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Reappointment, Tenure & Promotion

- Review of files for tenure and promotion
- Common procedural issues
- For Assistance...
The Procedures

The reappointment, tenure & promotion procedures are set out in Articles 5 & 9 of Conditions of Appointment for Faculty, and are supplemented by the Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC.
The Tenure Streams

The Research Stream

Assistant Professor → Associate Professor → Professor

The Educational Leadership Stream

Instructor I → Senior Instructor → Professor of Teaching
The Criteria

The Professoriate Stream

The Professor of Teaching Stream

Service
Research
Teaching

Service
Educational Leadership
Teaching
An individual may only be reviewed one time for tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Tenure Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate and Full Professor</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor 1, Senior Instructor, Professor of Teaching</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Tenure Clock

- All ranks, except Assistant Professor, may be reviewed early for tenure.

- A tenure-track Assistant Professor may be reviewed early for promotion to Associate Professor and, if granted, tenure will be automatic.

Issues:

- The emphasis of evaluation is on “candidate’s record since his or her appointment or last promotion” (SAC Guide, Section 3, pg 11), so evaluation for early promotion is very difficult for candidates who have been at UBC a very short time.
Timeliness of P & T Review

1. Head meets with candidate by June 30\textsuperscript{th} (5.02 meeting)

2. Candidate submits dossier by Sept. 15\textsuperscript{th} (unless otherwise agreed)

3. Completed dossier with Head’s recommendation to Dean by Dec. 1\textsuperscript{st}

4. Dean’s recommendation to SAC by March 31\textsuperscript{st} (or early April check for deadline each year)

NOTE: Prioritize – mandatory tenure and promotion cases and new appointments (more time sensitive)
Head’s Meeting

- It is an opportunity to clearly note the strengths, deficiencies and opportunities for improvement
- The Head & candidate must agree in writing on matters discussed
- It is also important to give advice re the CV & other relevant material required for the next review and agree on the framing of the case for sustained and productive scholarly activity
Sustained Scholarly Contributions – Research Stream

“scholarly activity" means:
- research of quality and significance
- in appropriate fields – distinguished, creative or professional work of a scholarly nature

can take three forms (can form a blended case):
- “Traditional” scholarship – Article 4.03 & 3.1(i) SAC Guide
- Scholarship of teaching – Article 4.03(a) & 3.1(ii) SAC Guide
- Professional contributions – Article 4.03(b) & 3.1(iii) SAC Guide
Additional issues for Heads

- Ongoing mentoring of new and junior faculty regarding:
  - expectations at UBC
  - top journals and presses
  - tri-council funding
  - expectations re: conference participation & graduate supervision
  - authorship (single; multiple; order)
  - Teaching effectiveness

- Overburdening junior faculty with service work
Common Problems with CVs

- 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 (including teaching), is not dated, or is not in UBC format.
- Excessive inclusion of narrative (8a; 9a) – less is more.
- Lack of clarity regarding the candidate’s role and contributions (pubs, grants, collaborative research and graduate student supervision).
- Full information is not provided on grants (competitive vs. non; status of applications), publications (year, page numbers, authors, etc.), or presentations.
Eligibility to be Consulted

- The Head must consult with eligible members of the departmental standing committee on all reappointment, tenure and promotion cases.

- Each Academic Unit is required to have documented procedures regarding consultation with the departmental standing committee for all reappointment, tenure and promotion cases.
Standing Committee

- **Issues:**
  - Consider an orientation session on
    - Criteria
    - Referees
    - Procedure for serious concerns
    - Educational leadership
  - Normally, the only material that will be considered is material that has been obtained following required or other recognized procedures (CA 5.06e)
Criteria for Research Stream

- **Collective Agreement:**
  - Assistant Professor – Article 3.06
  - Associate Professor – Article 3.07
  - Professor – Article 3.08
  - Tenure – Article 4.01
(SAC Guide – Section 3)
Educational Leadership Stream Criteria

- **Collective Agreement:**
  - Senior Instructor – Article 3.04
  - Professor of Teaching – Article 3.05
- **SAC Guide:** – Appendix 1
Letters of Reference

- All tenure and promotion cases require 4 letters of reference.
- The candidate provides 4 names, of which 2 must be solicited.
- The Head then consults with the departmental standing committee on choosing the final list of referees.
- There must always be as many letters from the candidate’s list as the department’s list.
Referees – Issues:

- Must be arm’s length: persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted (SAC Guide 5.4.10)

- *may not* include such categories as relatives, close personal friends, clients, former graduate thesis advisers, research supervisors

- *should not* include current or former colleagues where conflict of interest cannot be managed, grant co-holders or co-authors

- *can* include former instructors who were not supervisors or professional committee members

- Educational Leadership stream – arm’s length colleagues from within the University may be appropriate (at least 2 external to UBC required for Prof of Teaching)
Referees – Issues:

- referees for research stream are preferably from universities/programs with stature comparable to UBC (national; international); (one per university)
- choose referees who are known leaders/experts in candidate’s area and contact them early
- ensure detailed information is provided on referees and their suitability
- care should be taken in solicitation letter (note mandatory reviews for tenure; blended cases)
- secure explicit recommendations on T & P
- solicit additional letters as necessary
Tenure & Promotion Reviews

Department Standing Committee meets after obtaining letters of reference

Serious concerns?

Yes

Invited to respond in writing to serious concerns

No

Department Standing Committee votes & recommends to Head

Yes

Invited to respond in writing to serious concerns

No
Standing Committee Voting

- Issues:
  - Vote only after receiving response from candidate to any serious concerns, if any
  - For Assistant Professors, vote only on promotion in cases that are *not* mandatory 7-yr tenure review cases
  - In mandatory 7-yr tenure review cases, take two votes: one on promotion and one on tenure
  - For appointments at Associate Professor or Professor, also take two votes
Tenure & Promotion Reviews

- Head recommends to Dean
- Head notifies candidate in writing of decision
- Negative?
  - Yes
  - Invited to respond in writing to Dean
Head’s and Dean’s Letters

Of critical importance when file is reviewed by SAC:

- explain review process, referee selection and assessments, and results of votes
- provide detailed explanation of any negative votes (don’t dismiss these)
- provide details of contextual issues, and candidate’s unique contributions (e.g. collaborative work, aboriginal scholarship, unique teaching contributions, etc.)
- discuss case, based on relevant criteria and collective agreement

(SAC Guide: Head’s Letter 5.5.1 & Appendix 10; Dean’s Letter 6.2.1)
Head’s Letter – extremely important!

Issues:

- See Appendix 10 in SAC Guide to make sure all topics are covered
- Expectations and normative information are very helpful in allowing SAC members to understand the context of the candidate’s activities
  - Expectations for teaching, including graduate supervision (how to judge “success”?)
  - Expectations or normative information on scholarly outputs (NB – without sufficient info to identify colleagues), collaboration, funding
- Evidence that candidate was made aware of expectations
Other issues at department/school level

- Consider asking for letters from frequent collaborators (SAC Guide 3.1.3)
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.
Dean seeks Faculty Committee vote → Dean recommends to President → Dean notifies candidate of decision → Negative? → Yes → Invited to respond in writing to President
Supplementing the File

The University and the candidate have the right to supplement the file with new information at any stage prior to the President’s decision.

*Supplements must be dated and should contain only new information.*
Senior Appointments Committee

- 20 person committee of professors
- Includes representation from the Faculty Association, UBC O and all Faculties at UBC V
- Two Subcommittees: Associate and Professor (members meet weekly September through June)
- SAC reviews all tenure, promotion and new appointment files (170-200/year) and makes recommendations to the President
Advise the President on the merits of individual cases according to:

- the Collective Agreement and SAC guidelines
- appropriate standards of excellence across and within faculties and disciplines
- concepts of procedural fairness
- all relevant contextual matters

(Article 5.14; Section 12 SAC Guide)
Examples of Contextual Factors

- Maternity or parental leaves
- Delays due to set-up requirements for research or any other relevant information which may provide insight into timing issues
- Candidate’s personal circumstances, if relevant, and approved by candidate
- Discipline- and context-specific opportunities within each department and faculty

Article 5.14e; SAC Guide Section 5.5.1
SAC Review Process

- Files are reviewed in detail for merit & fairness by the Associate or Professor sub-committee members
- Cases may be deferred pending receipt of additional information or procedural clarification
- Cases are ranked:
  - ‘A’ – no substantive issues or procedural concerns
  - ‘B’ – negative recommendation by Dean or Head
    - SAC members have questions for the Dean
      (approximately 20% of all cases)
SAC Full Committee Review

- ‘A’ cases generally approved without substantive discussion by full SAC.
- ‘B’ cases require full SAC discussion:
  - Dean joins SAC for discussion of the case
  - Vote is taken in Dean’s absence
  - Dean is immediately informed of the result which is considered “confidential”
Expedited SAC process

- Starts in mid-late February
- All files are pre-screened by the sub-committee co-chairs
- Very strong files with no procedural concerns are forwarded to the President as ‘E’ files with positive recommendations
- ‘E’ files are not voted on by full SAC
- Other files go through normal ranking by a SAC sub-committee, followed by voting by SAC
Recommendations & Decisions

- SAC Chair informs the President of SAC’s recommendations and votes on each case
- Chair provides the President with notes on SAC discussion with the Dean regarding all ‘B’ cases (notes added to candidate’s file)
- President makes her recommendation to Board of Governors
Basis for Appeals (Article 13)

- A decision may be appealed:
  - on the ground that it was arrived at through procedural error
  - on the ground that it was unreasonable
Process Considerations (SAC Guide)

- Acting Head – co-author etc. (Note 3 - 5.0)
- timeliness of file (Note 4 – 5.0)
- documentation of 5.02 meeting (5.2.1)
- early discussions regarding areas of scholarly activity – traditional or blended case (5.2.1)
- current summative peer review of teaching (5.2 Guide)
- eligible members to be consulted (5.4.3)
Process Considerations (SAC Guide)

- selection & solicitation of referees (5.4 a)
- importance of confidentiality (5.4.22)
- identification of “serious concerns” and candidate’s right to respond (5.4.26)
- separate votes on promotion and tenure in cases of new appointments (7.7)
- letters from collaborators (3.1.4)
- option of “secret ballots” (5.4.23)
For Assistance...

- The *Collective Agreement*, in particular Articles 2 - 5 & 9 of *Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*
- *Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC for 2014/15*
- Faculty Relations website: [www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/](http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty_relations/tenure/)
- Call us!
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: Issue 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
Teaching Effectiveness (both streams)
Teaching Effectiveness (Article 4.02; SAC 4.3, Appendix 2)

- *Effectiveness* primary criterion, not popularity
- command over subject matter
- familiarity with recent developments
- preparedness & presentation
- accessibility to students
- influence on intellectual & scholarly development of students
- willingness to teach range of subject matter and levels
Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

- student evaluations – *quantitative* and *qualitative*
- *peer teaching reviews*
- multi-section course coordination
- teaching awards and nominations (one form of evidence)
- student supervision – professional, research, internships, residency, etc.
- student accomplishments and professional success

SAC 3.2, 4.3, Appendix 2
context is critical - identify norms in your unit/faculty, and how candidate compares

provide *quantitative* and *qualitative summary*:
- All teaching responsibilities
- Student and *peer evaluations*
- Explanation for low scores
Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness  cont’d

- Summary (cont’d:
  - Graduate student supervision including expectations for field/sub-discipline and evidence of effectiveness (Research stream only)
  - Other teaching contributions, accomplishments, awards, etc.)