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- Dr. Ken Baimbridge, *FoM SPROT Representative*
- Shanda Jordan Gaetz, *Executive Director, Faculty Affairs*
- Mark Trowell, *Senior Manager, Faculty Relations*
- Dr. Fred Mikelberg, *Vice Dean, Academic Affairs*
- Claire Bane, *Manager, Faculty HR*
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Our Objective

• To provide a review of the tenure and promotion process, especially its challenges.

• Review the SPROT process

• Support the success of faculty members going forward for tenure and promotion.
Tenure & Promotion Review Process

- The following information applies to tenure track, and grant tenure track faculty members
- The same may generally be applied to Partner appointees, except for any references to tenure and the Senior Appointments Committee (Partner promotion files move from the Dean to the President and do not go to SAC).
- Heads = Heads of Departments and Directors of Schools
Tenure & Promotion Review Process

Head’s Annual Meeting with Candidate – December to March of the academic year prior to a review
Head’s Meeting

• By June 30, the Head must meet with all tenure track faculty annually.

• We recommend that this occur between December and March in the year prior to a promotion or tenure review.

• For tenured faculty, we encourage annual meetings or, at minimum, at least in the 2 years prior to a promotion review.
Head’s Meeting (cont’d)

• It’s an opportunity to clearly note the strengths, deficiencies and opportunities for improvement.

• Ensure effective mentoring is in place.

• Discuss the scholarly activity tracks for the professoriate.

• Ensure the candidate has had at least 2, hopefully 4, classroom observations of teaching since their last review.
Head’s Meeting (cont’d)

• It is also important to provide advice regarding the CV & other relevant material required for the next review.

• Please encourage use of the FoM Annotated CV & Elements of a Teaching Dossier.

• The Head & candidate must agree in writing on matters discussed. (See FoM Sample Record of Meeting With Department Head on MedNet)
Head – Conflict with Candidate

- In the case that the Head has a research or teaching affiliation with the candidate (i.e. shared publications or grants, former doctoral supervisor), an **Acting Head** should be put in place for the entire process, including soliciting referees for letters of appraisal.
Tenure & Promotion Review Process (cont’d)

The Candidate is notified by the Dean of their opportunity for review – February to March

- The Candidate submits CV and Teaching Evidence - no later than Sept. 15 unless otherwise agreed

- Departmental Consultation – Dept. referee list and identify S PROT Reviewers – May to June

- Candidate submits names of potential referees – submit no later than May 15, unless otherwise agreed

- Solicit letters of reference; S PROT Reviewers prepare report – September to October

- Candidate may come forward in future year for a periodic or a non-periodic review.

To expedite files, consult with your Committee in the Spring!
## Periodic versus Non-Periodic Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Obligation to Initiate</th>
<th>Who can stop the process?</th>
<th>Appeal of negative decision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Candidate only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Periodic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Candidate or University</td>
<td>Head, Dean or Candidate</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Exception: Assistant Professors may appeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For Post-tenure reviews, no back-to-back reviews are allowed.
Letters of Reference

• All tenure and promotion cases and new appointments require 4 arm’s length letters of reference.

• For new appointments, letters must be external to UBC and to the individual’s current institution except:
  
  o Professor of Teaching Stream: It may be appropriate for some letters of reference to come from the previous institution though must be arm’s length.
Letters of Reference - Professor of Teaching Stream

• Senior Instructor: 4 arm’s length letters of appraisal on the candidate’s teaching, learning and educational leadership required. Referees should be from outside of the candidate’s Department, but don’t need to be external to UBC.

• Professor of Teaching: Require 4 arm’s length letters, two should be external to the candidate’s Department and two should be external to UBC.
Letters of Reference (cont’d)

What does “arm’s length” mean?

Persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. They are not normally expected to include such categories as relatives, close personal friends, clients, current or former colleagues, former thesis advisors, research supervisors, grant co-holders or co-authors.

*If you are unsure if a referee is at arm’s length, please consult with Susan or Claire.*
Letters of Reference (cont’d)

• The file must include an equal number or a greater number of letters of reference taken from the candidate’s list than the Departmental list.

• The candidate must not communicate with potential referees.
Letters of Reference – TIPS for Success

• Select referees who can speak to all, or particular aspects of the case - ideally from peer institutions.

• Encourage candidates to think of appropriate selections from peer institutions.

• Send accurate referee solicitation letters – especially for mandatory tenure reviews and Senior Instructor periodic review cases.
Letters of Reference – TIPS for Success (cont’d)

• Go back to referees to confirm recommendations on Tenure and Promotion when missing or ambiguous.

• If you get a one-paragraph letter that just reviews the candidate's CV, solicit more letters.

• Provide a clear rationale for the selection of each referee, particularly if not from peer institutions or if in special circumstances such as regarding the solicitation of an extra letter.
Tenure & Promotion Review Process (cont’d)

Department Standing Committee meets again after obtaining letters of reference – November to January

Serious concerns?

- Yes – do **NOT** vote
  - Head meets with candidate re serious concerns; provides in writing with redacted copies of reference letters
  - Candidate responds in writing to serious concerns

Department Standing Committee **VOTES** & recommends to Head

**e.g. If concerns might lead to a negative vote, do NOT vote!**
Voting

• **New, Tenured Appointment**: Two votes must be taken: one for the rank, and then a separate vote on tenure.

• **Promotion Review**: One vote for promotion needed.

• **Simultaneous Promotion and Mandatory Tenure Reviews**:
  - Vote for the promotion first.
  - If the promotion vote is unanimous in favour, tenure is automatic and no further voting is required.
  - **IF** the initial vote for promotion is **NOT** unanimous in favour, take a second vote for tenure.
Tenure & Promotion Reviews (cont’d)

Head recommends to Dean

Head notifies candidate in writing of decision

Negative?

Yes

Invited to respond in writing to Dean
Deadlines

- **March 19, 2015**: require that promotion files be received by the Dean’s Office in order to meet SAC deadline.
- **April 8, 2015**: SAC Deadline for academic year.
- Aim to send promotion file to the Dean’s Office **well in advance** of the Faculty ARPT Committee meeting date (minimum 2.5 weeks) to ensure time for review of file and scheduling of Head presentations.
- **Note**: New appointments are reviewed year round.
Tenure & Promotion Reviews (cont’d)

**Dean’s Office**
- Faculty Affairs reviews file;
- Faculty ARPT Committee reviews case, asks preliminary questions of Heads;
- **Heads present the file;**
- Faculty ARPT Committee votes & recommends to the Dean.

**Dean recommends to President**
- Dean notifies candidate of decision

**Negative?**
- Yes
  - Invited to respond in writing to President
- No
  - Review by SAC and the President
Supplementing the File – CV Addendum

• The candidate and the University have the right, up to the stage of the President’s decision, to supplement the file with new information that has not been solicited for this purpose by the candidate or a response to a particular concerns that emerge in the relevant documentation.

• If the candidate has solicited letters of support, notify the candidate and remove the letters from the file.
Areas of Suggested Improvement – SAC Questions

• **Teaching:** Provide as much detailed information as possible in the SPROT and Head’s letter of recommendation.

• **Framing and Context:** In the Head’s letter, state expectations for the Dept. or field, reasons for reduced teaching loads, strength of journals/conferences, and describe any special circumstances.

• **Letters of Reference:** Explicit recommendations required; choose appropriate referees.
Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPROT)
Dr. Kenneth G. Baimbridge

• Arose from the UBC Peer Review of Teaching Initiative which stemmed from recommendations from a variety of UBC initiated reports on peer review.

• Provides, in a comprehensive and consistent way, a evaluation of teaching that is now required for all promotion and tenure decisions.

• Replaced the FoM Teaching Evidence Guide for Department Heads/School Directors.

• SPROTs were implemented in the FoM in 2012-13.
SPROT Process...

- Each department/school has one or more SPROT representatives who serve as the local expert(s) on SPROTs.
- They are provided with guidelines for completing a SPROT and a SPROT Template. Both documents can be viewed by you on MedNet.
- The department/school reps are not necessarily the person(s) who write the SPROT for a particular candidate.
SPROT Process...

- SPROTs serve as an evaluation of ALL teaching activities.
- Key sections of the SPROT comment upon teaching load, student and peer evaluations, trainee supervision etc. and, in particular, in the context of the normal expectations of the department/school (*Role of Heads?).
- Additional sections on “Leadership” and “Scholarship” activities related to teaching may also be included if relevant to the case (e.g. promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching).

  * Use of Department/School Policies on Scholarly, Teaching and Service Workloads for Faculty Members?
SPROT Process...

- The SPROT is written by one or more individuals delegated the task by the Head/School Director
  - Eligibility of SPROT authors by rank

- A draft version of the SPROT is sent to the candidate ONLY for the purpose of identifying FACTUAL ERRORS.

- The final version of the SPROT is then submitted to the Head/School Director.
SPROT Process...

• The final version of the SPROT will be one of the documents reviewed by the department/school tenure and promotion committee at the time of their final (voting) meeting.

• The Head will provide comments relating to the SPROT in his/her recommendation letter to the Dean.
SPROT Process...

• The final version of the SPROT will then be appended to the Head’s Letter of recommendation to the Dean.

• The SPROT will also be part of the file submitted to, and evaluated by the FoM, SAC and the President.
SPROT Process: Issues arisen...

- Recruitment of SPROT authors of an appropriate rank.
- SPROT authors unaware of the units teaching expectations (norms).
- Difficulty obtaining reliable student evaluations of some formats of teaching.
- Student evaluations with low response rates.
- Lack of, or poor quality, peer reviews (classroom observations).
- Timing and updating of SPROTs.
Resources

- Articles 5 & 9 of the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty
- MedNet – HR/Managing and Developing Faculty/Promotion and Tenure
- Faculty Relations website
- Panel Members

(See Faculty Relations’ Summary of the Tenure and Promotion Process and the Tenure and Promotion Checklist for Heads/Directors online)
Questions?