

# Guidelines for Heads and Directors: Presentations to Faculty ARPT Committee

**Note: Updates from the 19/20 version are highlighted in yellow**

For appointment/promotion files coming forward for 2021-2022, Department Heads and School Directors (or Acting Chairs if the Head/Director is in conflict) will be required to personally present each case at the Faculty ARPT Meeting. This will provide an opportunity for a Head/Director to **summarize the casefile, outline any special circumstances and context, and directly respond to questions** that the Faculty Committee may have on the file.

## Overview of the Process:

- Appointment/Promotion file is forwarded to the Dean's office.
- The Manager, Faculty HR, reviews the file for completeness and adherence to the process set by the *Collective Agreement* then forwards to the Faculty ARPT Committee.
- The Faculty ARPT Committee reviews the file and, via the Manager, Faculty HR, may ask preliminary questions of the Head/Director in advance of the presentation. Preliminary questions may be answered via email or presented in person.
- Head/Director is invited to the Faculty ARPT Committee meeting to present the file.
- File is presented, the Faculty ARPT Committee discuss, vote and make their recommendation to the Dean.

## The Head/Director Presentation (5-10 minutes maximum allotted time):

The Head/Director's presentation to the Faculty ARPT Committee is to be for a **maximum of 5-10 minutes in length**. The presentation is an opportunity for the Head/Director to **briefly summarize the submitted casefile, highlight information in the casefile that is important for the Faculty ARPT Committee to note, and to outline any special circumstances or context to help the Faculty committee better understand the casefile**. Drawing from the Head's recommendation letter, the presentation should include:

1. **Recommendation (approximately 1 minute):** The Head/Director and the Department/School Committee's recommendation on the appointment/promotion.
2. **A brief summary of the candidate's casefile (approximately 4 minutes). Please note the Faculty Committee will have reviewed the file ahead of the presentation and only key information central to the casefile will need to be highlighted, which may include:**
  - **Candidate's background**
  - **Research interest:** a brief description of the candidate's research interests.
  - **Scholarly Activity:** the quality and significance of the candidate's contribution. Explain how the scholarly activity was assessed traditional publications, scholarship of teaching (See Articles 3 and 4.03 (a) in the Agreement), professional contributions (See Articles 3 and 4.03 b) in the Agreement) or if this is a blended case, explain if relative weighting was applied. Explain anomalies or unique conditions.
  - **Funding:** the candidate's record of peer review funding as Principal or Co-Principal on grants.
  - **Teaching:** provide a description of the Teaching Activities/Opportunities and methods in the Department or School (i.e. undergraduate, graduate or postgraduates; lectures (small and large), PBL, residents, CME, etc.). Provide context for any clinical teaching.
  - **Teaching assessment:** provide an assessment of the data rather than just the data, and discuss the candidate's contributions. Explain the strengths and the weaknesses.
  - **Additional teaching and learning activities:** major teaching or educational activities performed by the candidate – eg. curriculum development, program or course direction, or development of instruction material.
  - **Service:** Explain the context and norms for administrative responsibilities within the Department/School. Highlight specifically any linkage between context considered and the level of service by providing information on special conditions of the candidate's appointment, including,

but not limited to, reduced or unusually extensive administrative responsibilities, medical, maternity or parental leaves or responsibilities in more than one unit.

3. **Outline any special circumstances or context (approximately 5 minutes) with respect to:**

- **Quantity and quality:** provide context and norms for scholarly activity within the Department/School. Explain how the candidate's scholarly activity compares to the expected norms in both quantity and quality.
- **Recognition/Impact:** explain the reputation at a local/national/international level (international reputation particularly for the rank of Professor). Talks, lectures, presentations. Overall impact of the candidate's published work; and the overall impact of the candidate's work on their field of discipline.
- **Departmental norms:** provide context and norms for teaching and supervision both in quantity and quality within the Department/School. Explain how the candidate's teaching compares to the expected norms in both quantity and quality.
- **Referees:** explain the selection of the referees. Did all the referees vote positively for the case? Explain any lukewarm referees or negative remarks or recommendations, how were they addressed in the Departmental Committee meeting.
- **Closing:** reasoning as to why weak areas, if any, should not be an obstacle in a case. Summarize how the evidence provided meets or does not meet the criteria for the appointment/promotion/tenure as described in the Faculty Agreement.

**Teaching Stream:**

**Associate Professor of Teaching** - Explain the evidence of excellence in teaching, demonstrated educational leadership, and involvement in curriculum development and innovation. Explain other teaching and learning initiatives.

**Professor of Teaching** - Explain the *outstanding achievement* in teaching and educational leadership, distinction in 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. Accomplishments/impact and providing relevant contextual information. Evidence that demonstrates educational leadership.

## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### ***Can I read from the Head's letter of recommendation?***

Yes, though this is an opportunity to highlight salient points and elaborate on the areas whereby further explanation may be warranted eg. blended cases, negative recommendation, unique conditions etc.

### ***How much notice will I be given to present a file?***

We anticipate that you will be provided a minimum of two weeks advance notice. For those Departments with multiple cases, we will aim to have the Head present more than one case at a meeting.

### ***Can I bring a member of the Departmental Committee to the meeting?***

No, the Head is expected to be fully apprised of the file contents and be prepared to answer any relevant questions.

### ***Who presents the case if I am in conflict with the candidate?***

An alternate chair must be put in place, who will solicit reference letters and write the recommendation. The alternate chair will present the case to the Faculty Committee to allow for continuity as well as due to their familiarity with the file.

### ***What areas of the case are typically questioned by the Faculty Committee?***

- Negative recommendations – Why? What discussion took place at the Departmental committee?
- How the Departmental Committee responded to a negative or a lukewarm referee recommendation
- Unique or special conditions.
- Specifics as to why a case is being assessed as a blended case and what weight was given in all the areas of scholarship.
- Cases whereby there has been a substantial amount of collaboration with the same individuals.
- Why there were significant delays in the case coming forward.
- Explanation of how the candidate has the “ability to direct graduate students” (3.08 CA).
- Situations whereby the teaching contribution is unique to gain understanding as to how a candidate compares to their peers in both quantity and quality.
- For new appointments, to fully understand how a candidate meets the criteria for scholarship/teaching at UBC at the given rank.
- Reason for the selection of the external referees.

### ***My Department is “Home” to a Joint Faculty Member. Who should present the file?***

- If the academic appointment is close to 50/50 in each unit, then both Heads should be in attendance.
- If it is clear that a greater percentage of the academic contribution comes from one Department, it is acceptable for only the Head of that Department to present.
- The presenting Head should be able to answer any questions that the Committee may have relating to the overall case.