

# FoM Head's Letter of Recommendation for Department Heads and School Directors

---

The Department Head or School Director must forward a recommendation to the Dean in all cases except when the Head's recommendation is negative for any new appointments or any optional reviews for promotion (Article 5.07 of the Agreement.)

Please ensure that a summary of the departmental committee's deliberations is included with the Head's letter, with a full statement by the Head/Director of the majority and any minority opinions. This can be included in this letter.

The Managers, Faculty HR would be pleased to review any drafts of the Head's letter of recommendation to the Dean.

The suggested format below is adapted from the **2020** 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, 2022)
- Clearly identify a seventh-year tenure consideration.
- For candidates hired before July 1, 2017, if a 7th year tenure case waives the right to a mandatory review for promotion, 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 mandatory or optional.
- Make no distinction between grant tenure, and tenure or grant tenure track and tenure track.
- Provide information on Department norms at the rank being considered with regard to teaching load, graduate supervision, administrative responsibilities, educational leadership expectations (in the Educational Leadership stream), dissemination of research or other scholarly work and external funding.
- Provide a report of the departmental committee's deliberations including a full statement by the Head of the majority and any minority opinions.
- Ensure that the evidence supports the recommendation(s).
- Address all relevant concerns raised by referees.

## Process

- Date of Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings at which a vote was taken
- Summary of what occurred at each meeting
- *If serious concerns were identified, 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, Managing Director, Faculty Affairs, if the following could apply: Provide any relevant contextual information about how factors such as race, sex, disability or Aboriginal status may 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 Article 4.02 in the *Agreement*
  - See SAC Guide – *Appendix 1 – Guidelines for promotion to Professor of Teaching and Associate Professor of Teaching and Appendix 2 – Teaching Evidence – Summative Assessment of Teaching for Review by SAC and the President*
  - See FoM Guide to SPROT for Department Heads and School Directors.
1. **Head's Assessment of Teaching:** The Head should provide a summary of the 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.

2. **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 different lectures or other teaching activity. Deviations from these norms should be explained in this letter.
3. **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 (for the Professoriate stream)

- 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). Clearly identify if this is a blended case.
- 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.
- Provide the context and norms for the dissemination of research or other scholarly work, 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 and status of publishers (such as its acceptance rate) 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.
- Address publishing norms in the field (e.g. refereed journals, conference proceedings, quantity, quality, monograph, co-authorship).
- Citation records and the H index factor may be helpful.

### 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 their 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?).

### **Educational Leadership (for the Educational Leadership stream)**

- See Article 4.04 of the Agreement
- See also Section 3.4 of the SAC Guide

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 4.05 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.**