

 <b>DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY</b> FACULTY OF HEALTH  <b>Guidelines and Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure &amp; Promotion</b>	<i>Policy Sponsor:</i> Dean Faculty Council	<i>Approval Date:</i> Faculty Council and Full Faculty approval June 2019 Minor reappointment language update October 2019
	<i>Responsible Unit:</i> Office of the Dean FH Unit Directors Director of HR, FH	<i>Amendments:</i>

### **Background & Purpose**

According to the Collective Agreement between the Dalhousie University Board of Governors and the Dalhousie Faculty Association, tenure is considered the ultimate safeguard of academic freedom. Tenure is granted not for number of years served, but when it can be firmly predicted that someone will attain and maintain a high degree of academic proficiency. Candidates for tenure should become familiar with **Article 15** of the Collective Agreement, which governs tenure. Unit-level reviews for **reappointment** from probationary tenure track to a tenure track appointment assess candidates’ research and teaching as well as any other criteria that are set out in a letter of appointment. The standard is ‘satisfactory performance’ and the review intends to measure a candidate’s progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for tenure.

Under the Collective Agreement, promotion is based on the same criteria as tenure but moves beyond firm prediction of high level performance to evidence of actual achievement and accomplishments in those duties and responsibilities. Candidates for promotion should become familiar with **Article 16** of the Collective Agreement.

The Collective Agreement specifies that the criteria for Tenure and Promotion are:

- I. Academic and Professional Qualifications,
- II. Teaching Effectiveness,
- III. Contributions to an Academic Discipline,
- IV. Ability and Willingness to Work with Colleagues, and
- V. Personal Integrity.

Faculties, Schools, Colleges, units may add to or augment these criteria, or define them more precisely, but may not reduce them. This document outlines the criteria and standards for the Faculty of Health; criteria specific to each unit may be added (not reduced). Candidates will be assessed with regard to agreed upon workloads.

Files must be prepared for consideration in accordance with the guidelines later in this document. **It is the job of the candidate to clearly and concisely demonstrate the evidence** for firm prediction or accomplishment of high level performance. **Make the argument.**

## **Criteria and Evidence for Tenure and Promotion in the Faculty of Health**

The following required criteria clarify expectations as they relate to the Faculty of Health. Candidates should read Articles 15, 16 and 17 of the Collective Agreement.

### **I. Academic & Professional Qualifications**

For both tenure and promotion, a doctorate is normally required. Professional licensure or specialized certification may be required in addition in some units. Under special circumstances, the ordinarily required doctorate may be waived if specified in the applicant's letter of appointment.

#### Evidence in support of criteria

The candidate's *curriculum vita* indicates doctoral qualifications or professional qualifications or both. Exemptions require evidence in an appointment letter. If maintaining certification or license is professionally or legally required this should be indicated in the cover letter or CV.

### **II. Teaching Effectiveness**

The Collective Agreement addresses teaching effectiveness in Clause 16.11, and Article 17. Normally the candidate will be involved in teaching, regularly updating courses, planning, developing, coordinating, and organizing programs and curricula. The candidate might note use of innovative teaching methods, aids and materials; the production of instruction manuals, materials or teaching-related publications; supervision of students (clinical, graduate or other) as well as supervision of exams, academic counseling, assisting at registration and general student advising. Graduate student supervision may be considered teaching or research, depending on disciplinary norms.

Evidence for teaching effectiveness is complex. Several investigations<sup>1</sup> have made clear that student ratings of instruction (SRIs) are systematically biased against instructors from equity-seeking groups and have tenuous connection to teaching effectiveness. The consistent conclusion is that SRIs should not be used for evaluating instructors, particularly for tenure and promotion, though they may have value for instructors in improving their own teaching. Review committees should focus on how candidates interpret and respond to feedback.

Evaluation by students and former students should be complemented by in-class peer observations, curriculum assessment, and instructor self-evaluation. Formal recognition of teaching excellence through awards or nominations is valued. While SRIs should be included in a teaching dossier, the focus for tenure and promotion review will be on the qualitative comments, particularly on the candidate's reflection on and response to consistent student concerns. SRIs must be interpreted in light of: number of times a course has been taught, number of students, response rate, department means and variance, class material/level/type, and instructor expertise (Clause 18.09).

---

<sup>1</sup> CAUT. (2018, November). The end of student questionnaires? CAUT Bulletin. <https://www.caut.ca/bulletin/2018/11> Ryerson University v Ryerson Faculty Association, 2018; Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations. Feb 2019. Report of the OCUFA Student Questionnaires on Courses and Teaching Working Group.

Teaching is a normal expectation of all faculty unless otherwise and officially agreed upon. Candidates should clearly indicate workload assigned to teaching in the period under review, and how teaching is structured (e.g., problem-based learning, lecture, labs, co-teaching, online or in-person, TAs or tutors, etc.). Availability of and access to graduate students may warrant comment. Candidates should submit a Teaching Dossier that concisely demonstrates effective teaching. The Centre for Learning & Teaching has valuable resources for documenting teaching effectiveness, including peer observation processes.

<https://www.dal.ca/dept/clt/services/CUTL/forms-and-guides.html>

For **tenure**, candidates must demonstrate satisfactory performance in teaching effectiveness. **Promotion to Associate Professor** requires demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher through repeated and ongoing success since the previous rank was achieved. **Promotion to Full Professor** requires solid evidence of competence in teaching. A high level of teaching effectiveness and significant teaching contributions at unit, Faculty and university levels are expected when teaching is the main consideration for promotion.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness:

1. A summary statement of teaching philosophy, goals and methods including approach to student supervision.
2. A list of all courses taught in each year of the candidacy with the number of students enrolled in each course each year, credit or contact hours.
3. Peer evaluations and reports of teaching observations.
4. A summary of Student Ratings of Instruction for the last 5 years with candidate reflections on how they have interpreted and used that and other feedback to improve teaching.
5. Carefully selected course syllabi and/or other course materials with an introduction from the candidate indicating how they convey teaching excellence and/or illustrate the teaching philosophy.
6. Supervision of students and research trainees; clearly indicate their level, thesis or non-thesis, your role. Comments on student achievements such as publications and other scholarly recognition.
7. Documents signifying awards or other formal recognition of teaching excellence, and/or participation in teaching workshops or conferences on teaching.
8. Append official SRIs for the last five years clearly labeled with course number, name, instructor name and year taught. Do not include unsigned comments or information concerning co-instructors.

For **promotion through the ranks**, the record should show a trajectory of improvement or achievement. The Faculty expects to see increasing leadership and initiative in educational arenas, such as chairing or co-ordinating educational programs, interprofessional learning modules, program committees and program reviews; developing new programs, courses, instructional techniques and significant curriculum revision; significant mentoring of junior faculty and teaching assistants in the development of teaching competence.

**III. Contributions to an Academic Discipline**

The Collective Agreement demands development and maintenance of high levels of academic performance in research and scholarly contributions with the aim of increasing knowledge and

understanding (see Clause 17). Scholarly activity takes diverse forms; it will be “assessed as research if the results of the work are available to others and meet acceptable standards of scholarship as judged by peers” (Clause 17). The focus is on contributions since tenure-track appointment, or the most recent review for tenure or promotion. Productivity is assessed relative to agreed workload.

It is the candidate’s responsibility to show how their work demonstrates consistent scholarly contribution to their field, indicating clearly the norms in their field. Team scholarship is valued; it is important that candidates identify their roles in jointly-produced work. Assessment by external reviewers is key to judging quality, allowing for expectations to differ by profession or discipline while focusing on pursuit of excellence.

In keeping with the diverse forms of scholarship included in the Collective Agreement (Boyer’s Model), the Faculty of Health recognizes scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching, as well as scholarship of professional practice<sup>2</sup>.

- Scholarship of **Discovery**: systematic inquiry that builds a distinctive body of knowledge within the field of study; may be basic, applied or theoretical; may be solo or team; recognized by peer review as significantly contributing to and advancing the discipline. All candidates are expected to engage in scholarship of discovery
- Scholarship of **Integration**: analytical inquiry that develops new knowledge, perspectives, insights and understanding from purposeful examination and synthesis of original knowledge, evidence, theory and other information
- Scholarship of **Application**: advancing knowledge and new understandings through exploring how peer reviewed concepts, principles, research findings and theories are applied in practice, particularly concerning the advancement of practice knowledge in the profession or discipline
- Scholarship of **Teaching**: inquiry concerning pedagogy for conveying and developing the knowledge, skills and approaches of a discipline or profession; building or analyzing evidence regarding how knowledge and skills are acquired and constructed. It does not replace scholarship of discovery, integration and/or application as the primary contribution of candidates, but should be recognized and valued as scholarly activity
- Scholarship of **Professional Practice**: scholarly work closely linked to professional practice and contributions to a profession beyond the University; inquiry and interventions that advance the profession and are recognized by peers (including practitioners); taken into account as part of the overall evaluation of a candidate’s scholarly contribution to a field

Evaluation of a candidates’ scholarship must be flexible, ensuring the work relates to the discipline/profession and has been made known to an appropriate group that has provided feedback on the advancement of knowledge and/or impact. While academic peer review is traditional, when this is unsuitable it is the responsibility of candidates to clarify what constitutes appropriate peer review. In strongly oral traditions, a published manuscript may be far less relevant than oral dissemination and community witnessing. Candidates must convey evidence that their work has been disseminated, critically reviewed, and judged to be of value.

The Collective Agreement (Clause 17) states that, “Review and assessment of scholarship should recognize non-traditional forms of scholarship and traditional ways of knowing.” For Indigenous

---

<sup>2</sup> See Nippissing University, 2017. Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures.

scholars and scholars working with Indigenous communities, relationships are often critical, scholarly work is expected to benefit community, and credibility may be established by community. Candidates may want to show how their work operationalizes respect (e.g., for cultural knowledge, traditions, values, activities), relevance (e.g., to values and realities, community-driven priorities), reciprocity (e.g., participating communities, groups, individuals are partners in research), and responsibility (e.g., ethical relationships, appropriate methodologies, engagement, accountability for action)<sup>3</sup>. These important aspects of quality may also warrant discussion for other community-based and participatory research, which demands unusual time-commitment.

Candidates will be assessed on their overall mix of diverse forms of scholarly activity as documented in the file relative to workload agreements. Consistent productivity should show disciplined originality of thought and should advance the knowledge base of the field and/or enhance the profession's or discipline's capacity to respond effectively to challenges. Research and scholarly contributions are a normal expectation of all faculty unless otherwise and officially agreed upon. Candidates must demonstrate satisfactory performance in contributions to an academic discipline.

Evidence of scholarly contribution:

1. Clear articulation of the candidate's independent program of research.
2. Peer-reviewed research or scholarly publications from the candidate's program of research, accepted or in print, as first, shared first or senior author.
3. A consistent pattern of peer-reviewed products from the candidate's research.
4. Participation as principal or co-investigator in funded or unfunded peer-reviewed research activities from the candidate's program of research.
5. Additional peer-reviewed or high-quality non-peer-reviewed productivity.
6. Other scholarly activities.

For **tenure**, candidates must show promise ('firm prediction' – Collective Agreement Clause 15.02) of excellence in scholarly contribution. For promotion to **Associate Professor**, candidates must show evidence of actual achievement and accomplishment as a researcher and scholar through repeated and ongoing success over a period of at least four years. For promotion to **Full Professor**, the candidate must 1. show competence in both teaching and scholarship, 2. demonstrate attainment of a high level of effectiveness in teaching and/or scholarship likely to be maintained, and 3. show that teaching or scholarship makes a significant contribution to the discipline or the University as a recognized authority (Clause 16.11).

Scholarly work in this Faculty varies widely. Appendix A provides an example of progression through the ranks using standard academic criteria, but individual files may diverge significantly from this while still demonstrating excellence and value in scholarship. Candidates must make the case for their scholarly contributions.

#### **IV. Ability and Willingness to Work with Colleagues**

---

<sup>3</sup> Margaret Kovach, Nov 30, 2018. Non-traditional Scholarship and Traditional Ways of Knowing. Panel, Dalhousie. Verna Kirkness and Ray Barnhardt. 2001. First Nations and Higher Education: The Four R's - Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, Responsibility. <http://ankn.uaf.edu/IEW/winhec/FourRs2ndEd.html>

Ability and willingness to work with colleagues are reviewed in administrative and professional service. The Collective Agreement emphasizes the importance of collegiality, shown in respect for the rights of others as well as responsible behaviour (Article 17). Collegiality is not about congeniality, but about participation in governance. The well-being of the institution relies on members' contributions to duties generated by the unit, Faculty, University and students.

This criterion is best demonstrated by contributions to the School/College, Faculty and University, as well as to the local, regional, national and international community in an effective and co-operative manner. Such contributions are assessed through documenting service involvement – including service to the profession – and feedback from colleagues that indicate appropriate academic and professional interactions within Dalhousie. The academic unit where the candidate has a primary appointment is the primary site for assessment.

**Ability** to work with others might be indicated by: preparedness, conscientiousness, thoroughness, flexibility, problem-solving capacity and engagement, showing respect for internal and external standards and policies. **Willingness** to work with others might be indicated by: fulfilling assigned administrative workload, openness to the ideas of others, respect for different perspectives, active mediation to understand and include diverse points of view, and performing responsibilities without impeding the functioning of committees or the unit.

Administrative and professional service are assessed relative to agreed workload. This could include service on certification, licensure or accreditation boards, professional regulatory organizations, government bodies, commissions, non-profits, community groups or other organizations. When members of equity-seeking groups perform higher than normal administrative service, exceeding usual workload (Clause 20.09), this should be raised for consideration.

Candidates must demonstrate ability and willingness to work with colleagues. For **tenure**, the expectation is evidence of promise, such that reviewers can firmly predict future excellence. For **promotion to Associate Professor**, candidates are expected to show sustained participation in and contribution to academic governance and development (School/College, Faculty, University, professional associations) and make ongoing contributions to the wider community. For **promotion to Full Professor**, the expectation is increasing leadership and initiative, with sustained contributions beyond the local to the national and international arenas.

Evidence of ability and willingness to work with others:

1. A list of specific service involvement (such as committee membership, roles) at School/College, Faculty and University levels.
2. A list of service in professional and/or public arenas, indicating specific involvement.
3. Solicited and unsolicited letters from colleagues (e.g., unit and beyond, research teams, community and agency partners, staff) commenting on collegial engagement.

For **promotion through the ranks**, it is expected that candidates will demonstrate steadily higher levels of service engagement, moving into chairing committees; bringing experience and expertise to Faculty and University service roles; initiating and/or serving on *ad hoc* committees at multiple levels; significant leadership advancing the profession; substantial academic and professional contributions at national and international levels; membership on community and government boards or councils based on academic professional expertise; demonstrated

leadership and excellence with superiority in performance of administrative duties.

**V. Personal Integrity**

Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Collective Agreement Article 17 when considering evidence for this criterion.

The Collective Agreement calls for personal integrity in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship, service and other assigned workload. Indicators mentioned in the Collective Agreement range from fairness to students to conscientiousness to respecting confidentiality. The Faculty of Health expects personal integrity in these same areas.

Candidates must demonstrate personal integrity.

**Evidence in support of criteria**

In teaching:

- Student evaluation based on identified criteria
- Consistent use of relevant expectations and evaluations
- Student and peer feedback regarding fairness, integrity and ethical conduct
- Conscientious effort to meet all academic responsibilities
- Demonstration of appropriate respect for student confidentiality
- Any reports related to candidate integrity

In research and scholarship:

- Recognition of collegial contributions
- Ethical conduct of research
- Honesty

In administrative and professional service:

- Reflect appropriate professional values and ethics
- Comply with University policies and procedures
- Maintain confidentiality where such an expectation is specified

## Appendix A: Example of scholarly progression through the ranks

The focus is on contributions to an academic discipline since probationary tenure-track appointment, or the most recent review for tenure or promotion. Productivity is assessed relative to agreed workload. These are **minimal** criteria and may not meet the expectations in specific disciplines. They are also **standard** academic criteria, and may not capture non-traditional scholarship, nor the range of scholarship recognized by the Faculty, drawing from Boyer's Model.

Criteria	Tenure	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Independent program of research	Evidence of coherence and progression beyond the terminal degree	As for tenure, plus show initiatives emerging over time	As for Associate, plus repeated and ongoing leadership and initiative in the development of research and scholarship
Peer-reviewed publications	At least two peer-reviewed publications from the independent program of research as first, shared-first or senior author, since appointment or last review	At least two peer-reviewed publications from the independent program of research as first, shared first or senior author, since appointment or last review	Repeated and ongoing productivity beyond the Associate expectations
Consistent pattern of productivity	With ~40% research workload, at least one peer-reviewed product per year (e.g., publications, monographs, book chapters, books, films, videos, software, reports from research contracts or consulting, community research reports, published conference proceedings)	With ~40% workload, <u>additional</u> to the above more than one peer-reviewed product per year of high quality contributing to the profession or academic field. Minimally, n= the number of years the person has been at Dalhousie plus two	Repeated and ongoing productivity beyond the Associate expectations, on a par with other Full Professors in the unit and/or Faculty; assessed by external reviewers as having a strong record and/or reputation in the discipline
PI or Co-I in peer-reviewed research	Completed at least one major project, inception to dissemination, and involved in one or more projects	Involvement in peer-reviewed research activities, emerging reputation regionally or nationally	PI for at least one major research program
Additional productivity	Some involvement in conference presentations, exhibits, workshops, clinics, invited panels	Engaged in conference presentations, conference organizing, exhibits, workshops, clinics, invited presentations	In addition to criteria for Associate, conference organizing, chairing symposia, keynote addresses; awards or other formal recognition indicating research excellence
Other scholarly activities	Engaged in peer review, editorial boards, patents, program evaluation, community/ government consultations, professional advancement, media requests, industry links etc.	As for tenure, plus mentoring students and research trainees. Invited peer review of scholarly work elsewhere	Chairing or co-ordinating research programs, reviewing major research programs, providing significant mentoring of junior faculty and others in the development of research or scholarly competence



## Preparing your file

It is your right and responsibility to present your case in the most favourable light, in accordance with Faculty guidelines which will facilitate the review process. Succinctly outline your contributions relating to the Tenure/Promotion criteria.

The file should be submitted as five separate PDF documents. 1. Cover letter and file outline; 2. CV; 3. Teaching dossier; 4. Publications/sample scholarly work; 5. Other appendices.

### Cover Letter (maximum 6 pages)

Briefly address how you have met each of the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Contextualize your teaching and research so that reviewers from other fields can understand your work. Indicate your workloads during the period under review. Comment on any special or anomalous situations (e.g. unusual scholarly activity, special course development, workload weighted other than 40%/40%/20%, special awards or recognition) and any important areas of work in progress.

Make your case for tenure and/or promotion; simply presenting your CV and evidence in the appendices (which constitutes evidence) does not suffice.

Use plain language readily understood by a range of reviewers. Address each criterion in turn, showing clearly how you have met or exceeded expectations. Note your role and contributions to team efforts. Explain very clearly what teaching you have done and how teaching is done in your unit. Explain clearly your independent program of research and your scholarly accomplishments, with a trajectory from inception to dissemination. Student supervision may be scholarship or teaching, whichever fits for you.

Provide a brief executive summary of your file, including why particular items were included as evidence of your accomplishments. A well-prepared file has very judicious selection of evidence.

### Table of Contents (1 page)

Outline what is in the file.

### Curriculum Vitae

Include an up-to-date CV in a standardized format (Uniweb, granting agency format, other) that conveys your work and accomplishments on each of the tenure/promotion criteria. Include at least:

- Name, current academic position, contact information and date prepared
- Academic and professional qualifications, degrees, with dates
- Academic/professional awards and honors, with dates
- Employment history, starting with most recent, with dates
- Teaching responsibilities, courses taught, dates, enrollments
- Students and trainee supervision, with dates, level of trainee, your roles
- Scholarly work, indicating dates and your roles, contributions
  - Research grants – current, completed, under review (possibly unsuccessful applications), indicate funding sources, team members, dates, your roles
  - Publications and other products – indicate peer-reviewed or not, show trainee involvement, clearly show stage of review or publication, indicate your role
  - Presentations – indicate peer-reviewed or not, invited, role of trainees, type of forum
- Service work, administrative committees indicating level (unit, Faculty, University, profession)
- Other – community work, continuing education, media attention etc.

**Appendices** (in order of items in the CV)

Academic/Professional Qualifications

If equivalency is claimed, provide official documentation for any training that warrants exemption.

Teaching Effectiveness

A concise teaching dossier should be appended, which might include teaching philosophy, a summary of SRI results for the past 5 years and your reflections on/responses to those evaluations and other student feedback, reports of peer observations from colleagues and or from CLT, letters from colleagues and/or students (past and present). It is your responsibility to provide whatever evidence is meaningful to establish teaching effectiveness. All approved standardized Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) from the past 5 years should be appended, clearly labeled with the course number, name, instructor name and year taught. Do not include unsigned comments or co-teaching SRIs for other instructors.

Scholarly Activity/Research

A selection of up to five recent publications and/or other scholarly products that best illustrate your scholarly work. Books and other lengthy documents should not be submitted in their entirety because external reviewers are unlikely to read that much material.

Other evidence

Letters of support, copies of grant results or publication acceptances, evidence of other scholarly activities and other appendices you deem highly relevant to assessment of your application.



## File Outline Check List

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Cover Letter</b> (6 pages max.) as described above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>File outline</b> (1 page) clearly identifies what is in the file.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Updated Curriculum Vitae</b> including everything listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Teaching Dossier</b> including items noted above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Sample Scholarly Work</b> up to 5 publications or other examples with an index.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other Appendices</b> judicious selection of relevant other evidence in support of application. Follows CV order and appendices are labelled.
<b>Do NOT include the following items</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters of support written by a member of the unit or Faculty-level T&amp; P committees.</li> <li>• Any course evaluation (including students' comments) that pertains to instructors other than you (i.e., delete the names of any other instructors on signed evaluations)</li> <li>• Any confidential information appearing on student evaluations of other instructors</li> <li>• Unsigned course evaluations</li> <li>• Annual reports (workload deviations should be noted in your cover letter)</li> </ul>	

Date

Signature of Candidate

**Please complete and sign the check list and enclose with your reappointment/tenure and/or promotion file.** The purpose is to ensure you submit a complete file, thereby avoiding delays in the review of your application.

**Five electronic files** (letter & outline, CV, teaching dossier, scholarly products, other appendices) **submitted to your Director. Incomplete files will be returned.**

## Tips for Applicants

- Get familiar with the Collective Agreement Articles 15, 16 and 17.
- Files that have not been prepared appropriately will not move forward, so time your file submission to allow for revisions if necessary. Start early.
- Your unit Director must formally review your file, so cannot mentor you in file submission. But colleagues who are not on the T&P committee can. It can be very helpful to consult colleagues who have been through the process recently and/or who have served on T&P committees at unit or Faculty levels.
- A clear cover letter is vital. Address the criteria and promote your case. Ideally, reviewers will be convinced by the letter alone, even without the supporting evidence.
- Make sure a multi-disciplinary review committee understands the norms and measures of excellence in your field.
- Be sure to delineate your role in multi-person grants or publications. Order of authors differs by discipline – indicate the norms in your field (e.g., primary author first or last etc.).
- Distinguish between research grants awarded to you and studentships won by students you supervise.
- Graduate supervision may be considered teaching or research; disciplinary norms vary. Be clear in which category you are presenting supervision, which may vary for level of trainee.
- The Centre for Teaching & Learning can help with preparing a teaching dossier and may be able to provide observation and assessment of your teaching.
- Be very clear how teaching is conducted in your unit, and how your courses are structured (e.g., contact hours, labs, tutors, problem-based, online etc.). Be clear about your roles and contributions.
- Introduce SRIs with a summary chart that conveys course details and scores concisely. Indicate how you have thought about and responded to challenges.
- Organize your SRIs in a way that is easy to follow (e.g. Course A, years 1-5; Course B, years 1-5 etc.). State how they are organized and why any are missing (e.g. too small class sizes).
- The criteria listed here are minimum standards; in any specific field expectations may exceed these for demonstration of excellence.
- If you have a joint appointment or teach in more than one unit, the Director where you hold your principal appointment must ensure that a committee considering your case includes members from relevant units.
- You are entitled to meet in person with the committee at both the unit and the Faculty level.
- The committee at any level may request specific information from you if it might help deliberations, and may ask to meet with you.
- At every stage in the process, at unit and Faculty levels, you have the right to know what is being recommended. At any stage in tenure consideration you may request deferral (Article 15).
- Appeals are explained in Collective Agreement Article 15, grievances in Article 29.

## Timeline<sup>4</sup>

Dates	Tenure	Promotion & Professor Emeritus	Reappointment
August 15 or earlier	Dean notifies those eligible for tenure	Dean notifies those eligible for promotion	
August 15	Candidates submit their list of external referees to the Director	Candidates submit their list of external referees to the Director	Director notifies those eligible for reappointment
August 25	Director provides lists of referees to candidates	Director provides lists of referees to candidates	
First day after Labour Day	Tenure files are due in the Director's office		Probationary tenure track file submission due in School/College office.
September 15		Promotion files are due in Director's Office	
September 15		Director's Office confirms list of those submitting a file for promotion	
October 1			Unit Committee and Director's recommendations to the Dean
October 15	Unit Committee and Director's recommendations to the Dean		Dean's recommendation to President and Candidate
October 31 (Clause 14.15(a))			The President advises candidates of decision
November 30	Faculty T&P Committee recommendation to the Dean	Unit Committee and Director's recommendations to the Dean	
December 31 (in no case later than January 15)	Dean makes recommendations to President		
February 15		The Faculty-level T&P Committee recommendations to the Dean	
February 28 (in no case later than March 15 <sup>th</sup> )	The President advises candidates of decision		
March 31		Dean makes recommendations to the President	
May 31		The President advises candidates	
April 30 Clause 14.15(a))			The President advises candidates (spring term)

<sup>4</sup> Unit-specific dates may vary from the dates indicated here.