

**INFORMATION SESSION:
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
PROCESSES AT ALLARD LAW**

APRIL 8, 2024

- when you will be reviewed
- what is the process for “going for tenure early”
- what is the review process and timeline, and what documents are considered
 - what you need to put together (and when)
 - what you need to review
 - what is added to this
- advice and comments from others who have recently gone through the process

RPT SCHEDULES – MANDATORY REVIEWS



PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW

Year	Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor of Teaching	Associate Professor
1			
2			
3		Reappointment review (mandatory)	Reappointment review (mandatory)
4	Reappointment review (mandatory)		
5		Promotion review	Tenure review
6		[Terminal year]	[Terminal year]
7	Promotion review		
8	[Terminal year]		

- Tenure clock begins July 1 of the year of hire
- The academic year is July to June
- Maternity leaves automatically extend the tenure clock by one year
- Parental leaves are granted a one year tenure clock extension on request
- Medical leaves: “If a faculty member is unable to perform their duties because of illness or injury the Parties agree to consider whether, in the circumstance of each case, the period of a pre-tenure appointment should be extended” (CA 1.04).



- (a) An optional review for promotion may be conducted in any year with the consent of the [Dean] and the candidate, and may be stopped by the [...] Dean or Candidate at any time, except that only the Candidate may stop an optional review in the year after reappointment. A decision to stop the process by the [...] Dean is not subject to appeal as set out in Article 13.
- (b) Assistant Professors and Assistant Professors of Teaching may be reviewed early for promotion. A positive decision for promotion in an optional review shall result in a tenured appointment being granted.
- (c) A negative decision following an optional review for promotion shall not result in a terminal year
- (d) An optional review for tenure for Associate Professors, Professors, Associate Professors of Teaching, or Professors of Teaching may be conducted in any year with the consent of the [Dean] and the candidate, and may be stopped by the [...] Dean or Candidate at any time [...]. If a negative decision is made on the awarding of tenure, the faculty member shall be entitled to a terminal year pursuant to Article 2.03(i).

- (a) The [Dean] shall meet with pre-tenured faculty members during the first year of appointment to review the criteria and expectations for reappointment, tenure and promotion and provide the faculty member with an opportunity to ask questions about the reappointment, tenure and promotion processes.

After the first year, the [Dean] shall meet with pre-tenured faculty members no later than June 30 of each year. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and other relevant information to the [Dean] prior to the meeting.

- (b) The purpose of the annual meetings specified in Article 5.02(a) 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, educational leadership and service will be assessed;
 - iii) the candidate'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 candidate may bring a colleague to each of the above meetings.

- (e) At the conclusion of each annual meeting the matters discussed must be recorded in a memorandum prepared by the [Dean] and agreed to by the candidate. Although the candidate and the [Dean] must agree on what was discussed, they may or may not agree on the evaluations or advice provided.



- “Traditional” scholarly activity
- Scholarship of teaching: “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” (CA Article 4.03a)
- Professional scholarly activity: “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, Indigenous or other organizations or with scholarly publications which falls within the definition of scholarly activity may also be considered” (CA Article 4.03b).

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND LIFE OF A FILE

Leading up to the candidate's submission of their file ...



PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW

Timeline	Process	File – Research Stream	File – Educational Leadership Stream
No later than June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting with Dean to discuss candidacy and review reappointment/promotion process (CA 5.02) Candidate provides up-to-date CV (and other relevant info) Peer Reviews of Teaching (optional at this stage except for promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Peer Reviews of Teaching] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer Reviews of Teaching
No later than June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate shares CV (and Educational Leadership/Teaching dossier) with shepherds for review / feedback <p>Promotion/tenure only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate can consult with shepherds on list of arm's length external reviewers 		
July 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of file to Dean's Office Promotion / Tenure only: A list of at least four arm's length reviewers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV Peer Reviews of Teaching Educational Leadership/ Teaching dossier

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND LIFE OF A FILE

Leading up to the Faculty Standing Committee meeting ...



**PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW**

Timeline	Process	File – Research Stream	File – Educational Leadership Stream
Summer / early Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Experience of Instruction (SEI) reports and comparative summary (using Faculty-level data) prepared by the Dean’s Office and sent to candidate and shepherds for review/reference <p>Promotion/tenure only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate prepares sample materials for external review • Faculty consultation re. list of arm’s length reviewers (CA 5.05c) • Dean or designate contacts potential external reviewers • Candidate’s file sent to external reviewers (with samples of work, research stream) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV • Peer Reviews of Teaching • Educational Leadership /Teaching dossier • SEI reports and comparative summary
Fall / early Winter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Reviews of Teaching completed (if not done already) • Shepherds’ Report submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV • Peer Reviews of Teaching • SEI reports and comparative summary 	

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND LIFE OF A FILE

The Faculty Standing Committee meeting ...



PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW

Timeline	Process	File – Research Stream	File – Educational Leadership Stream
<p>November – March</p>	<p>Faculty Standing Committee Meeting and open vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Shepherds’ Report and circulation of candidate file (including External Letters of Review) <p>Faculty Standing Committee Report (CA 5.07)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafted by Committee Chair • Circulated for vote to participating members • Includes record of vote and discussion • Goes with candidate file to the Dean • Candidate is informed of Committee recommendation by the Chair of the Faculty Standing Committee <p>NOTE: Additional procedure required where the Faculty Standing Committee Expresses “serious concerns” about the file under CA 5.06(f)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV • SEI reports and comparative summary • Peer Reviews of Teaching • [Shepherds’ Report] <p>Promotion / Tenure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Letters of Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV • SEI reports and comparative summary • Peer Reviews of Teaching • Educational Leadership / Teaching dossier • [Shepherds’ Report] <p>Promotion / Tenure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Letters of Review

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND LIFE OF A FILE

The Dean's review and recommendation ...



**PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW**

Timeline	Process	File – Research Stream	File – Educational Leadership Stream
November - March	Dean's review and Letter of Recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Candidate is informed of Dean's recommendation when it (and the candidate's file) goes on to SAC / President	<ul style="list-style-type: none">CVSEI reports and comparative summaryPeer Reviews of TeachingStanding Committee Report[Shepherds' Report] Promotion / Tenure: <ul style="list-style-type: none">External Letters of Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">CVSEI reports and comparative summaryPeer Reviews of TeachingEducational Leadership / Teaching dossier[Shepherds' Report]Standing Committee Report Promotion / Tenure: <ul style="list-style-type: none">External Letters of Review

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND LIFE OF A FILE

SAC and the President's review ...



**PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW**

Timeline	Process	File – Research Stream	File – Educational Leadership Stream
<p>November - June</p>	<p>Promotion/tenure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered by SAC and reviewed by President • SAC can ask Dean for further information/clarification regarding their letter of recommendation <p>NOTE: The President can consult with the Provost on the file; if any new negative information or serious concerns are raised, the candidate would be informed and provided with the chance to respond in writing (CA 5.14c).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV • SEI reports and comparative summary • Peer Reviews of Teaching • Standing Committee Report • [Shepherds' Report] • Dean's Letter of Recommendation <p>Promotion / Tenure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Letters of Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV • SEI reports and comparative summary • Peer Reviews of Teaching • Educational Leadership / Teaching dossier • [Shepherds' Report] • Standing Committee Report • Dean's Letter of Recommendation <p>Promotion / Tenure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Letters of Review

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND LIFE OF A FILE

Final steps ...



PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW

Timeline	Process	File – Research Stream	File – Educational Leadership Stream
November – June	Reappointments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not considered by SAC• Usually not reviewed by President• Dean’s Recommendation Letter goes without the file to Faculty Relations• Usually a “debrief” meeting is held with the Dean regarding the reappointment process and any recommendations coming out of the process towards promotion/tenure		
November – June	Promotion/tenure: President’s review and recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Candidate informed directly by President’s Office / Faculty Relations• Dean sometimes informed as well		

FACULTY COMMITTEE MEETINGS - ELIGIBILITY



PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW

Type of review	Assc prof (EL) (pre-T)	Assc prof (R) (pre-T)	Assc prof (EL) (T)	Assc prof (R) (T)	Prof (EL) (T)	Prof (R) (T)
Asst prof reappointment (EL)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Asst prof reappointment (R)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Promotion to Assc prof (EL)			✓	✓	✓	✓
Promotion to Assc prof (R)			✓	✓	✓	✓
Tenure as Assc prof (R)			✓	✓	✓	✓

- Use the appropriate UBC CV template (last updated 2021)
- Brief, succinct and judicious narrative summaries are welcome (1-2 paragraphs for, e.g., sections on teaching; scholarly and professional activities; and service to the university and community)
- The CV should be up-to-date, error-free and avoid any duplicate entries. The SAC Guide contains a list of common problems and a helpful annotated version of the CV.
- The CV can be updated at any time in the process by way of a CV addendum (keeps the front matter of the CV and includes only the updated information and the relevant headings and subheadings for that information).



- Full reports per term are provided, as well as a summary
- Summary includes comparative data (faculty averages per term)
- Summary made available for review by candidate prior to being included in the file
- Candidates have the choice to include open text comments from SEIs (can consult with shepherds):
 - do not include at all
 - include all comments
 - representative sample selected by shepherds

- Should cover as broad a range of your teaching as possible. Courses that you are not scheduled to teach during your year of review may need to be reviewed the year prior.
- Usually done by your shepherds. Because of teaching schedule conflicts and other reasons this is not always possible.
- Reviews less than two years old can be included in subsequent review files.
- The same course/class should be reviewed on two different occasions by two different peer reviewers.
- Candidates do not see the peer review of teaching reports.
- Practices vary about “debriefing”, and we have no clear guidelines.
- Candidates can view the PRT report template ahead of time.



- reappointment/promotion process is a ton of work, start early [educational leadership]
- One thing that I wish I had known was that it was relatively little work to assemble my tenure 'package', as in the materials actually needed when you go up for tenure. I had assumed, the way in which it was referred to colloquially, that it was like having to do another academic job application. The reality was a pleasant surprise: it was just the CV, the suggested externals and a selection of my publications [research stream]
- going through reappointment process first is hugely helpful and makes promotion process work easier
- In terms of reappointment, I know I found it reassuring to hear that it was simply a mechanism for feedback on whether you are on track for tenure. And I found that process to be clarifying and also supportive.



- rely on the Dean's advice and committee feedback about moving file forward at either stage
- blank space on the CV is not uncommon, rely on shepherds here to guide you
- Personally, I felt very well-informed and comfortable with the process, and especially credit the 2 pre-tenure sessions hosted by Deans, having great shepherds, and having spoken to various colleagues beforehand. It would have been helpful to know where my file was at various steps along the way - and I wish I could have reviewed the external letters.
- I wish I had known more about how the process worked! Specifically, who got to vote, what the voting protocol is, whether it is a simple majority or consensus or what, etc. I feel like I put in my application for tenure and it entered a black box and came out the other side.

- Reappointment: CA Article 2.03(f)
- Standards/expectations per rank: CA Articles 3.03 – 3.09
- Criteria: CA Article 4
- Teaching: CA Article 4.02
- Scholarly activity: CA Article 4.03
- Educational leadership: CA Article 4.04
- Service: CA Article 4.05
- Tenure: CA Article 4.01(a)

FURTHER RESOURCES



PETER A. ALLARD
SCHOOL OF LAW

- "G:\0 FacultyStaffShared\Faculty Governance\Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure" – includes brief process guides, peer review of teaching report templates, peer review of teaching best practices, CV templates, the SAC Guide, and shepherd report templates
- SAC Guide
- Collective Agreement
- Faculty Relations workshops and website