

Tenure and Promotion Workshop

May 30, 2022



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

ubcfa UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Agenda

- Welcome – Mark Trowell
 - Moura Quayle, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs, UBCV
 - Alan Richardson, President, UBC Faculty Association
- Guide to Tenure & Promotion –
Robin Roff and Kristin Cacchioni
- Senior Appointments Committee – Marion Pearson
- Questions and Discussion



Our Objective

- To provide faculty members with an understanding of the tenure and promotion processes.
- To support the success of faculty members going forward for tenure and promotion.



Tenure & Promotion

- Tenure Streams
- Criteria
- Tenure & Tenure Clocks
- Promotion Reviews
- Procedures
- For Assistance...



The Tenure Streams

The Professorial Stream

Acting Assistant Professor




Assistant Professor —————> Associate Professor —————> Professor



The Criteria

The Professorial Stream

Three pillars: teaching, research and service



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

ubcfa UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Educational Leadership Stream

The Educational Leadership Stream

Assistant Professor of Teaching → Associate Professor of Teaching → Professor of Teaching




THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



The Criteria

The Educational Leadership Stream

Three pillars: teaching, educational leadership and service



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

ubcfa UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY ASSOCIATION

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* (“SAC Guide”)



The Tenure Clock

- The tenure clock begins on July 1 of the calendar year of hire

Rank	Optional Review	Tenure Review
Assistant Professor	Any Year	Year 7
Associate Professor	Any Year	Year 5
Assistant Professor of Teaching	Any Year	Year 5

- Extensions are granted for maternity & parental leaves (automatic) and sick leaves (on a case by case basis)



Going up early

Optional Reviews

- Tenure and promotion have different standards. Generally, two simultaneous reviews at level of Assistant Professor/of Teaching
- Optional review for promotion can occur in any year with the agreement of your Head/Director (Note: there are no longer mandatory reviews for promotion after the Assistant Professor rank)
- Optional review for tenure (without promotion) at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor can occur in any year with the agreement of Head/Director
- Assistant Professor/of Teaching cannot be reviewed early for tenure , but if promoted to Associate Professor in optional review, tenure is automatic



Stopping the Process

- Mandatory reviews for tenure and promotion cannot be stopped
- Optional reviews may be stopped by the University or the Candidate at any point up to the President's decision
 - Except... only the candidate can stop a review the year after reappointment
- If a process is stopped by the University:
 - Candidate must wait 2 years from the date of submission before going up again
 - Only the candidate can stop the next review



Optional Review Decisions

What happens next...

- Optional reviews for promotion (Assistant/Associate/Full Professors)
 - **Successful:** Promotion granted (+tenure for Assistant Professors)
 - **Not successful:** Tenured candidates must wait 3 years from time of submission to apply again. Pre-tenure candidates can be reviewed for promotion in any year with the consent of the Head and the candidate.
- Optional reviews for tenure (Associate/Full Professors)
 - **Successful:** Tenure granted at current rank
 - **Not successful:** Terminal year



Head's Meeting

- By June 30, the Head must meet with all pre-tenure faculty annually.
- For tenured faculty, we encourage annual meetings or, at minimum, at least in the 2 years prior to a promotion review.



Head's Meeting

- During candidate's first year of appointment – will review criteria and expectations for reappointment/tenure/promotion
- Candidate must provide updated CV and other relevant information to Head before meeting



Head's Meeting

Purpose of meeting:

- Discuss timing of next review
- Review criteria and expectations of the next review and means of assessment
- Review of candidate's record including strengths and potential difficulties and where necessary, identify support
- Relevant dossier documentation
- Head and Candidate must agree, in writing, on matters discussed



The Initial File

- Unless otherwise agreed, the faculty member's dossier and all relevant documentation necessary for review must be submitted by July 1.



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.



Letters of Reference

- All tenure and promotion cases require at least 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.




What referees receive


- The letter of request is only accompanied by the candidate's CV and selected materials relevant for the assessment of scholarly achievements.
- Teaching dossiers are usually only included for cases involving Associate Professor of Teaching & Professor of Teaching.




Tenure & Promotion Reviews




Tenure & Promotion Reviews



Tenure & Promotion Reviews



Tenure & Promotion Reviews



Supplementing the File

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



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*
- Faculty Relations website: <https://hr.ubc.ca/career-development/appointment-reappointment-tenure-and-promotion>
- Faculty Association website: www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/promotiontenure.php
- Call us!



The Promotion and Tenure Process from the Perspective of the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC)

Marion Pearson

Chair, Senior Appointments Committee



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

ubcfa UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Overview

- What SAC is and what it does
- Key criteria
- Some practical advice
- Q & A



Composition of SAC

- 20 UBC Professors
- Broad representation across Faculties & academic disciplines
- Members from both Vancouver and Okanagan
- At least one Professor of Teaching



SAC's Mandate

- Advise UBC President on the merits of applications for tenure and/or promotion, and appointments above Assistant rank
- In doing so...
 - Ensure each file is judged according to criteria specified in the Collective Agreement
 - Ensure each file is judged objectively and on its own merits
 - Ensure relevant contextual factors are taken into account
 - Ensure consistent use of appropriate standards of excellence across all disciplines and all Faculties
 - Ensure procedural fairness



SAC's Caseload 2020-2021

Type of case	#
Associate Professor	82
Professor	57
Associate Professor of Teaching	16
Professor of Teaching	5
Tenure only	3
TOTAL	163



Evaluation of Cases by SAC

- SAC subcommittees review and designate as “A”, “B”, or “D”
 - “A” Case: Straightforward and meets all criteria.
 - “B” Case: More complicated (for any of several reasons). The Dean attends a SAC meeting to address questions and may need detailed information from the Head in advance.
 - “D” Case: SAC requests additional documentation prior to designation as “A” or “B”.
- 2021-2022:
 - A = 121
 - B = 28
 - D = 14 (all subsequently rated A)



Key Criteria: Professorial Stream

- **Promotion to Associate Professor:**

- “evidence of successful teaching and of scholarly activity beyond that expected of an Assistant Professor”
- “sustained and productive scholarly activity”
- “ability to direct graduate students”
- “participation in the affairs of the Department and the University”

- **Tenure:**

- “high standard of performance in meeting [relevant criteria] and show promise of continuing to do so”



Key Criteria: Professorial Stream

■ Promotion to Professor:

- “reserved for those whose contributions...are considered outstanding”
- “appropriate standards of excellence”
- “sustained and productive scholarly activity”
- “wide recognition...distinction in their discipline”
- “high quality in teaching”
- “participated significantly in academic and professional affairs”



Key Criteria: Educational Leadership Stream

- **Promotion to Associate Professor of Teaching:**
 - “evidence of excellence in teaching”
 - “demonstrated educational leadership”
 - “involvement in curriculum development and innovation, and other teaching and learning initiatives”
 - “keep abreast of current developments in their respective disciplines, and in the field of teaching and learning”
- **Tenure:**
 - “high standard of performance in meeting [relevant criteria] and show promise of continuing to do so”



Key Criteria: Educational Leadership Stream

- **Promotion to Professor of Teaching:**
 - “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”



Evidence of Scholarly Activity (Professorial Stream)

Collective Agreement (Part 4, Article 4.03):

“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 ... consideration will be given to **different pathways to academic and scholarly excellence...**”



Evidence of Scholarly Activity (Professorial Stream)

- **Different forms:**
 - *'Traditional' scholarship* (most cases fit in this category).
 - Alternatively, *Scholarship of Teaching or Professional Contributions* may constitute all or part of the case for scholarly activity. This must be explicitly stated at the outset of the application for promotion.



Evidence of Scholarly Activity (Professorial Stream)

- **Primary sources:**
 - CV (e.g., publications, presentations, awards)
 - Referees' letters



Evidence of Educational Leadership (EL Stream)

Collective Agreement (Part 4, Article 4.04):

“Educational leadership is **activity** taken at UBC and elsewhere **to advance innovation in teaching and learning with impact beyond one’s classroom**” and includes:

- Engagement in the **scholarship of teaching and learning**
- Contributions to **curriculum development, pedagogical innovation** and other initiatives that extend beyond the member’s classroom
- Teaching, **mentorship** and inspiration of colleagues
- Formal **educational leadership responsibility**
- Organization of and **contributions to** conferences...and other **educational events on teaching and learning** locally, nationally and internationally
- **Contributions to the theory and practice of teaching and learning**
- Other activities that support **evidence-based educational excellence, leadership and impact within and beyond the University**

“Judgement of educational leadership is based mainly on the **quality and significance** of the individual’s contributions.”



Evidence of Educational Leadership (EL Stream)

- See also **SAC Guide Appendix 1** for further guidance
- **Primary sources of evidence:**
 - CV (e.g., contributions to curriculum development, pedagogical innovation, scholarship of teaching and learning, etc.)
 - Dossier prepared by candidate (if included in case file)
 - Referees' letters



Criteria for Teaching (Both Streams)

- **Collective Agreement (Part 4, Article 4.02):**

“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...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 instructors, 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 ... 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.”



Evidence Pertaining to Teaching (Both Streams)

- **Different forms of teaching:**
 - Effectiveness in teaching scheduled courses
 - Supervision / training of graduate students
- **Primary sources of evidence:**
 - CV (e.g., courses taught, students supervised, awards)
 - Peer reviews of teaching
 - Student evaluations of teaching
 - Dossier prepared by candidate *
 - Summative review prepared by or for Head/Director

** SAC may review teaching dossiers for Educational Leadership cases*



Evidence Pertaining to Service (Both Streams)

- **Primary source of evidence:**
 - CV (committees within the unit/Faculty/University, editorial work, positions held in professional organizations, etc.)

Note that “While service to the University and the community is important, it cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching, scholarly activity, or educational leadership.” (Collective Agreement, Part 4 Article 4.01a)



Contexts that SAC Considers Carefully

- **Discipline-specific norms of various kinds:**
 - Value placed on different kinds of scholarly products
 - Value placed on specific publication outlets/venues
 - Norms pertaining to authorship and authorship order
 - Norms pertaining to quantity of publications
 - Extent to which grant funding is relevant
 - Norms pertaining to quantity and quality of teaching and student supervision
 - Norms and expectations for service contributions



Contexts that SAC Considers Carefully

- **Situation-specific challenges and obstacles:**
 - Challenges associated with specific kinds of research
 - Challenges associated with resources / infrastructure
 - Challenges associated with specific teaching assignments
 - Personal circumstances (possibly, if relevant)



Contexts that SAC Considers Carefully

- **Primary sources of information about context:**
 - Recommendation letters from Head/Director and Dean
 - Referees' letters
 - CV and (sometimes) the dossier prepared by candidate



CV Preparation

- Use standard UBC format. Note advice in the SAC Guide; see annotated CVs in Appendices 3 & 4.
- Content should be:
 - complete, accurate and up to date
 - in the appropriate sections (and not duplicated)
 - sufficiently detailed (on publications, grants, courses, etc.).
- Distinguish between meaningfully different things (e.g., different kinds of publications, supervisees, supervisory roles, etc.)
- Where possible, provide information conveying contribution to collaborative projects (e.g., team-taught courses, multi-authored publications).



CV Preparation

- Use (but do not abuse) opportunities to provide potentially useful details that might not otherwise be evident, such as:
 - Student co-authors on publications
 - Awards, honors, and other indicators of distinction
- Use (but do not abuse) opportunities to provide narrative context
- Use (but do not abuse) opportunities to identify works in progress
- Consider submitting CV updates while the case is working its way through the process
- Bottom line: Content should be inclusive – and judicious



Dossier Preparation (EL Stream)

- Should complement the CV and focus on the criteria for the specific promotion being sought, and include material accordingly.
- Should follow relevant guidance provided in the SAC Guide (see Appendix 1).
- Should highlight evidence attesting to broader impact.
- The dossier is not normally included in the case file that reaches SAC and the President, but portions can be where more evidence is required to demonstrate the criteria have been met (see SAC Guide Appendix 2).



Teaching Report (Both Streams)

- Normally completed by the Chair of the Summative Peer Review of Teaching Committee or the Head.
- 4 to 5 pages, with added tables/charts and separate peer review letters as needed.
- Include outline of teaching responsibilities, summary of results of student evaluations (including supervisees), peer evaluations, and description of contributions to educational leadership as appropriate.
- See template in Appendix 2 of the SAC Guide.



Select Referees Who:

- Are likely to be familiar with disciplinary norms
- Are likely to understand the nature of the candidate's work and the UBC criteria for promotion and tenure
- Have unassailable credibility:
 - Transparently arms-length
 - Well-qualified; with relevant expertise; intellectual leaders
- Ideally, are at institutions of similar stature to UBC

Note: At least half must be from the candidate's list

See Letters of Reference chart:

https://hr.ubc.ca/sites/default/files/documents/Letters_of_Reference_Chart_2020.pdf



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Other Tips

- Plan ahead: Read relevant documents, get advice
- Seek opportunities to fulfill expectations for scholarly activity or educational leadership, teaching, and service
- Make sure your teaching is evaluated regularly by students and occasionally by peer reviewers. A recent summative peer review is needed for the teaching report.
- Start (really) early on preparing CV and dossier
- Be patient: It can take many months from file submission to President's decision



Questions?



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

