

**Summary of Changes to the
Procedural Guidelines for Unit-Level Reappointment,
Tenure and Promotion Committees**
which was revised and approved by Faculty Council in March 2020

This Summary of Changes document to be removed from FH website in March 2023

Page 1

Revisions are mainly to bring this document in line with the Collective Agreement and our Faculty R,T&P Guidelines June 2019, particularly regarding language. Also trying to make everything more concise. In the Special File section, revisions to acknowledge e-files rather than paper.

Incorporated into this document now are sections on:

Instructor Reappointment
Appointments with Tenure
External Referee processes
Provision of the opportunity to comment

all of which were in other documents now rendered obsolete.

Page 2

New in this document, taken from the Process Guidelines approved June 2019 - An attempt to have all things reappointment, tenure and promotion in as few documents as possible. Content the same, just made as concise as possible. That document now obsolete.

Page 7

Regarding final recommendation - this is new – not required by the CA for promotion (only for tenure) but it is generally usual practice in our Faculty and seems to be best practice.

Page 8

Regarding academic appointments with tenure - Section added here – taken from a very old document (1997) now obsolete.

Page 13

Regarding #7 when sending recommendations to the Director - this is new – the CA says candidates access copies by request, but in practice in our Faculty at each stage typically the candidate is copied on the decision letter when it is sent to the next level of review. Seems to be best practice.

Page 14

Regarding access to the special file - This is new – it used to just say DFA appointed faculty – yet other documents specify staff and students have the right to comment too.

Page 15

Referencing Confidential Information - Replaces a lot of detail about how to handle the paper copies.

Page 16

Regarding external referees for Tenure and Promotion Consideration - Whole section has been added – it was contained in a separate (very old) document. (now obsolete)

Referencing 1.4 and 1.5 - This is new – it did say final lists were the responsibility of the Director. Changed to committee.

Page 17

Referencing 1.9 – At least two referees for those being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and four referees shall normally be obtained for those being considered at the rank of Professor. This clarifies something that has been unclear in our Faculty guidelines.

This change follows the language of the collective agreement.

Page 18

Regarding the provision of the opportunity to comment - This too was in a separate, very old document, with three almost identical sections, one for colleagues, one for students, and one for external agencies. The details were nearly identical.