

# P&T File #3 of 3 – Correspondence

## Referee Summary – Candidate’s Name

---

### Checklist item # 7

#### Notes:

- 1) List of referees with brief biography including:
    - Position
    - Expertise
    - Reasons for selection
- 

#### Dr. XXX XXXX

Professor, Department of XXXX, University of XXXX  
President and CEO, XXXXX

Dr. XXXXX is trained in XXXXX and his research has been focused on the use of XXXX, XXXX, and XXXX. He has published and lectured extensively in the fields of XXXXX and XXXX. Prior to his position at XXX, Dr. XXXX was the XXXX. Given his professional and academic qualifications, this referee is well-suited to attest to the level of renown that the candidate has attained within the field of XXXX for his scholarly achievements.

#### Dr. XXX XXXX

Professor, Department of XXXX, University of XXX

Dr. XXX received his PhD and MPH at the University of XXXX where he now holds appointments as a Professor within the Department of XXXX and an Adjunct Professor within the Department of XXXX. His expertise is in the area of XXXXX and he was solicited to address the quality and significance of the candidate’s individual scholarly contributions.

#### Dr. XXX XXXX

Professor and Chair, Department of XXXX, University of XXXXX

Dr. XXX has been the Chair of the Department of XXXX at the University of XXXX since its creation in XXXX. He is a XXXXX and has received awards from the XXX and the XXX for his research on XXXX. He was chosen as a referee because of his leadership within the field of XXXX.

#### Dr. XXX XXXX

Professor and Chair, Department of XXX, University of XXXXX

Dr. XXXXX is familiar with the candidate’s scholarly activity from XXX. Given his familiarity with Dr. XXXX's field of research and his role as Chair for the equivalent Department at the University of XXX, Dr. XXXX was selected to address the appropriateness of an appointment as a tenured Professor.

# Sample FOM Referee Solicitation Letter for Professoriate Stream

---

## Checklist item # 8

### Notes:

- 1) In the case where a Head has been a co-author or received research funds with the candidate, an Acting Head should be put in place for the entire review process including soliciting the referee letters.
- 2) It is recommended that Head's contact potential referees to determine whether the referee is willing to provide a letter of assessment and if so, to do so by the deadline provided, using **Template A**. They should also confirm at this time whether or not they are at arm's length. If they are or have been a collaborator and declare that they are still at arm's length, it is helpful to know the reasons why so that a potential referee is not precluded unnecessarily.
- 3) If the potential referee is willing to provide a letter of assessment by the deadline, then **Template B** can be used. The referees are to receive a copy of the candidate's CV, two or three samples of scholarly work, such as publication reprints, unless the referee has alternate access to them, relevant criteria from the Collective Agreement and SAC Guide. The Teaching Dossier is not sent to referees except in the case of Professor of Teaching Stream reviews (please use Referee Solicitation Letter specifically for the Review of Teaching and Educational Leadership).
- 4) For New Hires, letters of reference from the candidate's application package can be used, however, a follow-up letter is often required to obtain an explicit recommendation regarding the appointment at X rank and tenure.
- 5) Note that cases can be based on one or a combination of these forms but the form of scholarly activity must be determined in advance in discussion between the Head and the candidate so that the appropriate referees are chosen and appropriate criteria are applied at all stages of the review.
- 6) One sample of a letter of solicitation is to be included in the file that moves forward to the President.
- 7) **Do not send the Teaching Dossier to the referees except for candidates in the Educational Leadership Stream.**

## **TEMPLATE A:**

[Date]

Dear [referee name]:

RE: [candidate name]

The University of British Columbia is considering [candidate name] for [decision option]<sup>1</sup> in the Department/School of \_\_\_\_\_. On behalf of [candidate name], I am writing to ask if you are willing to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] scholarly activity with particular emphasis on the significance of her/his scholarly work in this field.

Referees are not normally expected to include relatives, close personal friends, clients, current or former colleagues, former thesis advisors, research supervisors, grant co-holders, or co-authors. If you should feel that your relationship to the candidate is such that it might affect your ability to evaluate him/her effectively, please feel free to decline to write an assessment. However, if you are or have been a grant co-holder or co-author with the candidate and feel that your relationship to the candidate is such that it will not affect your ability to evaluate him/her effectively, we would be grateful if you would explain briefly in what context you do consider yourself arm's length.

We rely heavily on outside letters in making decisions of this nature. I realize that the effort required to write such letters is significant and that the rewards are very limited. I would therefore like to emphasize our deep gratitude for your assistance in this important task.

Please advise within the next week whether you are willing and able to provide us with this assessment and if yes, whether you can do so by [deadline]. If so, I will forward [candidate name]'s curriculum vitae, and selected publications to you as soon as possible. You can contact me at [email] or by fax at [fax #].

**If I do not hear from you by [next week deadline] I will assume that you are unable to provide a reference and will remove your name from the referee list.**

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

xxxx

Professor and Head/School Director

---

## **TEMPLATE B:**

[Date]

Dear [referee name]:

RE: [candidate name]

Dear [External Referee],

The University of British Columbia is considering [**candidate name**] for [**decision option**]<sup>1</sup> in the Department/School of [XX]. I am writing to ask you to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] scholarly and professional activity with particular emphasis on the quality and significance of her/his scholarly and professional work in this field. [Phrase options depending on year of decision]<sup>2</sup>. Please indicate in your letter whether you know the candidate, and if so, in what capacity.

This file is being considered on the basis of [*insert scholarship of discovery and/or scholarship of teaching and/or professional contributions*]. I would ask that you please make an **explicit recommendation** concerning [decision option] in the context of the UBC Collective Agreement, and based on the evidence made available to you. I have enclosed an excerpt from the Collective Agreement that discusses the criteria for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion at UBC. **[For professional cases]:** I have also provided an excerpt of our Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC, and I would ask that you address the specific points in this article in evaluating this candidate's professional contributions. **[For scholarship of teaching cases]:** I have also provided an excerpt of our Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC, and I would ask that you address the specific points in this article in evaluating this candidate's scholarship of teaching contributions. **[For blended cases]:** I have provided an excerpt of our Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC, and I would ask that you address the specific points in this article in evaluating this candidate's **blended** case of [*insert scholarship of discovery and/or scholarship of education and/or professional contributions*].

We would be grateful for candid and specific comments about all aspects of the candidate's scholarly and professional achievements as set out below. We have provided questions concerning the type of information we would find helpful, but we hope you will also refer to any other matters you believe will assist in evaluating the candidate (e.g. direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, administrative performance, etc.).

1. Were you aware of the candidate's publications before now? Had you read any of them? In what ways are they referred to in other literature in the field?
2. On the basis of the information available to you, how do you assess the candidate's contribution as a scholar and researcher in his/her field?
3. Has the candidate effectively disseminated his/her scholarly and professional work? For example, publications, conference presentations & participation, invited and other presentations, other evidence such as letters of impact, development and/or implementation of policies, practice guidelines, government reports and/or curriculum innovation.
4. Apart from his/her scholarly work, do you know of any contributions the candidate has made to the development of his/her subject in Canada or elsewhere, e.g. through activities in learned societies, organizing conferences, and so forth? In your opinion how significant have these activities been from the standpoint of promoting teaching and scholarship in his/her subject?
5. What is the impact of the candidate's work? Traditionally, evidence of impact includes journal impact factors and citation indices; however, please offer additional insights. For example, has the direction of the candidate's discipline

changed because of his/her work? Is the candidate's work novel, creative or innovative? Is the work recognized by her/his peers at local, national and/or international levels? Has there been adaptation of the candidate's work? Has the candidate's work opened new avenues of research? To what degree is it marked by industry and thoroughness? What would you consider to be reliable indication or evidence for the impact of the candidate's work?

6. What is the candidate's productivity relative to other scholars in his/her discipline?
7. Has the candidate sustained their scholarly and professional activities since their UBC appointment or last promotion?

**[For Blended, professional or scholarship of teaching and learning cases, please include the following two questions, as relevant:]**

8. On the basis of the information available to you, how do you assess the candidate's contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning in their discipline?
9. How is the candidate's discipline (in Canada or internationally) different because of her/his work?

**[For promotion to Associate Professor only:]**

10. Is the candidate an independent scholar, that is, has the candidate achieved sufficient independence from previous supervisors and current senior colleagues?
11. Would you recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion?

**[For promotion to Professor only:]**

10. Has the candidate attained distinction in his/her discipline? Are their scholarly activities (traditional scholarship and/or professional contributions and/or educational scholarship) considered outstanding?
11. Would you recommend the candidate for promotion?

Please add any further comments you think might be useful in assessing the candidate's academic contributions.

It is the policy of the University to treat as confidential letters of reference which it receives. It can, however, be required under Freedom of Information legislation to disclose the substance of any letter of reference but only where that can be done

without disclosing the identity of the writer. In addition, if in the course of consideration of a candidate a negative recommendation is made within the University, the candidate is entitled to see a summary or an edited version of letters, but again the summary or editing is done so as not to disclose the identity of the writer. To facilitate this, you may precede your evaluation with a letter of transmittal such that the evaluation itself does not identify you or your institution. The letter of transmittal will be included as part of the evaluation file but excluded from a requested summary.

Please note that the enclosed Curriculum Vitae contains personal information about the candidate. Please keep it confidential, store it in a secure location, and destroy it or return it to us after you complete your assessment.

We rely heavily on outside letters in making decisions of this nature. I realize that the effort required to write such letters is significant and that the rewards are very limited. I would therefore like to emphasize our deep gratitude for your assistance.

I look forward to receiving your letter of assessment by [deadline]. **If I do not hear from you by the deadline I will assume that you are unable to provide the reference and will remove your name from the referee list.** You can contact me at [email] or by fax at [fax #].

Thank you for your consideration and assistance.  
Yours sincerely,

#### Enclosures

1. Excerpt from the Agreement
  - a. Professor - Article 3.08
  - b. Associate Professor - Article 3.07
  - c. Assistant Professors - Article 3.06
2. Scholarship of Teaching (if applicable) [attach excerpt from the **SAC Guide 3.1.(ii)**]
3. Professional Contributions (if applicable) [attach *excerpt from the SAC Guide 3.1.(iii)*]
4. Samples of the candidate's scholarly work, unless the referee has alternative access to this work
5. Curriculum Vitae
6. Full excerpt from the Agreement – Part 4, Articles 3 & 4 (Optional – For further context)
7. Table of Research Stream Criteria (Optional – For further context)

- 
1. Tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor
  2. Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor
  3. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure
  4. Promotion to the rank of Professor
  5. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, or tenure at the rank of Assistant Professor
  6. (Re)Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor (tenure track)
  7. Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure
  8. (Re)Appointment to the rank of Professor (tenure track)
  9. Appointment to the rank of Professor with tenure

<sup>21</sup>1. [Include for pre-7th year decision regarding promotion to Associate Professor:]

“At UBC, a successful decision would result in promotion and tenure. A negative decision would mean that final consideration of tenure would be postponed until a subsequent year.”

“Tenure will be automatically granted if promotion occurs, but it is possible to recommend tenure in the current rank without promotion. Please provide a specific recommendation on both promotion and tenure.”

2. [Include for 7th year tenure and promotion decisions for Assistant Professors:]

“Tenure will be automatically granted if promotion occurs, but it is possible to recommend tenure in the current rank without promotion. Please make separate explicit recommendations for each decision.”

3. [Include for 7th year tenure decisions for Assistant Professors and 5th year tenure decisions for Associate Professors where a tenure clock extension has been granted:]

“Please note that [candidate name]’s tenure clock has been extended by one year in recognition of [reason for tenure clock extension];

# Letters of Reference:

---

## Checklist item #9

### Notes:

- 1) Place in the same order as listed in #7 above
- 2) 4 letters are required to assess the candidate's quality and significance of scholarly achievements. 2 referees are derived from the candidate's list; 2 referees from Departmental list:
  - Include a deadline for the referee to respond
  - These must be at arm's length, except in the case of Senior Instructors and Professors of Teaching.
    - Check their publication record, list of research grants, and PubMed
    - If the language in their letter suggests that a personal relationship exists, send a follow-up question inquiring about the nature of their relationship
    - Make sure that they are not a former supervisor, or from the candidate's current or former institution.
  - The dates of the referee letters must be consistent with timing of judgment
  - The referee selection should reflect all aspects of the candidate's scholarly activity and the candidate's renowned in their field.
  - They are normally expected to be a rank above the candidate (except for Professors)
  - They **must make an explicit statement** regarding **ranks** and, if applicable, **tenure**
- 3) New recruitment cases: there must be at least **four arm's length** letters of reference **external to UBC and to the individual's current institution** with the exception of the scenario outlined below. A maximum of 2 arm's length letters requested by the candidate as part of the recruitment process can be counted towards the four arm's length letters necessary. In the event letters of reference are used from the recruitment process, and tenure is a subject of the appointment, the referees will need to be further consulted and provide their recommendation on the specific question of tenure.



# Head(s)/ Director(s) Letter to the Candidate (if the Departmental Committee(s) had serious concerns)

---

## Checklist item #10

### **Notes:**

- 1) If serious concerns about the candidacy are raised by the Departmental Standing Committee(s), the Head(s) / Director(s) must provide the candidate with a summary of the concerns and be given the opportunity to respond in writing and introduce further relevant evidence **before** the Departmental Standing Committee votes.
- 2) The Head must provide the candidate with a written summary of the concerns in sufficient detail to enable the candidate to understand the concerns fully and enclose copies of the external letters of reference modified to the extent necessary to protect the identity of the external referees.

### **SAC Guide 16/17 – Section 5.4.27**

- 3) Serious Concerns: In all cases other than initial appointment, if serious concerns about the candidacy arise in the departmental standing committee, the Head must provide the candidate with a written summary of the concerns in sufficient detail to enable the candidate to understand the concerns fully and with a summary or copies of the external letters of reference modified to the extent necessary to protect the identity of external referees. The candidate must be given the opportunity to (i) respond in writing and (ii) to introduce further relevant evidence **before** the vote is taken (Article 5.06 of the Agreement). After considering the candidate's response, the departmental standing committee will vote at a subsequent meeting.

# Candidate's response to the Concerns of the Standing Committee(s) (if concerns were raised)

---

## Checklist item #11

### Notes:

- 1) If serious concerns about the candidacy are raised by the Departmental Standing Committee, the Head / Director must provide the candidate with a summary of the concerns and be given the opportunity to respond in writing and introduce further relevant evidence before the Departmental Standing Committee votes.
- 2) The response by the candidate to the serious concerns raised by the Departmental Standing Committee(s), and any supplemental information provided by the candidate, is to be included in the file.

# Letter(s) of Recommendation from Department Head(s)/ School Director(s)

---

## Checklist item #12

### Notes:

- 1) A statement of the Head's / Director's recommendation.
- 2) A statement of the consideration:
  - a. appointment, promotion, or seventh-year tenure consideration
  - b. **do not** distinguish between grant tenure/track and tenure/track.
- 3) Background for the case, outlining any special conditions of the appointment.
- 4) The process of the Departmental Appointments Committee meeting, including,
  - a. a summary of what occurred
  - b. the date of the Departmental Appointments Committee meeting
  - c. number of members present and an explanation of absences, for
  - d. number of votes for, against, and abstentions with explanation
  - e. Note: a minimum of 3 eligible members must vote.
- 5) The basis for the recommendation:

- a. assessment of the candidates' demonstrated activities under the headings of Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service to the University and Community, including:
  - i. information on Departmental norms at the rank being considered with regard to teaching load, graduate supervision, administrative responsibilities, dissemination of research, or other scholarly work and external funding.
  - ii. the research impact & significance of journal publications
  - iii. referee comments
- 6) State that the letter has been circulated for review by the Departmental Appointments Committee.
- 7) In the case of Joint Appointments, letters from both academic units must be included.**

The suggested format below is adapted from the **2016/17** Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC (**Appendix 10**).

---

Dear Dean XXXX:

Re: Consideration of Dr. XXXX for [Appointment as / Promotion to / Tenure at XXXX]

Recommendation

- Clearly state Head's / Director's recommendation.
- Confirm effective date of promotion and/or tenure (e.g. July 1, 2017)
- Clearly identify a fifth year or seventh-year mandatory tenure consideration.
- If a 7<sup>th</sup> year tenure cases waives the right to a periodic review, please indicate this in the letter. While the candidate has the right to waive this review, it would be helpful for SAC to set out the circumstances leading to the waiver.
- Clearly identify promotions as either periodic or non-periodic.
- Make no distinction between grant tenure, and tenure or grant tenure track and tenure track.
- Provide information on special conditions of the candidate's appointment (eg. reduced teaching, medical, maternity or paternity leaves.)

Process

- Date of Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings at which a vote was taken
- Summary of what occurred at each meeting

- **If serious concerns, confirm that the candidate was given the opportunity to respond prior to the vote**
- Number of members eligible to vote (not specific names)
- Number present at a meeting (a minimum of 3 eligible members must vote).
- Explanation of absences of eligible members (not specific names)
- Number of votes for, against, and abstentions (with an explanation of the latter); unexplained abstentions are usually to be treated as tantamount to a negative vote.
- If a formal joint appointment, please indicate how the process was handled.
- If the candidate is a member of research centre or institute, a letter from the Director should be obtained. Please note that this letter will inform the discussion and the Head's letter but will not be included in the dossier forwarded to the Dean.

### **Background**

- Please provide a brief summary of the candidate's education and start date at UBC, etc. Ensure the information is consistent with the candidate's CV.
- Please contact Shanda Jordan Gaetz, Executive Director, Faculty Affairs, if the following could apply: provide any relevant contextual information about how factors such as race, gender, disability or Aboriginal status should affect assessment of the candidate's performance. For example, some candidates who are members of historically disadvantaged groups, or under-represented groups at the university, may spend more time than is normally expected in mentoring students and junior colleagues. Note if and how any agreements have been made between the University and the Faculty Association governing the consideration of the case.

### **Teaching**

- See Articles 4.02 in the *Agreement*
- See SAC Guide – [\*Appendix 2 Teaching Evidence\*](#) and [\*Appendix 1 Guidelines for Promotion to Professor of Teaching Guidelines\*](#)
- See FoM Guide to SPROT for Department Heads and School Directors.

### **Head's Assessment of Teaching**

The SPROT should be appended to the Head's recommendation letter. The Head should provide his/her *summary* of SPROT to include:

**Departmental Norms or Standards**

- Provide the context and norms for teaching and supervision both in quantity and quality within the Department / School. **In providing an indication of the departmental norms for scores in each course, clearly indicate the scale (e.g. *The candidate scored 4 out of a scale of 5*). Where the candidate teaches in other programs/units, those programs/units should provide the norms for that program/unit.**

*Example: The teaching activities/methods of the Department of XX are represented through ... (i.e. undergraduate, graduate or postgraduates; lectures (small and large), PBL, etc.).*

- **Unique Conditions**

Highlight specifically any linkage between context considered and the level of teaching by providing information on special conditions of the candidate's appointment such as reduced or unusually extensive teaching responsibilities, medical, maternity or parental leaves or responsibilities in more than one unit.

### 1) Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations are to be solicited through formal procedures. The peer evaluations should normally consist of reports from at least 2 colleagues who have each attended at least 2 lectures or other teaching activity. Deviations from these norms should be explained in this letter.

### 2) Closing Statement

Include a closing statement to summarize how the evidence provided meets the criteria for teaching for the appointment / promotion / tenure. *Example: The committee **and I** concluded unanimously that the evidence of teaching presented by Dr. XX does meet the criteria of an Associate Professor with tenure.*

### Scholarly and Professional Activity

- **Note: for the professoriate stream;** may be included for the teaching stream if evidence of scholarship of education activities
- See Articles 3 and 4.03 in the Agreement
- Clearly state on what basis the scholarly activity was assessed (traditional publications, scholarship of teaching, professional contributions, or a combination of scholarly activity).
- Where a candidate's scholarly activities involve more than one area (traditional publications, scholarship of teaching, professional contributions), ensure that consideration is given to all of the active areas and explain if relative weighting should be applied to each area.
- Be sure to provide the context and norms for the dissemination of research or other scholarly work and external funding within the Department / School and field of research & indicate

how the candidate's contributions compare with their peers (e.g. consider using your departmental averages for each rank over the past 3 years to help identify patterns/norms). Please note that the norm does not equal the average.

- Highlight specifically any linkage between context considered and the level of scholarly activity by providing information on special conditions of the candidate's appointment, including, but not limited to, protected time for research or scholarly activity, medical, maternity or parental leaves.

### Traditional Publications

- See also Section 3.1.6 of the SAC Guide
- Please explain publishing norms in discipline (e.g. refereed journals? Conference proceedings? Quantity? Quality? Is co-authorship expected and with grad students? Expected to have grants?
- It is useful to have an indication of the stature of journals within the discipline (such as its acceptance rate or impact factors using Google Scholars) in which a candidate has published.
- Where there is multiple authorship of papers or books, make the precise role of the candidate clear unless this information is already provided in the CV or through letters which have been solicited from the Head/Director from collaborators which outline the contributions of the candidate.
- Citation records and the H index factor may be helpful in cases for promotion to Professor.

### Scholarship of Teaching

- See Articles 3 and 4.03 (a) in the Agreement
- See also **Section 3.1.7** of the SAC Guide
- Describe how the candidate has demonstrated originality/innovation, dissemination, sustained and substantial use by others, and demonstrable impact.

### Professional Contributions

- See Articles 3 and 4.03 b) in the Agreement
- See also **Section 3.1.13** of the SAC Guide

- Describe how the discipline is different because of the candidate in Canada for Associate Professors and internationally for Professors.
- If relevant, describe how the delivery of health care has changed because of the candidate.

### Referees' Comments

- This section could be a separate section in the letter or included within the scholarly activity section for the professorial stream or the teaching section for the teaching stream.
- Provide a summary of the referees' comments.
- Provide brief notes on the qualifications of the external referees. This can be a separate page in the dossier. See the FoM Referee Qualification Summary.
- Especially in professional cases, it is urged that the qualifications of referees to render judgment on the quality of a candidate's work be made as clear as possible. Although the qualifications of academic referees are often apparent from their rank and the name of their Department/ Faculty/Institute, it is unlikely that this will be equally true for non-academic referees even though their title and the letterheads under which they write lie before one. Referees at academic institutions who have had experience evaluating professional contributions in respect to promotion and tenure and/or whose own professional contributions were so evaluated should be included in the selection of external referees, if at all possible. A reasonably detailed statement of the reasons for selection of a referee and of his or her accomplishments could often be of great value to members of the Committee.
- The dossier should NOT indicate which referees were proposed by the candidate, and which by the Department.
- Address all relevant concerns raised by referees (e.g. how were these concerns taken into consideration in the deliberations?).

Include a closing statement to summarize how the evidence provided meets the criteria for scholarly activity for the appointment / promotion / tenure. *Example: The committee and I concluded unanimously that Dr. XX clearly demonstrates sustained and productive scholarly activity and that s/he meets the criteria of an Associate Professor with tenure.*

### **Service to the University and the Community**

- See Articles 3 and 4.04 in the Agreement

Be sure to provide 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.

Include a closing statement to summarize how the evidence provided meets the criteria for service for the appointment / promotion / tenure. *Example: The committee and I concluded that Dr. XX's service to the University and the community meets the criteria of an Associate Professor with tenure.*

### **Closing Paragraph**

- Summarize how the candidate meets the criteria for appointment / promotion / tenure as described in the Faculty Agreement

Include a closing statement for the recommendation for the appointment / promotion / tenure. *Example: Based on the record before me, I strongly agree with the unanimous and enthusiastic support of the Department's Academic Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee and it is my pleasure to recommend that Dr. XX be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure.*

Sincerely,

xxxx

Professor and Head/Director (or Acting Head/Director if the current Head/Director is in a conflict of interest with the candidate)

**Note: A copy of this letter has been circulated for review by the Departmental Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee.**



# Head(s)/ Director(s) Letter to the Candidate, inviting a response to the Dean (if recommendation to the Dean was negative)

---

## Checklist item #13

### **Notes:**

- 1) If the recommendation of the Head(s)/ Director(s) is negative, the Head(s)/ Director(s) must provide the candidate detailed reasons in writing. This letter is to be included in the file.

### **SAC Guide 16/17 – Section 5.6.2**

- 2) If the recommendation of either the Head and/or the departmental standing committee is negative, the Head must provide the candidate detailed and specific reasons in writing for any negative recommendation, including respects in which the candidate is deemed to have failed to satisfy the applicable criteria. Where the Head's recommendation is negative but that of the standing committee is positive, the Head must also provide detailed and specific reasons for the positive recommendation.

# Candidate's Response to the Dean on the Recommendation of the Head(s)/ Director(s) (if recommendation was negative)

---

### **Notes:**

- 1) The response by the candidate to the negative recommendation of the Head(s)/ Director(s) is to be included in the file. As the candidate will be responding to the Dean, Faculty HR is responsible for including the candidate's response to the file as per the SAC Guide.

### **SAC Guide 16/17 – Section 4.7.4**

- 2) The Head may provide reasons by giving the candidate a copy of the letter of recommendation being forwarded to the Dean. However, if that is done, the letter will be modified to the extent necessary to protect the confidentiality and identity of the referees. The candidate should be invited to make a timely written response to the Dean, which will be added to the file (Article 5.08 (d) of the Agreement).