Article 31: Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion – Documentation and Referees

Commencing the Process
31.1 A scheduled tenure consideration commences with written notice from the Chair to the faculty member by April 1st of the academic year prior to the year indicated in the letter of appointment (e.g. April 1st of the fifth year of appointment of an Assistant Professor). This notice should ask the faculty member to submit an application and a full curriculum vitae on or before April 15th. Additional materials as may be required are to be submitted by May 15th, as per article 31.3.1 below.

31.2 In order to be considered for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, a faculty member will submit by April 15th a written request including a full curriculum vitae to the Chair of the TPC asking for such consideration.

Documentation
31.3 A faculty member who is to be considered for renewal, tenure or promotion will provide the TPC with the following documentation:
   31.3.1 by May 15th: Copies of at least three examples of their peer-reviewed published research or its equivalent, and any additional materials that the faculty member wishes to be given to the external referees
   31.3.2 by September 1st: All material relating to their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service which they wish the TPC to consider

External Referees
31.4 The evaluation of a faculty member’s scholarly work by external referees with appropriate expertise should inform the assessment made by the TPC. The TPC should take account of the academic stature and the independence of each referee in weighing the assessment.

31.5 The faculty member must submit a list of at least five referees to the Chair of the TPC by May 1st. Those referees should be at arm’s length from the candidate, that is, they should not have been a recent thesis supervisor, co-author, co-applicant, collaborator or personal friend of the faculty member. University faculty and staff (including retirees) are not acceptable referees.

31.6 The TPC will develop a list of at least five potential referees, and will provide the list to the member by May 1st.
   31.6.1 When faculty members and TPCs anticipate there may be difficulty in obtaining referee agreement to provide reference letters, both parties should develop longer lists for review.

31.7 The Member and the TPC will have the opportunity to comment on the other’s list on or before May 15th.

31.8 Starting May 16th, the TPC will request confidential letters of reference from a minimum of six referees, at least half of which must be from the faculty member’s list. The TPC must receive agreement from at least five potential referees to proceed; at least two of which must be from the faculty member’s list, and two of which must be from the TPC’s list. If additional referees are required, the faculty member must provide additional names
so that there is always one more referee on the candidate’s list than the number of referees to be selected from the list.

31.9 The TPC must use a template letter, accompanied by the relevant Departmental Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion that have been approved by the Department and the Dean. The references must be received in writing. If received by email, the TPC Chair must verify that they are satisfied that the reference is legitimate.

31.10 There must be a minimum of four referees’ reports received before the case can be considered; at least two of which must be from referees who appear on the faculty member's list and at least two of which must be from referees who appear on the TPC’s list.

31.11 The TPC should not consider unsolicited letters of reference from faculty members at the University, including retired faculty members, or from other members of the University community.

31.12 Pertinent material received after a recommendation has been made formally at any of the stages of review will be forwarded for consideration to the next higher stage. If the new material is judged to be sufficiently important, the Dean, the Vice-President, Academic, the FRC or the President may direct that the case be reconsidered at any of the previous levels of review. A summary of the pertinent material will be sent to the faculty member under review. If there is to be a reconsideration, a revised timetable for the case will be adopted and the candidate will be notified. The reconsideration will be governed by the same procedures as the initial consideration.

This article is agreed to by the parties on this 20 day of JUNE, 2019.

John O’Neil, for SFU

David Broun, for SFUFA