A. Procedures To Be Followed in Departmental/School Tenure and Promotion Proceedings (DTPC/STPC)

These guidelines apply to promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Full Professor and to tenure considerations.

1) As early as possible during the academic year (recommendation at Admin Council in Dec, 2009 was to move this up to the same time as the merit process), but in any case, as per policy 77, no later than June 1st, the DTPC/STPC will determine those who are eligible for promotion. A list of faculty who must be considered for tenure will be forwarded to each department/school Chair/Director by the administrator in the Dean’s office. Faculty who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion should be consulted and given the opportunity to request in writing deferment of consideration, except in the case where, according to policy, an individual must be considered for tenure that year.

The Chair/Director of the DTPC/STPC should discuss potential candidates with the Dean as early as possible. The Chair/Director should submit the names of the candidates going forward in addition to the membership of the DTPC/STPC for the Dean to review. If a candidate is to be considered, then they should be asked to provide a list of at least three people who can assess their scholarly work. A short description of the academic/research accomplishments, and current position, rank, reputation in the area, etc. qualifying the person to be a referee should be provided by the candidate. It is not enough to merely list a few references. In addition, the referee must not have a close relationship with the candidate. The candidate in consultation with the DPTC Chair/Director should complete the form "External Referee Information Sheet". The candidate should supply for each external referee, a set of three to five reprints that reflect the significance and nature of their scholarship, curriculum vitae and a statement on teaching, research and service (limit to 3 pages). These documents must be submitted to the Dean by July 1st.

2) The first task for the DTPC/STPC is to determine if any of its members have a potential conflict of interest because of a close association with a candidate. Secondly, the DPTC must evaluate the list of external referees and normally will suggest additional names. For cases involving tenure or promotion, assessments should be sought from at least 5 external referees (please provide 6 so one can be sent out if a person declines) with at least 3 chosen by the Dean in consultation with the DTPC/STPC. It is important to ensure there are more than one external “international” referees on the list, particularly for cases for promotion to Full Professor, so that one international external letter can be obtained for the candidate’s dossier. As per Policy 77, a minimum of 3 external assessments are required. The entire ranked list should include suggested externals from both the candidate and the DTPC/STPC. The external referee information sheet should make clear who suggested a particular referee and why, and include a sentence or two about the referee’s stature and relationship to the candidate. Care should be taken to choose referees of high academic stature. They should not be closely associated with either the candidate or the department/school. For example, the candidate's co-authors, former colleagues, thesis supervisor, or adjunct professors in the candidate's department/school, should be avoided if possible, especially in the case of promotion to Full Professor. (Referees' evaluations should not only be fair and objective, but also be seen to be so). If the committee is unable to select enough suitable names from the list supplied by the candidate, it may request other names from the candidate. In any event, it may add names of its own choosing, and submit the entire list to the candidate for comment. Objections by the candidate to particular referees may be considered by the committee, but the resultant list of referees to be approached will remain confidential. Refer to Policy 77 for further explanation on selection of external referees.

For cases involving promotion to Full Professor, it is particularly important that the set of referees be a clearly recognizable collection of objective experts in the candidate's research area. The referees should
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be full professors for credibility. Occasionally associate professors may have to be used but a special case qualifying them must be made.

3) **A list of referees for each candidate should be given to the Dean no later than the first working day in July.** The Chair/Director will identify candidate-suggested referees and DTPC/STPC-suggested referees. The external referee information sheet for each proposed referee should accompany this list as well as an appropriate number of sets of reprints and current C.V. An explanation should be provided in those cases where the DTPC/STPC feels it is appropriate or necessary to propose a referee having a close association with the candidate or department/school, or a referee who is not a full professor, as described in item 2) above. Assessments will be sought from at least 5 external referees; at least 3 chosen by the Dean in consultation with the DTPC/STPC. During the referee selection procedure and upon receiving the names from the Chair/Director’s, the Dean (or delegate) will determine by email and before sending them the package that they are willing to provide their opinion on the candidate. This will help to ensure that an adequate number of letters are obtained. It seems that referees would prefer to be asked ahead of time prior to the packages being mailed out. A record of such contact, including reasons for refusal, will be kept in the Dean’s Office. An initial email asking for agreement followed by an official letter\(^2\) will be sent (couriered to ensure delivery) to the referees from the Dean's Office, along with copies of the University tenure/promotions policy, candidate's reprints, and the candidate’s current C.V and candidate’s statement. Referees will be asked to respond by October 15\(^{st}\), and the Dean’s Office will follow up with external assessments that have not been received by the deadline. Policy 77 states normally at least three external reviews are required, however it is better to have four or five if possible. This is a fairly tight schedule, so it is important to meet the deadline of July 1st so that the information can be sent to the externals no later than August 1st.

4) The DTPC/STPC will conduct their deliberations as soon as all documentation is available and the Dean’s office has forwarded the external assessments to the Dept/School. Every effort should be made to have proceedings completed by the beginning of November.

5) The Faculty tenure and promotion committee (FTPC) will meet during December and January (if necessary), with the objective of having all deliberations completed by February 1. The FTPC Chair/Director will identify FTPC members and provide a brief summary paragraph on each candidate, including the FTPC vote in their recommendation that is added to the T&P file before it goes forward to UTPC.

**Handling DTPC/STPC and FTPC memos:**

- Committee members are to be provided with a copy of the memo that the chair/director and dean has written on their behalf.
- The memo is to be signed by each committee members or receipt acknowledged in an email.

A phrase has been provided for use at the end of the memo and in the email. “I acknowledge that I received a copy of the memo setting out the discussion and recommendation of the committee. I am aware that, in the event I disagree with the majority recommendation, I have the opportunity to submit a signed statement with reasons for my disagreement. I am also aware that should I see the need, I have the opportunity to submit a signed clarification. Disagreements and clarifications must be submitted to the Chair/Director within 5 working days of distribution of memo.” [Endorsed by Dean’s Council, Nov. 25, 2009].

- Anyone who voted in the minority may submit a signed statement explaining their disagreement.
- Anyone may submit a signed statement clarifying any points.
- Any statements submitted are to be attached to the memo, as are any emails that take the place of signatures. [Endorsed by Dean’s Council, June 19, 2013].
- Committees will conduct votes by secret ballot.

The Department/School should provide at last one hard copy binder for the Dean’s office (please check with the Administrator, Faculty Relations and Appointments at the time of submission as to how many hard copies are needed) and upload the electronic files to the AHS sharepoint site:

\(^2\)Form letter attached. No two external referees should come from the same institution.
B. Outline for Document To Be submitted for Tenure only, or Tenure and Promotion Proceedings in the Faculty of AHS (FTPC) (to be provided in electronic format)

1) The preparation of the candidate’s statement addressing research, teaching and service contributions is the primary responsibility of the candidate, who should collaborate with the department/school Chair/Director to ensure that the document is complete in all respects before it is submitted to the DTPC/STPC committee (limit to 3 pages).

2) The submission to the FTPC should include the Summary Report for Promotion which is placed in the very front of binder (see attachment on last page of these AHS Procedures), a 3-page covering memorandum from the department/school Chair/Director, indicating the DTPC/STPC committee's recommendation (including the vote) together with the Chair/Director's recommendation. Also include the names of the DTPC/STPC committee members (Chairs/Directors also vote). The memorandum should include an evaluation of the candidate under the general categories of research, teaching and service. If a negative vote is cast, the dissenting votes must be noted in the Chair/Director’s letter.

Of special relevance is the Chair/Director's comments on how the candidate has performed over the long-run in terms of the Department/School's expectations, keeping in mind the appropriate University Policy. If for example, a candidate has achieved satisfactory, or above, ratings on the majority of previous yearly evaluations for merit, then for tenure and promotion to associate professor the Chair/Director should comment on this in light of the Committee's decision. The reverse also holds; if a candidate has not achieved a majority of satisfactory ratings in yearly evaluations, or in a reappointment to a first and/or second probationary term some weaknesses were noted, this information should be carefully discussed in relation to the Committee's current decision.

Finally, the Chair/Director should comment upon the “fit” of the candidate into the long-term plans of the Department/School. Depending upon the candidate, and interpretation of the appropriate University Policy, this information may be vital to the success or lack of success for a tenure decision or promotion to associate professor.

Annual Performance Summaries (to follow the Chair/Director’s statement)
Annual performance reviews provide important guidance to faculty members on their progress and must be considered in conjunction with external peer reviews. The Chair/Director will provide an annual performance rating table of the candidate for the past 5 years, for teaching, research and service and overall; 0-2 scale (include copies of annual performance review letters and provide the acknowledgement signed merit sheets).

Reprints of significant research papers must be available in the Chair/Director's and Dean's Offices at the time of tenure and promotion meetings for review by committee members. Please provide electronic copies if available for inclusion in the Tenure and Promotion documentation that will go forward to the external referees and to the DTPC/STPC and FTPC committees.

C. Candidate's Statement (refer to section VI of Policy #77)

According to policy, by July 1, the candidate should provide a short statement (limit to 3 pages and signed by the candidate) outlining their major strengths, contributions and accomplishments in the three areas of teaching, research and service.

Please provide the number of full time years teaching at UW and the number of full time years teaching at any other institution(s). This information is required for the Summary page that is included in the committee deliberations.
It is important that the candidate include evidence of impact and effectiveness of both research and teaching. For example, evidence of research impact may include references in citation indices, references to the candidate's work by leading researchers in the field, publications in leading journals, sole authorship, invitations to speak at major conferences, etc. Similarly, evidence of impact and effectiveness in teaching and service should be provided by drawing attention to areas where the candidate has made particularly innovative contributions to teaching or has achieved significant positive influence on curriculum development. The candidate should also make note of significant administrative activities that have been undertaken.

D. **Candidate's Curriculum Vitae**

An [AHS format curriculum vitae](#) should be presented (refer to AHS CV format in this document). Special attention should be paid to the listing of publications, contracts, and research grants: full authorship as listed in the publication (or grant application) must be presented; the term "In press" should be used for an article accepted for publication but not yet in print; and, "submitted" should be used for those articles submitted for publication but where no final editorial decision has yet been made. Identify student co-authors with an asterisk on each publication. Clearly identify the contribution made by the candidate to multiple authored papers.

Committee members are looking for evidence of research leadership and personal contributions in collaborative research programs. This can be done either in the candidate letter or in an explanatory page preceding the reference lists in the C.V.

E. **Documents for Research Evaluation**

Five to six letters from external referees are sought, in response to a letter from the Dean. (These letters are confidential, so the preparation of this part of the statement is the responsibility of the Chair/Director and Dean). Do not include old letters, as they may not provide an accurate reflection of the candidate's current stature and accomplishments. If old letters are to be used, the referee should be contacted and asked if they wish to change or add anything. This information should be clearly indicated on the old letter. The "External Referee Information Sheet" should precede each letter. (external letters should be presented in alphabetical order).

It may also be appropriate, in addition to the above, to have faculty from the candidate's department/school or other departments at UW, write letters indicating the candidate's role in joint research projects, research developmental activities (e.g. development of a laboratory or development of a research team), the contribution the candidate has made to students' research education, etc. It is particularly important to obtain a statement from the Chair/Director of the other Department for jointly appointed candidates.

Scholarly work outside of the usual peer reviewed venues is valued, however, the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance.

F. **Documents For Teaching Evaluation**

The most important documentation concerns peer (or expert) evaluation of the candidate's in class teaching ability, curriculum planning (e.g. course content and course structure including course outlines optional at Dept. level, not required at FTPC level, assignments, etc.), and course evaluation. At least two peers should write critical reports of the candidate's teaching activities that arise from visiting the candidate's classroom (at least two visits should be made if no prior direct observation has been made), and discussing with the candidate curriculum planning and evaluation activities.

Also of relevance here will be the candidate's record in merit evaluations for several years in teaching. Any divergence between current evaluations and past merit evaluations should be fully explained.

A summary of courses taught over the last five years should be included indicating which are graduate and undergraduate, approximate class size, the number of students who completed course and teacher evaluations and what the ratings were. Summarize student course evaluations by course and provide meaningful interpretive information. (e.g. comparative ranking within a unit).
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Student testimonials solicited by the Department are not required. While candidates may include student testimonials in their teaching portfolio they are typically given little weight by T&P committees.

**Peer Teaching Evaluations (peer reviewers should NOT serve on FTPC in the same year)**

UW Policy 77 indicates that if either the DTPC/STPC or FTPC committee express reservations that could result in a negative recommendation, the entire redacted tenure and promotion file is to be provided to the candidate, along with written explanation of the nature of the reservations. Since the candidate is aware of the identity of the peer teaching evaluators, it is not possible to redact the identities of these evaluators should the above situation arise. Thus, it is necessary to seek the consent of the individual evaluators prior to providing the file to the candidate. The timelines for informing the candidate and their opportunity to respond are short, and specifically seeking consent for individual cases may cause unnecessary attention to the case that could breach confidentiality. Thus, it is necessary to obtain this consent at the time that the teaching evaluations are provided.

Although Chairs/Directors may obtain the consent in a manner of their choice, the following sample standardized statement may be helpful.

**Sample standardized statement for Chairs/Directors to use when confirming a peer teaching evaluator:**

You have agreed to conduct a peer teaching evaluation as part of the tenure and promotion evaluation of ______________(candidate’s name). Policy indicates that your review may be shared with the candidate should a situation arise that either of the DTPC/STPC or FTPC committee’s express reservations and the candidate is given their redacted file to respond to the committee. In order to avoid time delays or breaches of confidentiality in the process, your consent to provide your evaluation to the candidate, only in the case that this situation arises, is sought at the outset of the process.

I, ________________ (signature) acknowledge that my peer teaching evaluation may be shared with the candidate in the event the case is challenged at any of the tenure and promotion committee meetings DTPC/STPC or FTPC.

*Adopted at Admin Council, February 12, 2014*

*Subsequent to this approval, it was discussed with the Dean and Continuing Lecturers should not provide peer teaching evaluations, given they are not part of the tenure and promotion process. Retired faculty should not be asked to provide a peer teaching evaluation either.*
THESE GUIDELINES APPLY TO CONSIDERATION OF A 2ND PROBATIONARY TERM (REAPPOINTMENT)

A. Procedures To Be Followed in DTPC/STPC Committees

A list of faculty who must be considered for a 2nd probationary term will be forwarded to each department Chair/Director by the Dean in March. The Chair/Director of the department/school in which the faculty member has more than 50% of their appointment is required to give information to the other Chair/Director when a joint appointment is being considered for renewal of a probationary term. Each case should be considered by the Department and forwarded to the Dean no later than September 1st. Candidates should be reminded by the Chair/Director to read the University Tenure and Promotion Policy 77.

The submission by the candidate to the Chair/Director for the DTPC/STPC must include:

1) A 1-3 page statement, signed by the candidate, outlining their major strengths, contributions and accomplishments in the three areas of teaching, research and service. Please provide the number of full time years teaching at UW and the number of full time years teaching at any other institution(s). This information is required for the Summary page that is included in the committee deliberations.

   It is important that the candidate include evidence of impact and effectiveness. For example, evidence of research impact may include references in citation indices, references to the candidate's work by leading researchers in the field, publications in leading journals, sole authorship, invitations to speak at major conferences, etc. Similarly, evidence of impact and effectiveness in teaching and service should be provided by drawing attention to areas where the candidate has made particularly innovative contributions to teaching or has achieved significant positive influence on curriculum development. The candidate should also make note of significant administrative activities that have been undertaken.

2) An AHS format curriculum vitae. Special attention should be paid to the listing of publications, contracts, and research grants: a chronological order must be used, full authorship as listed in the publication (or grant application) must be presented; the term "In press" should be used for an article accepted for publication but not yet in print; and, "submitted" should be used for those articles submitted for publication but where no final editorial decision has been made. Identify student co-authors with an asterisk.

3) The most important documentation concerns peer (or expert) evaluation of the candidate's in class teaching ability, curriculum planning (e.g. course content and course structure including outlines, assignments, etc.), and course evaluation. At least two peers should write critical reports of the candidate's teaching activities that arise from visiting the candidate's classroom (at least two visits should be made if no prior direct observation has been made), and discussing with the candidate curriculum planning and evaluation activities. A summary of courses taught while at the University of Waterloo should be included indicating which were graduate and undergraduate, approximate class size, the number of students who completed course and teacher evaluations and what the ratings were. Summarize student course evaluations by course and provide meaningful interpretive information. (e.g. comparative ranking within a unit).

Peer Teaching Evaluations (peer reviewers should NOT serve on FTPC committee in same year)

UW Policy 77 indicates that if either the DTPC/STPC or FTPC committee express reservations that could result in a negative recommendation, the entire redacted tenure and promotion file is to be provided to the candidate, along with written explanation of the nature of the reservations. Since the candidate is aware of the identity of the peer teaching evaluators, it is not possible to redact the identities of these evaluators should the above situation arise. Thus, it is necessary to seek the consent of the individual evaluators prior to providing the file to the candidate. The timelines for informing the candidate and their opportunity to respond are short, and specifically seeking consent for individual cases may cause unnecessary attention to
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the case that could breach confidentiality. Thus, it is necessary to obtain this consent at the time that the teaching evaluations are provided.

Although Chairs/Directors may obtain the consent in a manner of their choice, the following sample standardized statement may be helpful.

Sample standardized statement for Chairs/Directors to use when confirming a peer teaching evaluator:

You have agreed to conduct a peer teaching evaluation as part of the tenure and promotion evaluation of __________ (candidate’s name). Policy indicates that your review may be shared with the candidate should a situation arise that either of the DTPC/STPC or FTPC committee’s express reservations and the candidate is given their redacted file to respond to the committee. In order to avoid time delays or breaches of confidentiality in the process, your consent to provide your evaluation to the candidate, only in the case that this situation arises, is sought at the outset of the process.

I, _________________ (signature) acknowledge that my peer teaching evaluation may be shared with the candidate in the event the case is challenged at any of the tenure and promotion committee meetings DTPC/STPC or FTPC.

Adopted at Admin Council, February 12, 2014

Subsequent to this approval, it was discussed with the Dean and Continuing Lecturers should not provide peer teaching evaluations, given they are not part of the tenure and promotion process. Retired faculty should not be asked to provide a peer teaching evaluation either.

4) The DTPC/STPC or Dean may request that the candidate be asked to provide a list of at least six people who might write letters of recommendation. A short description of each proposed referee should include the academic/research accomplishments, current position, rank, reputation in the area, etc. In addition, the referee must not have a close relationship with the candidate (the candidate should complete the “External Referee’s Information Sheet” form (limit to 2 pages) and submit to their Chair/Director). The candidate should supply for each external referee, a set of three to five reprints that reflect the significance and nature of their scholarship.

5) The DTPC/STPC will conduct their deliberations as soon as all documentation is available. Every effort should be made to have reappointment proceedings completed by September 1 but no later than November 1. The Chair/Director votes and abstentions will not be allowed unless a conflict of interest is declared at the outset.

Handling DTPC/STPC and FTPC memos:

- Committee members are to be provided with a copy of the memo that the chair/director and dean has written on their behalf.
- The memo is to be signed by each committee members or receipt acknowledged in an email.

A phrase has been provided for use at the end of the memo and in the email. “I acknowledge that I received a copy of the memo setting out the discussion and recommendation of the committee. I am aware that, in the event I disagree with the majority recommendation, I have the opportunity to submit a signed statement with reasons for my disagreement. I am also aware that should I see the need, I have the opportunity to submit a signed clarification. Disagreements and clarifications must be submitted to the Chair/Director within 5 working days of distribution of memo.” [Endorsed by Dean’s Council, Nov. 25, 2009].

- Anyone who voted in the minority may submit a signed statement explaining their disagreement.
- Anyone may submit a signed statement clarifying any points.
- Any statements submitted are to be attached to the memo, as are any emails that take the place of
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signatures. [Endorsed by Dean’s Council, June 19, 2013].

- **Committees will conduct votes by secret ballot.**

The FTPC will meet during December and January (if necessary), with the objective of having all deliberations completed by February 1. The Dean shall decide whether to reappoint and shall inform the candidate in writing to summarize any concerns that have been identified, and provide advice on preparing for future tenure consideration. The Dean shall also inform the candidates in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative. The candidate may appeal a negative decision in writing to the FTPC within ten working days of being notified. Refer to policy 76.

The Department should submit **one departmental binder** containing all 2nd Probationary Term candidates’ prepared statements to the Dean for approval. Effective May, 2000, the FTPC serves as an appeal committee for 2nd probationary candidates. The Chair/Director will notify the candidate in writing with respect to reappointment consideration. The recommendation from the Chair/Director and DTPC/STPC will go forward to the Dean. The Department will be notified if more copies are needed for FTPC. The Dean will notify the candidate once a decision has been finalized.

Also of relevance here will be the candidate's record in merit evaluations for several years in teaching. Any divergence between current evaluations and past merit evaluations should be fully explained. Provide copies of all written assessments made of the candidate within the Department, including a summary of performance rating on teaching, research, service and overall; 0-2 scale to date and copies of the annual reviews carried out under UW MOA, article 13.

**B. Order for documents to be submitted electronically to the Dean’s Office**

1) **Summary page of Candidate and DTPC/STPC meeting date and vote**

2) **Chair and DTPC/STPC recommendation and merit summary (include annual performance reviews)** - The submission to the Dean must include a 1 to 2 page covering memorandum from the department Chair/Director, indicating the departmental committee's recommendation together with the Chair/Director's recommendation (limit to 3 pages). The memorandum must include an evaluation of the candidate under the general categories of research, teaching and service.

   Of special relevance is the Chair/Director’s comments on how the candidate has performed over the long-run in terms of the Department's expectations, keeping in mind the appropriate University Policy. If for example, a candidate has achieved satisfactory, or above, ratings on the majority of previous yearly evaluations for merit, then for tenure or promotion to associate professor the Chair/Director should comment on this in light of the Committee's decision. The reverse also holds; if a candidate has not achieved a majority of satisfactory ratings in yearly evaluations, this information should be carefully discussed in relation to the Committee's current decision.

   Finally, the Chair/Director should comment upon the “fit” of the candidate into the long-term plans of the Department. Depending upon the candidate, and interpretation of the appropriate University Policy, this information may be vital to the success or lack of success for a tenure decision and promotion to associate professor.

3) **Candidate’s Statement** – (signed by candidate, and limit to 3 pages) - the preparation of the statement is the primary responsibility of the candidate, who should collaborate with the department Chair/Director to ensure that the document is complete in all respects before it is reviewed by the DTPC/STPC committee.

4) **CV (AHS format, paginated)** – see above

5) **Two signed peer reviews (peer reviewers should not serve on FTPC in the same year)**

6) **Teaching summary and table (include course/instructor ratings)**
Letter to External Peers for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration** see “NOTE” below

Date

CONFIDENTIAL

«AddressBlock»

Dear Professor:

Dr. ____ is being considered for (tenure and promotion) (promotion) or (tenure) to the rank of (Associate Professor) or (Professor) and you have been suggested as an external referee. We sincerely hope you will be able to help us with this very important task.

**Insert Paragraph if there has been an extension to the tenure clock.... see note below**

External assessments of the quality and significance of the candidate’s published work are a key component of our review process. I would be very grateful if you would provide brief responses to the list of questions contained in the Guidelines for External Referees which is included with this letter. Although all of the questions are important, explicit comparison of Dr. ____’s research stature and contributions to those of others in the same research area would be particularly helpful, as would your assessment of whether Dr. ____ would be promoted to the rank of Professor at your institution.

Referees’ reports are considered by the appropriate University committees and normally are not released to the candidate. Copies of referees’ reports are given to the candidate in appeal situations, but care is taken to remove any material that might identify the referees.

Enclosed is a copy of Dr. ____’s curriculum vitae and candidate’s statement along with copies of some recent papers and our tenure and promotion policy. I would appreciate receiving your response by October 15, 2010 so that we can meet University deadlines. If you wish, you may send your reply by facsimile or email. The Dean’s Office Fax No. is (519) 746-6776 and the email address is jwerush@uwaterloo.ca.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

James W.E. Rush, PhD
Professor and Dean

Encl
Attach: UW’s guidelines for external referees
NOTE:

When there has been an extension to the tenure clock, please include the following as the second paragraph in the letter to the potential referee, adjusting as necessary (removing “and promotion” if the application is for tenure only).

A candidate for tenure and promotion at the University of Waterloo may choose to be considered after having served 4 or 5 years as a probationary faculty member. In this particular case the candidate had an extended probationary term. Such an extension can be due to, for example, a period of non-working leave. They should be evaluated as if they had been at the university for the usual 4 or 5-year period; i.e., the expectations for teaching and scholarship do not change.

This wording was drafted with input from Peter Van Beek, chair of the FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

DTPC/STPC and FTPC chairs/directors may also use such wording at committee meetings. A candidate may choose to disclose the reason for a leave or extension; such disclosure is up to the candidate.
Date

Dr. ____________
Professor
Address

Dear Dr. ____________:

This letter is to express my appreciation to you for your recent assessment of Dr. ____________ for promotion. Review Committee evaluations will proceed over the next few months.

We are grateful for your very thoughtful responses. As you know, this whole process is entirely dependent on reviewers giving a significant amount of time and I am always impressed that it is done with such thoroughness, objectivity and high quality.

Thank you again for taking the time.

Sincerely,

James W.E. Rush, Ph.D.
Professor and Dean
APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES VITAE FORMAT

NAME:

CONTACT INFORMATION (STREET ADDRESS, EMAIL, PHONE, ETC.):

DEGREES RECEIVED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- include changes in job or appointment status

ACADEMIC AWARDS AND DISTINCTIONS:

SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

- refereeing journals and grants
- professional society positions
- consulting

PUBLICATIONS:

a) **Refereed Journals**:

   - refereed implies a decision by peers has been made as to acceptance or rejection of the document.

   - include all authors’ names as they appear on article as well as full title of article and journal including year, volume, and page numbers.

   - for articles accepted but not yet in print, use the term "In press" instead of accepted or forthcoming. For articles "accepted with revisions" or articles that have been submitted for review, use the term "Submitted"

   - identify student co-authors with asterisks.

   e.g. 1. Brown, J.R. The relationship of health studies to recreation and leisure studies. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 1985, 12, 123-147.


b) **Refereed Conference Proceedings**:

   - form as for refereed journals

c) **Books and Book Chapters**:

   - list as they would be cited in a bibliography

d) **Technical and Consulting Reports**:

   - list all authors, title of report, contractor, date completed, number of pages
c) **Other Publications:**
- form as for refereed journals or as they would appear in a citation

**PRESENTATION TO SCHOLARLY GROUPS:**

a) Invited
   - include name(s) of presenter(s), title of talk, date, place, and name of conference, seminars, etc.

b) Self-initiated
   - same format as invited presentations.

**PRESENTATION TO PROFESSIONAL GROUPS** (this category for non-peer groups)

a) Invited
b) Self-initiated

**OTHER PRESENTATIONS:**
- e.g. community groups, TV, etc.

**RESEARCH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Short Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(in order that they appear on proposal)

**GRADUATE STUDENT SUPERVISION**

a) **As Supervisor**
   1. Ph.D. - List student's name, thesis title, year completed
   2. Masters - List student's name, thesis title, year completed

b) **As Committee Member** (numbers)
   1. Ph.D.
   2. Masters

c) **External Examiner**

**SERVICE**

a) University
b) Faculty
c) Department
d) Community

**AREAS OF TEACHING EXPERTISE**

**CURRENT RESEARCH INTERESTS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date for completion</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Provide notification list for T&amp;P and 2nd probationary eligibility; note candidates likely to be eligible the following year also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Inform eligible candidates for T&amp;P and 2nd probationary consideration (may occur in conjunction with faculty performance review follow-up meetings); discuss peer teaching evaluation timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Confirm with Chair whether or not to proceed with T&amp;P or 2nd probationary consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Coordinate peer teaching evaluations for each candidate including signed release statement from evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Provide materials for consideration; revised materials accepted up to the meeting date for DTPC/STPC and FTPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Establish DTPC/STPC and members for FTPC and UTPC and confirm names of candidates for consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>DTPC/STPC meets to review submissions for T&amp;P and 2nd probationary consideration, and determine list of external referees to be shared with candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Confirms to Chair list of external referees is acceptable or submits objections in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Provides candidate statement, CV, and 3-5 reprints for each candidate to Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Provides ranked list of external referees to Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Contact external referees to request consent to provide review by October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Follow up with any missing external referee letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>DTPC/STPC completes review of candidates for T&amp;P and 2nd probation consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Completes Chair’s memo for each candidate and obtains signatures of committee members or submitted statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Informs candidates of outcome of DTPC/STPC decision and provides completed file for each candidate to Dean; DTPC/STPC committee member files and access to electronic copies are destroyed/removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15 (following)</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>FTPC meets to complete review of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year; normally early December</td>
<td>T&amp;P candidate cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform each candidate of the outcome of the FTPC assessment and provide completed files to President/UTPC; FTPC committee member files and access to electronic copies are destroyed/removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1 – May 1</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UTPC completes assessment of all files and President informs each candidate of the outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATE'S CHECK LIST

Please Refer to Faculty of AHS Tenure and Promotion Procedures (available on the AHS policies/procedures web page) in conjunction with Policy 76 (Section 3B – Probationary Term Reappointment) and Policy 77, Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members

Candidate's Statement/C.V
Candidate's complete AHS formatted curriculum vitae
(please use * to identify graduate students, and “in press”, and “submitted”)
- refer to guidelines
Candidate's statement (signed by candidate) outlining personal assessment of contribution to teaching, research and service (limit to 1-3 pages)

Teaching Assessment/Peer Evaluation
- Teaching Record over past five years
  (summarize by course: include class size, number of students who completed course and instructor evaluations ratings)
- complete course outlines are “optional” - check with your Dept. Chair/Director
- at least 2 peer reviews will be conducted by peers within the Dept/School

Research Assessment
- Brief biographical and career information of 3 external referees (at least 3 candidate-suggested referees)

Professional Activities (include in CV)
- Society positions
- Refereeing duties - include number of pages refereed year for specific journals
- Other reviewing functions for promotion/tenure/grant committees
- Editorial duties
- Participation in Thesis Examination
- Consulting/Technology Transfer endeavours
University of Waterloo
External Referee Information Sheet
Section 6, Policy 77, Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members

Faculty of ______________________

Referee for:

Department/School:

Candidate under consideration for:
- Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor
- Tenure
- Promotion to Professor
- Tenure & Promotion to Professor

Referee Proposed by
- Candidate
- DTPC/STPC

(no two referees should come from the same institution)

Referee
Name:
Position and Rank:
University/Institution:

Address:
Street:
(must include a street address for courier, PO box alone is not sufficient)
City:
Province/State:
Country:
Postal/Zip Code:

Contact Info:
Telephone #
(must include a phone number for courier)
Email Address:

Statute of the Referee and Rationale for proposing this Referee: (Areas of research distinction and expertise, as they relate to the background of the candidate – include such things as titles of books authored, recent major papers, professional honours awarded, editorial duties, or society offices held):

Relationship to the Candidate: (A brief statement regarding the referee’s impartiality by identifying the referee’s knowledge of the candidate – as a colleague, co-author, collaborator, former supervisor, or researcher in an area of mutual interest). Referees must be at arms’ length (no close relationship) with the candidate. Referees are not normally selected if a special relationship exists with the candidate (e.g. friend, colleague, co-author, collaborator, former supervisor). If such a relationship exists, please indicate what it is and why the referee was selected.)
DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DIRECTOR'S CHECK LIST
For Tenure and Promotion and Reappointment to a 2nd Probationary Term

Please refer to Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
- Procedures to be followed in Departmental Tenure and Promotion Proceedings
- University Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members Policy #77
- Faculty Appointments – Policy #76, Section 3B Probationary-term Reappointment

Memorandum from the Department Chair/Director
(limit to 3 pages and include annual perf. eval. table listed below)

- indicate the composition of the DTPC/STPC, the vote and explanation if totals are less than the total number of voting members (Chair/Director’s vote)  
- indicate the DTPC/STPC recommendation
- the Chair/Director's own recommendation vis-a-vis the candidates
- statement from the Chair/Director indicating any exceptional considerations at variance with University Policy
- statement from the Chair/Director alluding to any special considerations made clear to the candidate at the time of employment
- signature of DTPC members on Chair’s/Director’s memo or email acknowledgement plus any submitted additional signed statements (as appropriate)

Annual Performance Reviews
- provide copies of all written assessments made of the candidate within the Department for the past 5 years, including a summary and copies of the annual reviews carried out under MOA, article 13

Teaching Assessment (solicited by the Chair/Director)
- include student evaluations summarized by course for past 5 years; include meaningful interpretive information
- copies of course outlines are optional unless a recommendation is going forward for tenure on the basis of outstanding teaching – and in this case, a complete teaching portfolio would be required. If a candidate wants to provide their course outlines it is their choice. Course outlines are not required at FTPC and UTPC levels of consideration

Internal Peer Reviews
- reviews by colleagues (detailed report)
- comparisons with average questionnaire results for the Faculty or for relevant multi-section courses

Research Assessment
- copies of significant research papers made available in the Chair/Director's and the Dean's Office
- to include a brief description of the career highlights of each referee providing a letter of reference and outline. At least 3 of the five referees sought must be chosen by the Dean in consultation with the DTPC/STPC.
- no close relationship with referee (see attached External Referee form)
- record of any objections of the candidate to any referees chosen (tenure only)
- record of any reasons for refusals of letters by referees
- record of any reason for including a referee who was a close associate with the candidate or the department
# CONFIDENTIAL
## FACULTY OF APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES
### SUMMARY OF TENURE AND PROMOTION DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>DEPT/SCHOOL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ph.D. Awarded:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Yrs. Full-Time Teaching at UW:</th>
<th>No. of Yrs. Full-Time Teaching at another institution(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Appointed to a Professional Rank at University of Waterloo</th>
<th>Current Appointment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Full-Time Faculty in Dept./School in Respective Ranks: at time form is completed prior to sending to UTPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Tenured Faculty in Dept./School in Respective Ranks: at time form is completed prior to sending to UTPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record of Vote for Tenure / Promotions Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept./School Committee Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Favour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggested order of the DTPC/STPC/FTPC/UTPC tenure and promotion documentation going forward to the various levels.

Once FTPC has completed its deliberations and the Dean of the Faculty has written the recommendation on behalf of the FTPC committee, each case is provided in pdf format (with bookmarks) electronically to the UTPC

**Department/School**

- Submits 2 binders (check with Faculty, some FTPC members require hard copy) to the Dean’s Office.

- See order of documentation below. Include tabs for the binders: Summary of Vote/Dean’s Memo/Chair/Director’s Memo/Merit Summary and Performance Review Summaries/Candidate’s Statement/CV/External Referees (alpha order)/Peer Teaching Reviews/Teaching Summary/Course Outlines

- Use page and bookmark panels for pdf file and forward to Faculty Administrator (Julie) in Faculty Office

- Ensure all recommendation letters are signed by referees and peer reviewers, Candidate’s statement signed by the candidate, and the Dept/School Committee members on the Chair/Director’s letter. The Chair/Director must also sign their letter.

**Order of Documentation**

Use pdf files to create one file named “candidate’s name_year_”tenure and/or tenure and promotion to Assoc. Professor” or “Professor”. All documentation, reviews, candidate statements, recommendation letters should be signed.

1. Summary Report Form/voting must be indicated for both committees (DTPC/STPC& FTPC). Provide a word file so that Julie can revise this after the FTPC meets to include FTPC vote and Faculty meeting date, and replace the page before it goes forward to UTPC.

2. Dean’s supporting memorandum (includes FTPC composition). (Faculty will complete after FTPC deliberations)

3. Chair/Director’s memo (includes DTPC/STPC composition and signatures of all committee members or additional statements) limit to 3 pages; summary of last 5 years annual performance table (include signed performance reviews after the merit summary).

4. Candidate’s statement – limit to 3 pages: teaching/research/service and signed by candidate

5. C.V. – ensure CV is numbered for referencing purposes so that the deliberating committees can make reference when they are discussing the cases, accuracy, AHS format, font, margins, etc.). Font should be large enough to read.
6. External referees documentation in alphabetical order by last name, external form followed by signed referee letter (identify Dept/School candidate-suggested referees. This is normally identified at the outset when the Dept/School Chair/Director and Dean have consulted with each other prior to the materials going out to request for external assessments).

7. 2 peer-reviewed letters re: teaching (Peer reviews should be conducted by the DTPC/STPC members, and no peer reviewer should serve on FTPC to minimize/avoid conflicts of interest w/ the candidate.)

8. Include course summary for past 5 years.

9. Extra documentation may be provided to the FTPC level for weak cases. Normally, student unsolicited comments are not forwarded to FTPC or UTPC for consideration.