candidate's file should include a summative assessment prepared by the candidate's Head or by the chair of a summative peer review committee (Appendix 2).

APPENDIX 2 – TEACHING EVIDENCE – SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING FOR REVIEW BY SAC AND THE PRESIDENT

All recommendations for initial appointments, promotion, or tenure should be supported by enough evidence detailing the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching 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. In the case of Professors of Teaching, the higher standard of outstanding achievement in teaching, which includes the development of the learning environment, is required. For Associate Professors the standard is successful teaching, beyond that expected of an Assistant Professor, as well as the ability to direct graduate students. Professors are expected to have shown high quality teaching to an appropriate standard of excellence.

For guidelines for cases for promotion in the **Educational Leadership stream**, see **Guidelines for Promotion to Professor of Teaching and Senior Instructor** (Appendix 1).

For candidates in either the **Teaching or Professoriate stream**, the complete teaching dossier is often important in assessment for promotion and tenure by the candidate's Department, School or Faculty, and by the external referees. However, the complete dossier is less useful to Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) members, who lack discipline specific expertise, and knowledge of each academic unit's standards and expectations with respect to teaching. Full teaching dossiers **should not** be forwarded to SAC. However, for cases in the **Educational Leadership stream** involving reviews for promotion (with tenure) to the rank of Senior Instructor or promotion to Professor of Teaching, where more evidence is required in order to demonstrate the candidate has met the requisite standard of excellence or outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership the full teaching dossier, less the following material, can be submitted to SAC:

- Course outlines/syllabi;
- Assignments and handouts; and/or
- Full sets of students evaluations.

In addition, SAC requests that each candidate's file include a summative assessment of the teaching dossier (**normally completed by the Chair of the Summative Peer Review of Teaching Committee or Head**). Length is usually 4-5 pages of text; tables or charts and separate peer review letters may require additional pages. The assessment may be **included as a separate document or as part of the Head's letter of recommendation**. The assessment should include the information outlined in the following template. Acceptable formats vary and if the template format is problematic, alternative approaches are acceptable as long as appropriate information is provided in a logical order. Note, commentary and suggestions are italicized in the template.

Template for a Summative Review of Teaching

1. Description of the procedure.

- *An explanation of how the teaching review is carried out.*

2. Description of candidate's teaching responsibilities.

This should include:

- *A quantitative summary of the amount of teaching of all kinds performed by the candidate at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels.*
- *A statement comparing the amount of teaching to the expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty.*
- *An explanatory statement or comment if the amount of teaching in one or more particular areas does not meet the expected norms.*

3. Summary of student evaluations of teaching. (Note *Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching, approved by Senate May 16 2007*)

- Explanation of scale used in evaluation questionnaires. E.g. ratings from 1-5, 5 is 'excellent'.*
- Explanation of departmental norms. Specify how the norms are calculated. They may be, for example, averages for all classes at the same level taught over the same time period. Standard deviations may be provided, if so desired.*
- Table of student scores evaluating overall instructor effectiveness (e.g. Q6 of the on-line student evaluations at UBCV or Q20 at UBCO equivalent). The table should provide scores; if possible, for all course offerings in which the candidate teaches together with appropriate norms for those courses or level formats of instruction. If a questionnaire other than the standard UBCV or UBCO questionnaire is used, please provide a blank copy of the questionnaire.*

Example: Table of student scores evaluating overall effectiveness

Course	Year	Term	Class size	# of responses	'Effectiveness score' of instructor	Mean 'effectiveness' score for similar courses in the department

- Scores in addition to 'overall effectiveness.' If student evaluations scores from questions other than 'overall effectiveness' provide particularly useful evidence about the candidate's teaching record, organize the information in additional tables. List the questions asked of students on the evaluation form and list the instructor's scores, along with departmental norms for each question.*

- e. A summary of student comments for each course may be presented. *The candidate has the right to add all the student comments to the file providing they were obtained through formal procedures (Article 4.02 of the Agreement). If selected comments are to be presented, they should be chosen by the Head or the committee rather than by the candidate. Selected comments should represent the full range of student opinion across courses taught, as illustrated in the examples that follow.*

Examples of Summaries of Qualitative Comments from SEoT/TEQ

Representative Student Comments

COURSE 101 (2015 W)

Professor X encouraged students to really understand where things came from rather than just showing formulas.

Was always willing to offer help outside of class.

COURSE 222 (2015 W)

Professor X presented the material very clearly and made sure that everyone understood.

I wish that Professor X spoke louder.

COURSE 101 (2014 W)

Professor X made the material really interesting, but I got confused when he made an error and had to back track.

Professor X was the best teacher I had this term.

Assessment of Student Evaluations

Overall, the comments reveal that students appreciated the clarity with which Professor X presented the material. They commented especially on how the examples made the material more relevant. The main negative comment, especially from large first year classes, was that students had difficulty hearing. Upper-level students found the classes demanding, but stated that they felt that the tests and assignments were fair.

4. Optional: Graphical view of the candidate's scores compared with other scores of other instructor/classes. As long as other instructors cannot be identified, a chart can be a useful way of showing trends and variation across courses and instructors.
5. Description of contributions to educational leadership (*Required for candidates in the educational leadership stream, and optional for candidates in the professoriate stream. See Appendix 1 and Article 3.05 of the Agreement*).
6. Description of contributions to graduate or professional training.
(*Article 3.07(a) of the Agreement - For candidates in the professoriate stream and optional for candidates in the educational leadership stream.*)

This should include, as appropriate, evidence of 'ability to direct graduate students' as shown by:

- *Supervised students' degree completion, publications, research awards, and subsequent professional success.*
- *Teaching of graduate courses.*
- *The quality and quantity of graduate student mentoring compared to the expected norms in the Department, School or Faculty.*

7. Highlights from summative peer evaluations.

This should include:

- *A minimum of one recent summative report (consisting of at least two assessors' assessments) OR a minimum of two recent summative reviews obtained through formal departmental processes. Deviations from these norms should be explained in the Head's letter.*
- *A statement comparing assessments of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels to the expected norms of the Department, School or Faculty.*
- *A comment or explanatory statement if the candidate's peer evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the expected standards.*
- *For information about summative peer evaluations, see the **Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology**.*

8. Qualitative evidence regarding the candidate's effectiveness and the importance of candidate's educational activities to the Department, School or Faculty.

This may include:

- *A summary of the candidate's quantitative teaching evaluation scores and student comments, relative to the norms of the Department, School or Faculty.*
- *A summary of any other evidence that bears upon the effectiveness or quality of the candidate's teaching, e.g. national professional accreditation of a training program the candidate directs or recognition by a scholarly society of the candidate's educational contributions to the field.*
- *A list and brief description of any special or remedial efforts undertaken by the candidate to improve teaching performance.*
- *A list and brief description of any awards or other recognition of teaching excellence the candidate has received.*

9. Concluding statement that relates the candidate's overall teaching record to the relevant criteria for promotion or tenure from *Articles 3.04-3.08* of the Agreement.

APPENDIX 3 – ANNOTATED CV FOR THE PROFESSORATE STREAM

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; dollar amounts of grants; specific role in graduates supervised) 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.
- If the formatting of the CV (e.g. tables etc.) is problematic, alternative approaches are acceptable however the content and its order should be consistent. For example, for the Faculty of Medicine, please see the Faculty of Medicine's **Specialized CV Format** available on the Faculty of Medicine's website
- Avoid subjective and self-evaluative 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 especially where such statements affect the way student or peer evaluations could be interpreted (statements exceeding 150 words will not be considered by SAC).

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

Session	Course Number	Total Scheduled Hours per term	Class Size	Total Hours Taught per Course			
				Lectures	Tutorials	Labs	Other

Notes:

- Entries should be in chronological order by academic year and term (2007-T1, 2007-T2, 2008-T1, 2008-T2), listing all courses taught each term (even if this means repeating course entries for different terms)
- 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 by date of degree completion
- Graduate students who are no longer "active" (e.g., withdrawn or transferred to another supervisor) 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. It is important to differentiate between research supervision and supervision of a non-research project (e.g. major papers).
- Supervision of Postdoctoral Fellows and residents can be included (or a new section can be created for fellows and residents).

(d) Continuing Education Activities

List activities where you delivered, presented or provided continuing education to professionals in your field.

(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 (statements exceeding 150 words will not be considered).

(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 the total grant.
- In cases of multiple recipients of grants, please indicate your specific role and if necessary, add a footnote to provide additional information. Only research grants that have been received or those applied for in the latest competition (results pending) should be included in this list.

(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 (Identify whether International/National/Local)

(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*

This includes 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 as a separate category.

(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*

Nominations for Awards may also be noted.

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 chronological order in the standard bibliographical form (with first and last page indicated and the order of authorship being clear). Publications that are considered to be of primary importance should be marked with an asterisk.
- Where there is multiple authorship of papers or books, please make your precise role clear. It is recommended that you include a statement of "policy on authorship" that indicates the significance of first author, last author, etc., or might specify the contribution made to each publication
- For co-authored papers, it is helpful to provide a legend that indicates the status and role of other authors, e.g., which co-authors are a candidate's own former supervisors, which publications are with students or postdoctoral fellows.
- While the headers must be maintained, the order can be changed to reflect importance within your 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 4– ANNOTATED CV FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP STREAM

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.
- If the formatting of the CV (e.g. tables etc.) is problematic, alternative approaches are acceptable however the content and its order should be consistent. For example, for the Faculty of Medicine, please see **Medicine’s Specialized CV Format** available on the Faculty of Medicine’s website
- The Publications section is included to be used, if applicable to your record. It is not required in this stream.
- Avoid subjective and self-evaluative 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 UBC:*

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 should provide a concise statement of teaching philosophy or approach to teaching (statements may be up to one page in length).

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

Session	Course Number	Total Scheduled Hours	Class Size	Total Hours Taught per Course			
				Lectures	Tutorials	Labs	Other

Notes:

- List all courses taught each year, including courses where a substantial role was evaluated.
- List courses in chronological order by academic year and term (2007-T1, 2007-T2, 2008-T1, 2008-T2) (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) *Students Supervised (If Applicable)*

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

Note: Entries should be in chronological order of “Finish” date.

(d) *A summary of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness scores over the past five years (or since appointment if less than five years)*

(e) *Continuing Education Activities*

List activities where you delivered, presented or provided continuing education to colleagues or others

(f) *Visiting Lecturer (indicate university/organization and dates)*

(g) *Other*

List other involvements by subheadings (e.g., guest lectures, seminar support, project support).

9. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

(a) *Areas of special interest and accomplishments in educational leadership*

Candidates should provide a concise statement of their unique contributions to educational leadership (statements may be one to two pages in length).

(b) *Curriculum development/renewal*

- (c) *Pedagogical innovation*
- (d) *Applications of and contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning*
- (e) *Teaching and Learning Grants*
- (f) *Formal educational leadership responsibilities*
- (g) *Innovation in the use of learning technology*
- (h) *Other educational leadership contributions*

10. SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- (a) *Areas of special interest and accomplishments*

Candidates may include a concise statement of their contributions to scholarship/professional activities (statements exceeding 150 words will not be considered by SAC).

- (b) *Invited Presentations (Identify whether International/National/Local)*
- (c) *Other Presentations*
- (d) *Other*
- (e) *Conference Participation (Organizer, Abstract Reviewer, Moderator, or Panelist etc.)*

11. SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

- (a) *Areas of special interest and accomplishments*
- (b) *Memberships on committees, including offices held and dates*

Separately list committee membership at the departmental and university level with a brief description of the committee's mandate. Do not include activities already listed in other parts of the CV (for example serving on graduate student supervisory committees).

(c) *Other service, including dates*

12. 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*

13. AWARDS AND DISTINCTIONS

(a) *Awards for Teaching (indicate name of award, awarding organizations, date)*

(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*

Nominations for Awards may also be noted.

14. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION (maximum one page)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Publications Record

If Applicable – not required in the Educational Leadership Stream

SURNAME:

FIRST NAME:

Initials:

MIDDLE NAME(S):

Date:

Notes:

- **Publications should be listed in chronological order in the standard bibliographical form (with first and last page indicated and the order of authorship being clear). Publications that are considered to be of primary importance should be marked with an asterisk.**
- **Where there is multiple authorship of papers or books, please make your precise role clear. It is recommended that you include a statement of "policy on authorship" that indicates the significance of first author, last author, etc., or might specify the contribution made to each publication**
- **For co-authored papers, it is helpful to provide a legend that indicates the status and role of other authors, e.g., which co-authors are a candidate's own former supervisors, which publications are with students or postdoctoral fellows.**
- **While the headers must be maintained, the order can be changed to reflect importance within your 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. **SPECIAL COPYRIGHTS**

5. **ARTISTIC WORKS, PERFORMANCES, DESIGNS**

6. **OTHER WORKS**

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

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

APPENDIX 5 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR PERIODIC REVIEWS ONLY

Note: This letter normally must be sent by the Head between March 1 and May 15 to those entitled to a periodic review in the next year (i.e. July 1 to June 30). If the candidate wishes to proceed with the review, the Head must meet with the candidate no later than June 30 of the year preceding the review.

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 for promotion to [insert rank] at this time, please indicate so at the bottom of this letter and return it to me by [date]. If you choose not to be reviewed at this time, your next periodic review will be in [insert number] years. A non-periodic review of your record may be conducted with the agreement of the Head in any year pursuant to Article 9.01(d) of the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty.

If you wish to be reviewed for promotion, please provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and 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 no later than June 30 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. Final documentation for your review must be provided to me no later than September 15.

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) (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

b) _____
(Name, please print) (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

c) _____
(Name, please print) (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

d) _____
(Name, please print) (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

APPENDIX 6 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 7TH YEAR CASES PERIODIC REVIEW OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TENURE (AND PROMOTION)

Note: This letter must be sent by the Head between March 1 and May 15 to those entitled to a periodic review in the next year (i.e. July 1 to June 30). The Head must meet with the candidate no later than June 30 of the year preceding the review.

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(b). 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]. A non-periodic review of your record may be conducted with the agreement of the Head in any year pursuant to Article 9.01(d) of the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty.

Please provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and 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 no later than June 30 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. Final documentation and your list of possible referees must be provided to me no later than September 15.

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: _____

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). For each referee, please provide full contact information, an explanation of their special expertise and credentials relative to the review, and a description of any prior contact, if any.

APPENDIX 7 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 5TH YEAR CASES PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURE/PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

Note: This letter must be sent by the Head between March 1 and May 15 to those entitled to a periodic review in the next year (i.e. July 1 to June 30). The Head must meet with the candidate no later than June 30 of the year preceding the review.

Dear:

In accordance with Article 9 of the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty, I am pleased to inform you that your mandatory review for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor with tenure will occur during the next year (July 1-June 30).

Please provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and 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 teaching and educational leadership. Please do not contact any potential referees about this process. I will arrange for us to meet no later than June 30 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. Final documentation and your list of possible referees must be provided to me no later than September 15.

Yours sincerely,

Head,

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)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

b) _____ (Name, please print) _____ (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

c) _____ (Name, please print) _____ (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

d) _____ (Name, please print) _____ (Contact Information)

Please provide a rationale for recommending this referee, including the referee's special expertise:

Any prior contact with referee:

APPENDIX 8 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE FOR REVIEW OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY (for Professoriate stream)

1. It is recommended that Heads 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 _____. 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 quality and significance of her or 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 _____. I am writing to ask you to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] scholarly activity with particular emphasis on the quality and significance of her or his scholarly work in this field. 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(s)]

in the evidence made available to you and the context of the UBC Collective Agreement including a specific recommendation for each promotion and tenure decisions when appropriate. [**For a pre-seven year decision for an Assistant Professor regarding promotion to an Associate Professor**, highlight that at UBC a successful decision for promotion would automatically result in both promotion and tenure. A negative decision would mean that final consideration of tenure would be postponed until a subsequent year. **For a seventh year decision for an Assistant Professor regarding promotion and tenure to an Associate Professor**, highlight that at UBC a successful decision for promotion would automatically result in both promotion and tenure. However, if the promotion is unsuccessful, the candidate may still receive tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor. For this reason, it is important to highlight that each referee provide a specific recommendation on each promotion and tenure. **For a seventh year decision for an Assistant Professor or a fifth year decision for an Associate Professor where the tenure clock has been extended**, highlight that the clock has been extended in recognition of a particular leave].

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 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. **For blended cases:** Where there is a blending of two or three types of scholarly activity, use appropriate language for each scholarly activity.]

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 quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly (including professional, and/or creative) achievements. We would be grateful for your candid and specific comments in this regard.

- (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, including the caliber of the respective papers you have reviewed, how do you assess the candidate's contribution as a scholar and researcher in her or his 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 her or his specific area and in her or his subject more generally?**

It is recommended that Heads modify this template if there is discipline-specific wording that may be more appropriate.

- (d) **Apart from her or his 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 her or his subject?**

- (e) **[In a professional or scholarship of teaching file] How is the candidate's discipline (in Canada or internationally) different because of her or his work?**
- (f) **Please add any further comments you think might be useful in assessing the candidate.**

For blended professional or scholarship of teaching and learning cases, please include the following two questions, as relevant:

- (g) **On the basis of the information available to you, how do you assess the candidate's contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning in their discipline?**
- (h) **Please add any further comments you think might be useful in assessing the candidate's scholarly professional contributions.**

It is the policy of the University to treat as confidential letters of reference that 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.

Please note that the enclosed Curriculum Vitae contains personal information about the candidate. Please keep it confidential, store it in a secure location, and destroy it or return it to us after you complete your 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.

I 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 – Article 3.08
 - b. Associate Professor – Article 3.07
 - c. Assistant Professor – Article 3.06 (a)(b)
2. Professional Contributions (if applicable) [attach a copy of Section 3.1 (iii)]
3. Scholarship of Teaching (if applicable) [attach a copy of Section 3.1 (ii)]

4. Samples of the candidate's scholarly work, unless the referee has alternative access to this work
 5. Curriculum Vitae
 6. Full excerpt from the Agreement – Part 4, Articles 3 & 4 (Optional – For further context)
 7. Table of Research Stream Criteria (Optional – For further context)
-

- ¹ 1. Tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor
2. Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor
3. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure
4. Promotion to the rank of Professor
5. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, or tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor
6. (Re)Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor (tenure track)
7. Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure
8. (Re)Appointment to the rank of Professor (tenure track)
9. Appointment to the rank of Professor with tenure

APPENDIX 9 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE FOR REVIEW OF TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP (for Educational Leadership stream)

1. It is recommended that Heads 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 _____. I am writing to ask if you are willing to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] teaching and educational leadership.

Referees are not normally expected to include relatives, close personal friends, clients, or persons with whom [candidate name] has co-taught. 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 teaching dossier 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 _____. I am writing to ask you to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] teaching and educational leadership.

UBC has initiated the new stream of Professor of Teaching. This stream is distinct from the professoriate stream with different criteria relating to excellence in teaching and educational leadership. Evidence of educational leadership in this stream is required and can include, but is not limited to:

- Leadership taken at UBC and elsewhere to advance innovation and excellence in teaching;
- Contributions to curriculum development and renewal (curriculum design/re-design) within the unit/Faculty;
- Pedagogical innovation;
- Applications of and contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning;
- Innovative use of learning technology; and
- Leadership and contribution to teaching and learning initiatives and programs.

Scholarly teaching (i.e. teaching informed by and based on scholarship of teaching, learning, and educational research,) is valued. Scholarship of teaching and learning (i.e. discipline-situated research into effective curriculum and pedagogy to optimize student learning) is not required in this rank although, if present, constitutes evidence of educational leadership and should be considered. Please note that there is no requirement of published scholarly work in this stream.

I would ask that you please make an explicit recommendation concerning **[decision option]**¹, in the context of the UBC Collective Agreement, and based on the evidence made available to you. Please include the following in the final paragraph of your letter: “Based on this evidence, I recommend **[awarding/not awarding tenure] and/or [awarding/not awarding a promotion]**. I have enclosed an excerpt from the Collective Agreement that discusses the criteria for appointment, tenure, and promotion at UBC. I have also enclosed **[candidate’s name]**’s curriculum vitae and teaching dossier.

We would appreciate you providing succinct, candid and specific comments on all aspects of the candidate’s teaching and educational leadership achievements, but particularly on each of the questions below. We hope you will also refer to any other matters you believe will assist in evaluating the candidate. Please comment on:

- a) **[candidate’s name]**’s teaching abilities and activities and whether she or he has provided evidence demonstrating that she or he has met a standard of **[phrase options depending on rank in question]**² in teaching, learning and educational leadership. Please ensure that you consider **[her or his]** role as lecturer as well as curriculum development and other aspects of teaching in the area of undergraduate, graduate, postgraduate, continuing education and/or community outreach.
- b) **[candidate’s name]**’s command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and ability and willingness to teach a range of subject matter at various levels of instruction.
- c) **[candidate’s name]**’s influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. If applicable in the case of exceptional instructors who may be members of the Faculty of Graduate and Post Graduate Studies, please comment on **[her or his]** performance as a graduate student supervisor in terms of the students’ degree completion, publications, research awards, and subsequent professional success.
- d) **(candidate’s name)’s contributions to educational leadership, in a variety of its manifestations, and their value in the enhancement of teaching and learning within the university and beyond.**

- e) Please add any further comments you think might be useful in assessing the candidate's teaching educational leadership and curriculum development.

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.

Please note that the enclosed Curriculum Vitae contains personal information about the candidate. Please keep it confidential, store it in a secure location, and destroy it or return it to us after you complete your assessment.

We rely heavily on these 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 look forward to receiving your letter of assessment by [date].

You can contact our Department Administrator at [number] or by fax at [number].

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Professor and Head

Enclosures

1. Excerpt from the Agreement
 - a. Senior Instructor – Article 3.03
 - b. Professor of Teaching – Article 3.04
2. Criteria for Teaching [attach a copy of Section 3.2 and Appendix 2]
3. Professor of Teaching or Senior Instructor Guidelines (if applicable) [attach a copy of Appendix 1]
4. Definition of Educational Leadership from Appendix 1
5. Candidate's full teaching dossier (Appendix 1)
6. Curriculum Vitae (Appendix 4)
7. Full excerpt from the Agreement – Part 4, Articles 3 & 4 (Optional – For further context)
8. Table of Criteria for Teaching and Educational Leadership Stream (Optional) – For further context)

¹ 1. Appointment to the rank of Senior Instructor with tenure.

2. (Re)Appointment to the rank of Senior Instructor (tenure track)
3. Promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor with tenure.
4. Appointment to the rank of Professor of Teaching with tenure.
5. (Re)Appointment to the rank of Professor of Teaching (tenure track).
6. Promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching.

² 1. *For Senior Instructor*: “excellence”

2. *For Professor of Teaching*: “outstanding achievement”

³ 1. *For Senior Instructor*: “our”

2. *For Professor of Teaching*: use either “our” when referee is from UBC or “your” when referee is external.

APPENDIX 10 – HEAD’S LETTER (SUGGESTED FORMAT)

Dear Dean XXXX:

Re: Consideration of Dr. XXXX for [XXXX]

- Confirm effective date of promotion and/or tenure (e.g. July 1, 2016)
- Clearly indicate Head’s recommendation and the basis for the recommendation.
- Clearly identify a seventh-year tenure consideration
- Clearly identify the effective date of the decision
- If a 7th year tenure case waives the right to a periodic review for promotion, 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, educational leadership expectations (in the Educational Leadership stream), 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 may 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 (not specific names);
- Number present at a meeting;
- Explanation of absences of eligible members; and
- Number of votes for, against, and abstentions (with an explanation of the latter). Unexplained abstentions are usually to be treated as tantamount to a negative vote.

Teaching (for both streams)

See Article 4.02 of the Agreement

- See the guidelines for a summative assessment of the teaching dossier and other appropriate evidence of performance as a university teacher and educator in Appendices 1 and 2. **Summative peer reviews of teaching in all departments must conform to the University Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching**, and depending upon the practice of the Department and/or Faculty, will include a minimum of one recent summative report (consisting of at least two assessors' assessments) OR a minimum of two recent summative reviews obtained through formal departmental processes. Deviations from these norms should be explained in the Head's letter.

Undergraduate Teaching

Graduate Teaching

Graduate Student Supervision

Please describe discipline norms and expectations for graduate supervision as well as the types of evidence appropriate for the discipline.

Scholarly Activity (for the Professoriate stream)

- See Article 4.03 of the Agreement.
- See Sections 3.1.1 – 3.1.5.
- Where a candidate's scholarly activities involve more than one area (traditional publications, scholarship of teaching, professional contributions) clearly identify if this is a blended case.
- If so, ensure that appropriate 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.
- Highlight any linkage between context considered and the level of scholarly activity

Traditional Publications

- See Section 3.1.6.
- 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.
- Address publishing norms in the field (e.g. refereed journals, conference proceedings, quantity, quality, monograph, co-authorship).

Scholarship of Teaching

- See Article 4.03(a) of the Agreement
- See Sections 3.1.7 – 3.1.12.

Professional Contributions

- See Article 4.03(b) of the Agreement
- See Sections 3.1.13 – 3.1.22.

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 her or his 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.

Educational Leadership (for the Educational Leadership stream)

- See Article 4.04 of the Agreement.
- See Section 3.4.

Service to the University and the Community (for both streams)

- See Article 4.05 of the Agreement.
- See Section 3.3.

Relevant Contextual Factors

- See Article 5.14(f) in the Agreement
- See Section 5.5.1.

Closing Paragraph

Sincerely,

xxxx
Professor and Head

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

APPENDIX 11 – SAC COVER SHEET

Faculty Relations Case # _____

Faculty Case # _____

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"/> Professor of Teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Instructor <input type="checkbox"/>

PROMOTION TO: Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Professor of Teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Instructor <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"/>

3)

Periodic Review? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Seventh (7 th) Year Mandatory Tenure Review <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Review for Senior Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Effective date _____

Revised August 2013

APPENDIX 12 – SAC’S PROCEDURES

1. Subcommittees

There are two Subcommittees, with two co-chairs for each, which 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.
- Subcommittees will meet individually in the weeks alternating with full SAC meetings. 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. Subcommittee meetings can be cancelled if all members give all files under consideration a pre-ranking of ‘A’.
- If the subcommittee finds that the file is missing information, they can request the additional information be provided before they classify the case as “A” or “B”. In this case, the classification is deferred.
- Subcommittees should classify cases as “A” or “B”. A case is automatically rated “B” if there is a negative recommendation from the head or 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 SAC 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 the case, but may just mean that discussion by the full Committee, for a variety of possible reasons, is warranted.
- After being reviewed by the Chair, the subcommittee co-chair will convey to the Dean through the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations, the specific questions of the Subcommittee regarding the case.
- In the absence of questions being raised by 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”.

3. Expedited process

- At the start of the year, the regular process will be used, with each sub-committee thoroughly reviewing all the files assigned to them. This will allow new members to learn about disciplinary norms and give them an opportunity to participate in the discussions, review and ranking with more seasoned SAC members.
- Beginning about early February, when the load starts to become heavier, expedited review will be implemented. Cases will continue to be distributed between the sub-committees. Each pair of co-chairs will take responsibility to preview the files. Automatic "B" cases, any cases with a negative recommendation at the Department/Unit or DACOPAT level, and any cases with a substantial number of negative votes by the Departmental Standing Committee or Dean’s Advisory Committee will be automatically assigned to the respective sub-committee for review. Other files will reviewed to ensure positive and appropriate referee recommendations and the absence of procedural errors.
- If the two co-chairs agree, strong cases with positive recommendations from the Head and Dean and no flags or procedural issues will be sent directly to the President. Cases with potential procedural errors will be sent to the SAC Chair to follow up with FR and/or the Faculties. Cases with missing information will be deferred and reassessed by the co-chairs in question when the necessary information has been received. A decision will then be made by the co-chairs as to whether the case should be forwarded to the President or sent to a sub-committee for closer review and ranking. In cases where a co-chair feels that a file would benefit from further discussion by the whole sub-committee, an attempt will be made to inform sub-committee members of these files by the Tuesday immediately prior to the sub-committee meeting. Those files will be given an “A” or “B” rating by the subcommittee and then voted on by SAC at a subsequent meeting.
- The President has the prerogative to send any of the expedited cases back to SAC if she/he feels that she/he would like to have a case reviewed by the whole of SAC.
- Cases will continue to be made available on the SAC website for all SAC members to view until such time as the President makes her or his decision. Co-chairs will flag particularly strong and/or unique cases from the various Faculties (good examples of blended cases; good examples of cases of interdisciplinary and/or community engaged scholarship; very strong Professor of Teaching files, etc.).

4. Agenda

- There is an agenda for each meeting of SAC, which is prepared by the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations.
- Normally rank and tenure for such cases are considered together.
- It is the responsibility of the subcommittee chairs to inform the SAC Assistants 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 SAC Assistants must also be provided with the questions to be sent to a Dean in “B” cases.
- By the Monday morning after the subcommittee meeting, the co-chairs shall notify the SAC Assistants and the SAC Chair of cases that they have ranked "A" and that are ready for voting 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. Separate votes will always be taken for promotion and tenure in appointment cases where the recommendation is for a tenured appointment.
- “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.

5. UBCO representation for UBCO cases

- Consideration of “B” cases involving UBCO faculty members requires the presence (either in person 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.

6. Introduction of supplemental information

- **Supplemental information from the Dean prior to the SAC meeting must be submitted in advance and no later than three hours prior to the SAC meeting, through the SAC Assistants.** Such written material should be limited to information that updates the file, information that has been requested by a SAC subcommittee, or additional information obtained through consultation with the Head which may assist in responding to questions and concerns raised by the

committee. In addition, both the candidate and the University have the right to supplement the file with relevant information, as described in Article 5.03 of the Agreement. Any supplementary information from the candidate should be sent to the Dean, who should then forward it to the assistant to SAC in Faculty Relations no later than three hours prior to the SAC meeting.

- Members of SAC with discipline-related expertise in a case may provide simple, factual information in response to specific questions, such as "This journal is peer reviewed" or "This is a top press in the field". Such members should not introduce personal opinions or provide academic judgment expected of disciplinary colleagues or referees. SAC may request expertise from these members in the form of normative comparisons (i.e. typical practices within a discipline or department) but should avoid making individual comparisons).
- The Chair should remind members to disregard information that has been introduced but that does not adhere to these principles.

7. 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.

8. 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 the 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 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, apart from a brief in camera discussion after the Dean has withdrawn to determine whether SAC requires further information or to clarify procedural issues.
- 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 advisory and confidential. Others, including the candidate and members of the Faculty and Departmental committees, should *not* be informed of the SAC recommendation or vote.

9. The role of SAC members at full SAC meetings

- SAC members may ask questions to clarify the Dean's responses to questions about her or his 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 Introduction of Supplemental Information in Section 6).

10. Voting

- Quorum: The quorum is 60% of committee members.
- The Chair does not vote.
- Members of SAC are usually expected to refrain from participating in or voting on a case at the Department or Faculty level. If a member has voted at a previous level (Department or Faculty), she/he may attend but not cast a vote nor participate in the deliberations at the SAC level.
- Members who have a conflict of interest in a case (e.g., co-author, grant co-holder, close personal friend) may attend but should abstain from voting or participating in the deliberations at the SAC level. In the case of a spouse; family member; or another close, personal relationship, members should not attend the meetings nor participate in any way in that case, including viewing the documentation.
- All questions are put in the affirmative.
- Committee recommendations are determined by a simple majority (>50%). Therefore, a tie vote is a negative recommendation.
- 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. SAC will always take separate votes on promotion and tenure (when recommended) for new appointments, whether or not the vote for appointment at the rank in questions 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 in the fall.

- When a meeting is cancelled, voting on "A" cases may take place by email.

11. Reconsideration

- At the discretion of the Dean, SAC will 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.

12. 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; and
- 3) Robert's Rules of Order.

The SAC Chair is expected to do the following:

- 1) Subcommittees:
 - Appoint subcommittee chairs
 - Appoint SAC members to subcommittees, assuring appropriate balance with respect to disciplines and other factors of importance (UBCO, gender equity, etc.)
 - Be a reference point for the subcommittee chairs and other committee members regarding relevant policies and procedures
 - Vet any questions arising from the subcommittees prior to asking the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations to send the questions to the Deans
 - Meet with the subcommittee chairs half an hour before each SAC meeting if there are any matters to discuss
- 2) Maintain communication with and oversight of subcommittees to make certain that they function effectively and use similar standards in making their assessments.
- 3) Consultation & Communication:
 - Consult with the SAC Assistants in Faculty Relations as necessary regarding scheduling of meetings and scheduling of time for Deans
 - Communicate the results of the votes for each meeting to the President following a prescribed format. For B cases discussed and voted on at SAC,

prepare objective/factual notes for the President, remembering that these notes will form part of the file in the event of an appeal

- Consult with Faculty Relations, as required, on procedural matters.
- 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.

4) Service to the University:

- Be available to speak at a variety of workshops/panels on tenure and promotion matters
- Review and revise presentation materials as necessary (as provided by the previous Chair)
- Assist with revisions of the Guide to review promotion and tenure processes at UBC.

13. 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. Paper copies of files that have been voted on by SAC and are no longer needed should be left after meetings of SAC to be destroyed and electronic files should be deleted. 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.

14. 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.

15. Communication with the President

- The Chair of SAC, on behalf of the full committee, provides a written summary of the votes to the President, along with a recommendation on each case and notes on the substantive 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 SAC Assistants 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 13 – 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**.

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 in a decision made by the President has the right of appeal

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

3.02 Instructor

Appointment to this rank normally requires completion of academic qualifications, evidence of ability and commitment to teaching and promise of educational leadership. Appointments and reappointments are normally made for two years but in exceptional circumstances may be made for a lesser period. An Instructor who is in the fifth year of appointment shall be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor and if successful shall be granted tenure in that year.

3.03 Senior Instructor

Appointment at or promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor requires evidence of excellence in teaching, demonstrated educational leadership, involvement in curriculum development and innovation, and other teaching and learning initiatives. It is expected that Senior Instructors will keep abreast of current developments in their respective disciplines, and in the field of teaching and learning. A Senior Instructor may be promoted to the rank of Professor of Teaching in the fifth or subsequent years in rank.

3.04 Professor of Teaching

Appointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching requires evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, distinction in the field of teaching and learning, sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, course design and other initiatives that advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandate. Initial appointments at this rank are normally tenured appointments.

3.05 Acting Assistant Professor

Appointment to this rank requires evidence of potential ability in teaching and research. Appointment is for a maximum of two years. Upon completion of a terminal degree, the person's rank shall be covered to Assistant Professor. A person will not be reappointed as an Acting Assistant Professor. The pre-tenure period begins at the start of appointment as Acting Assistant Professor.

3.06 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.

3.07 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.

3.08 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 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 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

Judgment 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.

When assessing scholarship for career decisions, consideration will be given to different pathways to academic and scholarly excellence. Diverse substantive contributions to knowledge and methods of dissemination, as recognized with the field of inquiry, are valued.

- 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 Educational Leadership

a) Educational leadership is activity taken at UBC and elsewhere to advance innovation in teaching and learning with impact beyond one's classroom. Educational leadership includes but is not limited to such things as:

- application of and/or active engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning;
- Significant contributions to curriculum development, curriculum renewal, course design, new assessment models, pedagogical innovation and other initiatives that extend beyond the member's classroom and advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandates;
- teaching, mentorship and inspiration of colleagues;
- formal educational leadership responsibility within Department/Program/Faculty;
- organization of and contributions to conferences, programs, symposia, workshops and other educational events on teaching and learning locally, nationally and internationally;
- contributions to the theory and practice of teaching and learning, including publications such as textbooks, print and electronic publications, book chapters, articles in peer-reviewed and professional journals, conference proceedings, software, training guidelines, instructional manuals or other resources; and
- other activities that support evidence-based educational excellence, leadership and impact within and beyond the University.

b) Judgment of educational leadership is based mainly on the quality and significance of the individual's contributions.

4.05 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, Acting Assistant Professor, 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) No later than June 30 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. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and other relevant information for the review of the Head, prior to the meeting.
- b) The purpose of the meeting is to identify any potential difficulties with the candidature, to assist the candidate with any concerns, and to discuss:
 - i) the timing of the next review
 - ii) the criteria and expectations of the next review, including how teaching, scholarly activity and service will be assessed;
 - iii) the faculty member's record including their successes, any potential difficulties and how concerns may be addressed; and
 - iv) where relevant, the information and documents required for the review to proceed.
- 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 must be recorded in a memorandum prepared by the Head and agreed to by the candidate. Although the candidate and the Head must agree on what was discussed, they may or may not agree on the evaluations or advice provided.

5.03 Candidate's File for Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure

- a) Initial file

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the file that is to be reviewed no later than September 15, unless otherwise agreed by the Head.

- b) Supplementing File

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, all tenured and tenure-track members of the department
- 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 the duration of this Collective Agreement, Article 5.04(b)(ii) and 5.04(b)(iii) do not apply as per Letter of Understanding #1 ...

- 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.
- c) The Head may decide to stop the process of a non-periodic review. In such cases, the Head will provide detailed and specific reasons to the Candidate in writing including in which respects he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Such a recommendation is not subject to Appeal as set out in Article 13.

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 professor and professors of teaching, 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 and professors of teaching 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.
- c) The Dean may decide to stop the process of a non-periodic review. In such cases, the Dean will provide the detailed and specific reasons to the candidate in writing including in which respects he or she is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Such a recommendation is not subject to Appeal as set out in Article 13.

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 Senior Instructor, Associate Professor, Professor, or Professor of Teaching, 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. At least ten (10) percent of the Senior Appointments Committee appointed by the President will hold appointments at UBC Okanagan. 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) In his or her deliberations, the President may consult or request further information only from the Senior Appointments Committee as per Article 5.14(a), the Dean as per Article 5.14(b), the Provost, or the Deputy Vice Chancellor regarding the decision he or she proposes to make. If the Provost or Deputy Vice Chancellor raise

any new negative information or serious concerns are introduced during the consultation, the candidate shall be informed in writing and given an opportunity to respond in writing to the President making his or her decision.

- d) 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.
- e) Notwithstanding the procedures set out in Article 5 of the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*, the President may make an initial appointment of Associate Professor with tenure or Professor of Teaching with tenure or Professor with tenure where (1) the Departmental Committee, including the Head, a representative of the Faculty Committee and a representative of the Senior Appointments Committee, and (2) the Dean have recommended in favour of the appointment.
- f) 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:
 - i) the provisions of this Agreement;
 - ii) concepts of procedural fairness in the university context;
 - iii) consideration of appropriate standards of excellence across and within faculties and disciplines.

In addition to considering the merits of the candidate's teaching, scholarly activity and service, the President will also consider all relevant contextual factors.

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 consideration for reappointment, tenure or promotion results in a positive recommendation by the President, the reappointment, tenure or promotion shall take effect on July 1 following the calendar year in which the review was initiated.
- c) 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 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 periodic 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, unless the candidate requests in writing that the University refrain from conducting that review.
- b) A periodic 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, unless the candidate requests in writing that the University refrain from conducting that review.
- c) A periodic review of the record of each Senior Instructor shall be conducted during the fifth year after appointment at or promotion to that rank, and every third year thereafter, unless the candidate requests in writing that the University refrain from conducting that review.
- d) A non-periodic review may be conducted in any year with the consent of the Head and the candidate, and may be stopped by the Head, Dean or Candidate at any time. A decision to stop the process by the Head or the Dean is not subject to appeal as set out in Article 13.
- e) The candidate may decide to stop the process of a periodic or non-periodic review at any time before the President makes a decision as defined in Article 13.01

For post-tenure promotion reviews, the following will apply:

- f) Where a non-periodic review results in a recommendation by the Dean, the review will be deemed to be a periodic review for the purpose of determining the timing of the next periodic review.

- g) If a post-tenure review is conducted, a review will not be conducted in the following year.

APPENDIX 14 - LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING RE FACULTY MEMBERS ELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING #1

BETWEEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

AND

**THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Re: Faculty Members Eligible to vote on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

For the duration of this Collective Agreement, Article 5.04(b)(ii) and (iii) do not apply and faculty members eligible to be consulted are set out in the charts below:

(A) Eligible members for votes regarding reappointment

Rank/Decision being considered	“eligible member” for new agreement <u>effective July 1, 2014</u>
Reappointment of Instructor	Associate Professor; Professor; Senior Instructor; Professor of Teaching;
Reappointment of tenure track Senior Instructor	Associate Professor; Professor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Professor of Teaching	Professor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Assistant Professor	Associate Professor; Professor; Senior Instructor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Associate Professor	Professor; Professor of Teaching
Reappointment of tenure track Professor	Professor; Professor of Teaching

(B) Eligible members for votes regarding tenure and promotion

Rank/Decision being considered	“eligible member” for new agreement effective July 1, 2014
Tenure and Promotion to Senior Instructor (from Instructor)	Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Senior Instructor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Promotion to Professor of Teaching (from Senior Instructor which is a tenured position)	Professor; Professor of Teaching
Tenure – at rank of Assistant Professor	Tenured Assistant Professor; Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Tenure – at rank of Associate Professor	Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Tenure – at rank of Professor or Professor of Teaching	Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (from Assistant Professor)	Tenured Associate Professor; Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching
Promotion to Full Professor (from Associate Professor)	Tenured Professor; Tenured Professor of Teaching