



Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures

Approved by Senate 21 March 2002; Amended 27 November 2003; 24 May 2007; 28 June 2007; 26 October 2017, 27 June 2019, 25 June 2020, and 24 October 2024

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Preamble..... | 1 |
| B. The Description of Criteria for Tenure and Promotion | 2 |
| B.1. Teaching | 2 |
| B.2. Professional Contribution and Standing | 3 |
| B.3. Service to the University | 3 |
| B.4. Application of the Tenure and Promotion Criteria..... | 4 |
| C. Eligibility for Professorial Ranks and Tenure | 4 |
| C.1. Professorial Ranks..... | 4 |
| C.1.1. Assistant Professor..... | 4 |
| C.1.2. Associate Professor..... | 5 |
| C.1.3. Professor | 5 |
| C.2. The Relation of Promotion to Tenure | 5 |
| D. Appointments Leading to Tenure | 5 |
| D.1. Classes of Full-Time Appointments..... | 5 |
| D.2. Probationary Appointments | 6 |
| D.2.1. Pre-Candidacy..... | 6 |
| D.2.2. Candidacy..... | 6 |
| D.2.3. Length of Probationary Period | 7 |
| D.2.4. Extension of Probationary Period for Pregnancy or Primary Care Giver Leave..... | 7 |
| D.2.5. Termination of a Probationary Appointment..... | 7 |
| D.3. Initial Appointment as Lecturer..... | 7 |
| D.4. Initial Appointment as Assistant Professor | 7 |
| D.5. Initial Appointment as Associate Professor or Professor | 7 |
| D.6. Denial of Tenure | 8 |
| E. Sabbaticals and Leaves of Absence | 8 |
| F. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion | 8 |
| F.1. Overview of the Process | 8 |
| F.2. General Rules | 8 |
| F.3. Procedures..... | 9 |
| F.3.1. File Preparation..... | 9 |
| F.3.2. Adjudication of the File..... | 13 |
| F.3.3. Dean's Letter..... | 14 |
| F.3.4. Review of Adjudication by a Senate Review Committee | 15 |
| F.3.5. Senate Committee Report to Senate..... | 16 |
| F.3.6. Appeals to the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee | 16 |
| G. President..... | 16 |
| H. Temporal Equity..... | 16 |

A. Preamble

The modern university is a paradoxical institution, for it is part of society but belongs to posterity. The university is ideally valued as a place where the best that humankind has thought and done is kept alive, but it is often valued for its power to create thousands of skilled professionals and technicians, to generate new forms of industry, to stimulate the Gross National Product and to raise the standard of living.

If the university's role were not paradoxical, tenure would not be needed. Universities tenure their members precisely because they feel the need to preserve their responsibility to the past and the future, as well as to today's society. In an institution devoted to the pursuit of truth and the communication of knowledge, it is necessary to protect the scholar's right to search for the truth and to serve the truth as a responsible critic of both the university and society. It follows then that not only must the scholar be protected through tenure; the very process of tenuring itself must be protected. Thus the continuing members of a university must be those individuals whose achievements as teachers and scholars have proven that they are worthy of holding the university in trust for the society to which it truly belongs.

To hold the university in trust in an age of overwhelming technological change is no simple matter. In an age when knowledge doubles every decade, knowledge becomes the most dynamic feature of our lives. Thus the scholar now serves their profession in a variety of ways that cannot be simply set down in some monolithic form. Nevertheless, one can recognize that there are three general areas of activity associated with university scholars: teaching, professional achievements and service to the institution. Inside the university, members of faculty teach, do research, and create the structures that help their colleagues to teach and do research. Outside the university, members of faculty perform their professional duties in an enormously extended range of activities, e.g., government and public service, scholarly publication, lecturing, consulting, communication through the media, and even the creation of new media of communication. All these activities are essential to the university's life in society, although these activities should not be permitted to turn the university into a place where men and women simply develop their professional careers indifferent to the problems and needs of the academic community.

Thus, to evaluate a candidate for tenure and promotion, it is necessary to consider the total contribution the individual has made to the University. Given the range of activities in modern scholarship, it is foolish to establish a single linear scale on which to measure all the members of all the Faculties of the University. Since individuals are individual, there is no formula for weighting the three areas of achievement that could result in a number that would be above or below the automatic tenuring level. It is more reasonable to assume that candidates for tenure in any Faculty will have demonstrated those qualities that have earned them the respect of their colleagues at York and abroad. No committee on tenure and promotions could honestly expect that after three to six years of service all candidates for tenure would have achieved excellence in their careers; however, no committee on tenure and promotions could seriously entertain the notion that a grey competence is sufficient for tenure. Each faculty member will have to be assessed on their own merits but with an eye to the fullness of an individual's presence within the University.

The conferring of tenure is, therefore, one of the most important relationships between the University and the individual faculty member. And although the criteria for tenure are sometimes identical with those for promotion (in that a candidate's performance in teaching, professional contribution, and service to the University will be assessed in each instance), the nature of tenure is distinct from that of promotion. Tenure is primarily concerned with the scholar's right to pursue and communicate knowledge and express opinions in an atmosphere free of reprisal and with the University's right to entrust its institutional life to its best men and women. Thus the decision to grant tenure to a candidate is more critical than the decision to promote; in granting a continuing career appointment to a candidate, the University is entrusting itself to their care in concert with their tenured colleagues; in granting a promotion, however, the University recognizes the personal achievement of a meritorious candidate.

These observations are made as an introduction to the description of the criteria that follow for tenure and promotion. They also indicate the spirit in which the criteria should be taken. These criteria are guidelines proposed by the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions for its own guidance and for the information of the University as a whole. They are intentionally flexible, and require application and amplification according to the explicit standards that are expected to be provided by each and every Faculty and department/division/school. In light of the many and different types of academic progress co-existing in a complex university like York, the Senate Committee's criteria can reflect only those standards common to the University as a whole. The Senate Committee must rely on the individual Faculties and departments/divisions/schools to supplement these general criteria with specific applications to their particular disciplines. It is implicit, however, that the particular standards of each Faculty will be in accord with the University criteria. Only in this way may the Senate Committee perform its mandate to ensure that the procedures and criteria used in the evaluation were applied fairly and equitably and in accordance with University standards.

B. The Description of Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Set out below is a description of the criteria which reflects the University standards:

The Senate Committee requires explication of the standards employed in the evaluation of candidates by individual departments/divisions/schools and Faculties. In keeping with the University's commitment to foster a climate of respect for equity, diversity, and Indigenity, diversity, standards for tenure and promotion must recognize research and professional contributions in an equitable way. This includes acknowledging diverse career paths, traditions and values, ways of knowing, including Indigenous knowledges, methodologies, and practices, ways of engaging the community through community-engaged scholarship and forms of communicating knowledge.

Because promotion and tenure primarily affect junior members of the academic community, the following criteria are described so that they may constitute not only a basis for evaluation after performance, but also a means of encouraging junior faculty before and during performance.

B.1. Teaching

Members of faculty perform many functions, but all are teachers. At the level of the university, teaching is itself an expression of scholarship. In an age of intense specialisation generating an information explosion, the scholar who can take information and synthesise it into coherent structures of knowledge is performing an essential and sophisticated task. To be able to create an intelligible and intelligent university course is a very significant accomplishment. The facile distinction between teachers and researchers comes from another era when a graduate education conferred upon the teacher a long-lasting competence in a single field. Today disciplines interpenetrate to such a degree that the researcher cannot rest tranquilly secure in their area of expertise, and the teacher cannot rest secure that a gentle summer's preparation will be sufficient scholarship for a good introductory course.

To assess the quality of a candidate's teaching, there are certain standards which can and should be applied within the University. The content of the teaching must be evaluated — whether it is conventional and routine, or whether scholarship is revealed through research, analysis, reflection, synthesis and the expression of original work. The effectiveness of communication must also be considered, since communication is the essence of good teaching. The performance of the candidate must be assessed in terms of specific situations — i.e., with undergraduate or with graduate students, in groups and tutorials, in the laboratory or in the field or in the community, in small or large lectures. A candidate may be more effective in one situation than in others. While no one situation should be given a premium value to the detriment of others, a candidate should be superior in at least one area of teaching.

The judgement of colleagues must be brought to bear on the assessment of teaching performance; reliance on mere hearsay should be avoided. The direct expression of students' evaluation of teachers should be solicited. Without a concrete, highly specific and well-supported evaluation of a

teacher's performance, the Senate Review Committee will return a dossier with a request for more information.

B.2. Professional Contribution and Standing

In most cases distinction within a profession arises from the communication of knowledge or skills through public service and community engagement, scholarly publication, or the production of works of art. Although publication and performance are not in themselves a guarantee of excellence, one recognises that these kinds of professional activity are addressed to communities larger than York University and that, therefore, they must be judged in this larger professional context. In certain cases a distinguished public expression constitutes *prima facie* evidence that the quality of the work has been assessed and found to be of a high standard; in other cases it may be necessary to solicit assessments from specialists in the same field.

When the candidate has written or produced a work as part of a team or group in a research project, including in the context of community-engaged scholarship, the nature of their contribution must be assessed.

Intellectual achievement may also be manifested by studies or activities that have been commissioned by governments, communities or by private institutions. Contributions of this kind are significant, but they can be uneven and should always be evaluated by a recognised authority in the same field.

Generally, the quality of a candidate's scholarship will be evaluated in the light of judgements by reputable scholars, augmented where relevant by the judgement of community experts; in cases where there may be division within a discipline, the File Preparation Committee should describe the nature of the conflict among schools of thought and present the Adjudicating Committee with a wider range of professional opinion. Where the candidate is relatively junior, judgement should point not only to immediate achievement, but to the promise or lack of promise for further development.

The work performed by members of faculty for public and private institutions and for community constituencies or organizations is indeed an integral part of the relationship between the University and the community. Communication with the general public in a variety of forms and media will be a continuing necessity for the modern university, and outstanding contributions of faculty in this area must be recognised. Service in the context of community-engaged scholarship to various public agencies, presentation of lectures and talks to other than professional audiences, performances with radio and television networks — all such activity should be documented as evidence of any special capacity to enhance the intellectual relationship between the University and the community.

These activities must not be separated from the other criteria; they will be weighed in relation to the central core of responsibility which belongs to every member of faculty not only to transmit but to extend the boundaries of perception, understanding and knowledge.

B.3. Service to the University

Service to the University will take many forms. Service to the University is performed by faculty members through participation in the decision-making councils of the University and through sharing in the necessary administrative work of departments/divisions/schools, Faculties, the University or the Faculty Associations not otherwise counted under professional contribution and standing. Reviewers will attempt to discriminate among the kinds of administrative work in which a faculty member has participated. Contributions through committees and administrative offices should be assessed as an area for the display of knowledge and good judgement in the creation of new courses, programs, Faculties and Colleges.

The work of some committees is routine; obligations to serve on them from time to time are implicit in being a member of faculty and deserve no special weight. Committees relevant to the making of academic policy, or major duties assumed at the request of the University or assumed on behalf of the Associations which have led to its improvement, are clearly more important and will be given proper consideration.

In exceptional cases the University must recognise its responsibility for the fact that the growth of a candidate's scholarly and academic development may have lagged because of the large demands which important administrative work has made upon their time. In such circumstances the Senate Committee will require full information from persons familiar with the extent and nature of the candidate's participation in a major service activity.

B.4. Application of the Tenure and Promotion Criteria

The Senate Committee requests explication of the standards employed in the evaluation of candidates by individual departments/divisions/schools and Faculties in accordance with these criteria. All recommendations for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor require either demonstrated superiority (excellence) in a minimum of one of the three categories outlined above, with at least competence demonstrated in teaching and in professional contribution and standing, or at least high competence in all three categories.¹ Without diminishing or detracting from existing scholarly expectations, standards for tenure and promotion must, as relevant, recognize and provide an appropriate basis for the assessment of community engaged scholarship encompassing all three areas of professional responsibility, where community may be local, national or international.

The Senate Committee will review the standards set forth by Faculties and departments/divisions/schools; it will also undertake to ensure that standards are uniformly applied throughout the University. The level of achievement required for the granting of tenure and promotion is identical for first, second and third year Candidacy consideration.

C. Eligibility for Professorial Ranks and Tenure

A university scholar is a professional person devoted to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and service to the University. Promotion, although it may be associated with seniority within the University, must in its essential nature be related to the University's recognition of a scholar's real achievements.

In keeping with the University's commitment to foster a climate of respect for equity and diversity, standards for tenure and promotion must recognize research and professional contributions in an equitable way. This means acknowledging diverse career paths, traditions and values.

The following outline of promotion through the ranks is a mere average profile; it is put forth to give members of faculty a general notion of what is to be expected; it is not, however, a set of rules. Candidates for tenure and promotion will move at varying rates, according to their own patterns of professional growth.

C.1. Professorial Ranks

C.1.1. Assistant Professor

In some Faculties promotion to this rank is seen as automatic upon the completion of a PhD; in other Faculties this degree is not an appropriate indication of achievement. Clearly, it is possible for junior scholars to demonstrate that they are already mature professionals who have completed their training and have embarked upon their careers. The Committee is sensitive to the different indications of this level of achievement prevailing in the different departments/divisions/schools and Faculties. The Committee will not use a single scale to judge all candidates, but will be guided by the initiating unit's and the Faculty's own criteria.

¹ It is the Senate Committee's interpretation of Senate's action on 27 May 1976 that Senate wished to downplay service slightly when excellence in teaching or professional contribution and standing is involved, but that Senate did not wish to eliminate it completely as a consideration in such cases. Even when a claim for excellence is made in teaching or professional contribution, it is essential that the area of service be fully documented and evaluated. (24 June 1976)

Nevertheless in all the Faculties of the University, an Assistant Professorship should mean that the years of apprenticeship are over and that the student has now become a scholar.

C.1.2. Associate Professor

An Associate Professor is a matured scholar whose achievements at York and/or elsewhere have earned their colleagues' respect as an individual of superior qualities and achievements. A normal expectation of promotion to Associate Professor would be between three to six years of service in the rank of Assistant Professor.

C.1.3. Professor

A Professor is an eminent member of the University whose achievements at York and/or in their profession have marked them as one of the scholars from whom the University receives its energy and strength. Clearly this level of achievement cannot be identified with serving several years as an Associate Professor; nevertheless, the rank should not be considered a form of apotheosis. The rank of Professor should be within the expectancy of all Associate Professors.

C.2. The Relation of Promotion to Tenure

The Preamble has expressed the distinction between the principle of tenure and the principle of promotion. The decision to grant tenure is one of the most important relationships between the faculty member and the University, since it confers upon the scholar a continuing career appointment. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that a candidate, who has been judged to have met the standards for tenure, normally will also merit promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

An exceptional case, where tenure may be granted and promotion delayed, may involve individual circumstances such as one or more of the following, for example:

- (a) medical circumstances — where certain extended and severe medical problems have delayed a candidate from realising their promise;
- (b) major change in field of academic concentration;
- (c) documented high promise of excellence or high competence in the three criterion categories to be realised in the immediate future (i.e., no longer than two years);
- (d) exceptional conditions where extraordinary service was rendered by a candidate.

Granting tenure and delaying promotion shall normally be reserved for candidates in their final year of candidacy.

D. Appointments Leading to Tenure

D.1. Classes of Full-Time Appointments

Full-time appointments to the faculty of York University fall into the following classes:

- (a) those that confer probationary status, implying that the University will give serious consideration to the granting of tenure;
- (b) those which place the faculty member in a "Separate Stream" of faculty, under the terms of Senate legislation approved 22 June 1972;²

² For purposes of this document, "Separate Stream" and "Teaching Stream" are equivalent.

- (c) those which confer tenure, which is awarded only to faculty members of professorial rank or at the senior levels of the Separate Stream;
- (d) those made in exceptional cases, where the University finds it necessary to make appointments with a contractually limited term, carrying no implication of renewal or continuation beyond the stated term and no implication that the appointee is on probation for a permanent appointment.

D.2. Probationary Appointments

Most initial appointments at York are probationary. The purpose of the probationary appointment is to provide the University and the candidate an opportunity for mutual appraisal. Probation does not imply that tenure and promotion will be granted, but it does imply that the University gives serious consideration to such an appointment during that period.

Two sequential probationary periods are used at York:

D.2.1. Pre-Candidacy

Assistant Professors and Lecturers normally become pre-candidates upon appointment. The period of Pre-Candidacy will not normally exceed three years. The purpose of Pre-Candidacy is to allow the adjudicating unit time to determine whether it wishes the individual's appointment to be continued into Candidacy. Normally, an individual will successfully move from Pre-Candidacy to Candidacy. This transition allows the unit to assess and advise the candidate. Units will review a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional contribution and standing, and service. Procedures to be followed in making this determination are to be found in the "*Procedures Governing Decisions on Advancement to Candidacy*". The Dean³ of the Faculty shall inform the Secretary of the University of the final decision in each case.

D.2.2. Candidacy

During the period of Candidacy, which extends up to three years beyond Pre-Candidacy, the eligibility of the person for a continuing appointment, i.e., tenure, must be determined by the adjudicating unit by 1 November of the year in which the candidate's file comes forward. Under no circumstances can a faculty member be required to come up for consideration for tenure (and/or promotion) in the first year of Candidacy if they do not wish so to be considered. The adjudicating unit must prepare a complete file for all members of faculty not later than their second year of Candidacy. The decision of the Adjudicating Committee must be sent to the candidate by 1 November. The complete file shall be forwarded to the Review Committee, regardless of the recommendation, which may be positive, negative or delay. A recommendation to delay is realistic only if substantial change is necessary to allow a positive recommendation. Where a delay recommendation is first made, the candidate shall be informed of the reasons for that recommendation by that body. For those candidates for whom a final decision has not been made in the second year of Candidacy, a positive or negative recommendation must come forward from the adjudicating unit and be sent to the candidate before 1 December of the third year of Candidacy. In any reconsideration of cases where a previous delay or negative decision has been made, all the material contained in the previous file shall be retained and brought before each committee that reconsiders the case.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, any promotion and tenure decision must be based solely on information contained in the candidate's file.

³ For purposes of this document, *Dean* refers to Faculty Deans and the Principal of Glendon.

D.2.3. Length of Probationary Period

The two phases, Pre-Candidacy and Candidacy, may not total more than six years. In the exceptional case of Pre-Candidacy lasting four years and the individual then being moved into Candidacy, the period of Candidacy shall be two years, those years being, in the terms of this document, the first year and the final year of Candidacy.

D.2.4. Extension of Probationary Period for Pregnancy or Primary Care Giver Leave

For those faculty members appointed in the probationary/tenure stream, candidates who qualify for pregnancy or primary care giver leave shall, upon request, receive an extension of their probationary period for one year. Normally, candidates must have qualified for pregnancy or primary care giver leave and must have made the request for an extension prior to the adjudicating unit's decision on their Candidacy 3 application. The Secretary of the University must be informed of all such extensions.

D.2.5. Termination of a Probationary Appointment

The termination of a probationary appointment is not the specific concern of the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions. Candidacy is a protected period, during which a faculty member's appointment may be terminated only for cause, by a negative decision on tenure, or for budgetary reasons. In any event, for candidates for tenure, and for faculty who have served as full-time probationary appointees for three years or more, notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed shall be given no later than one calendar year before the appointment is to terminate.

D.3. Initial Appointment as Lecturer

The status of Lecturer varies in the University from department to department and from Faculty to Faculty. It represents an initial appointment and temporary status, subject to the following guidelines:

- (a) Each person appointed to the rank of Lecturer shall be informed in writing at the time of appointment as to what conditions and length of service are expected to be fulfilled for subsequent promotion to the Assistant Professor rank. A faculty member shall not remain in the Lecturer rank for longer than three years.
- (b) Promotion from Lecturer to Assistant Professor is not a matter for express action by the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions. Such promotions shall be made using the standard appointment form.

D.4. Initial Appointment as Assistant Professor

Persons appointed initially at the rank of Assistant Professor will enter into the Pre-Candidacy period. Progression through Pre-Candidacy and Candidacy will be governed by performance and by the norms governing progress in the particular departments/divisions/schools and Faculty, provided that the decision regarding tenure is taken before the end of the sixth year of service. It is possible that the Pre-Candidacy and Candidacy periods may be shortened in the case of persons with service elsewhere. *The Dean shall inform the Faculty Tenure and Promotions Committee and the Secretary of the University of the decision in each case.*

D.5. Initial Appointment as Associate Professor or Professor

In the case of candidates whose initial appointment at York was made at the level of Associate Professor or Professor, the first year of service would initiate the Candidacy phase unless an agreement to the contrary has been reached between the University and the candidate. Thus, it is

the responsibility in such cases for the initiating unit to forward a recommendation for tenure not later than the second year of Candidacy whether the recommendation be positive, negative, or delay. Normally, a faculty member appointed at this level should have completed one year of service with the University before being proposed for tenure.

D.6. Denial of Tenure

A faculty member denied tenure during the Candidacy phase of a probationary appointment shall be given notice of termination on or before 30 June in the year in which the decision to deny tenure is made, that the next academic year commencing 1 July and concluding 30 June shall be the terminal year of employment. Reappointment for a subsequent period would be most unusual, and conditions regarding such appointments shall be governed by the approved document "*Appointments for Contractually Limited Terms*".

E. Sabbaticals and Leaves of Absence

The period spent on sabbatical leave will count as service even though the faculty member is not engaged at York in teaching and other normal activities of University life. On the other hand, leaves of absence other than sabbaticals may extend from short to very long periods of time. In every case of leave of absence, provision for credit or non-credit of such time to the years of service to York University should be arranged in advance by written agreement between the candidate, the Chair of the department/division/school and the Dean.

F. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

F.1. Overview of the Process

1. Proceedings to assess a candidate for tenure and/or promotion will normally be initiated by the Dean or department/division/school Chair of the candidate's home unit (the initiating unit). Proceedings may also be initiated by the candidate or by other interested parties within the academic body of the University. Except for applications for tenure in Candidacy 2 or 3, which are required to be prepared and assessed, no file will be prepared without the consent of the candidate.
2. A file will be prepared for each candidate under the direction of a File Preparation Committee and assessed in the first instance by an Adjudicating Committee.
3. The complete file will proceed from the Adjudicating Committee, via the Dean of the candidate's home Faculty, to a Review Committee involving Senate. The file will then pass to the President for their recommendation to the Board of Governors. A candidate may ask for reconsideration of their file by any committee tendering a negative or delay recommendation.

F.2. General Rules

1. Deliberations of all adjudicating or reviewing committees shall be *in camera* and completely confidential.
2. The candidate shall have the right to appear in person, with or without a representative, before any adjudicating or reviewing body in the tenure and promotion process, for the purpose of making a statement or providing clarification with respect to substantive or procedural matters concerning their file. A written record of the statement and/or information so obtained shall be added to the file and forwarded to the candidate.
3. Candidates shall have the right to review their complete file at any stage subject to the exceptions outlined in F.3.1.6. *Confidentiality and the Candidate's Right to Know*.

4. Whenever it is required that a report or letter be copied to a candidate, it shall be sent by priority post (or such alternative service as will guarantee secure delivery within two business days).
5. The candidate shall be kept informed in writing about the progress of their case at each point where a recommendation is made to the next higher committee and shall be given 15 days from the date of mailing of the notification at each point to provide additional material before the file is forwarded to the next committee.
6. To the extent possible, those responsible for nominating members to adjudicating and reviewing committees will strive to ensure broad representation of disciplines or sub-disciplines and to ensure representation of both men and women. No person shall serve simultaneously on tenure and promotions committees (including the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee) at different levels.
7. Each Faculty shall have a Tenure and Promotions Committee, elected in accordance with its normal procedures.
8. In Faculties without departments, divisions or schools, the Faculty Committee will serve as the Adjudicating Committee.
9. Where files are prepared and adjudicated in departments, divisions or schools, the Faculty Committee, augmented by two members seconded from the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions, will act as a Review Committee. In addition, they will review standards applied in local units to ensure that they are in accordance with Faculty standards and criteria.
10. If a member of the Review Committee has considered a file as a member of an adjudication committee they shall not take part in consideration of the file at the review level.
11. Before the adjudication of a file at the Faculty or Senate level, a candidate may challenge the participation of a member of the Adjudicating or Senate Review Committees on the grounds of a reasonable apprehension of bias. Such a challenge must be supported by facts constituting grounds. The Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee will rule on the challenge, and if it is upheld, the committee member in question shall recuse themselves from consideration of the file.
12. In *all* Faculties, the Faculty Committee will deliberate on Faculty tenure and promotion policy and make recommendations on such policy to Faculty Council and the Dean.
13. The Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions will review adjudication in Faculties which do not have departments, divisions or schools.
14. The Senate Committee will also review changes in standards for tenure and promotion in Faculties and advise on ways to ensure that local standards are in accord with University criteria and procedures.

F.3. Procedures

F.3.1. File Preparation

F.3.1.1. General

- (a) Files shall be prepared in the initiating unit by a committee of no fewer than three persons: one named by the candidate (ordinarily, but not necessarily, from their home unit) and two named by, and normally from, the Adjudicating Committee. All members of the File Preparation Committee shall be probationary or tenured members of faculty.
- (b) The File Preparation Committee has the responsibility of assembling a file which is complete and which fairly and accurately reflects the candidate's academic career at York and/or elsewhere. It will be responsible for presenting diverse career paths

fairly and effectively, so that candidates' professional contribution and standing, teaching and service can be equitably assessed. Where a candidate is appointed at the level of Pre-Candidacy 3 or later in the probationary period, the File Preparation Committee will make reasonable efforts to obtain teaching evidence from the candidate's previous institution, consistent with the terms of Section F.3.1.2. The File Preparation Committee will not adjudicate the file.

- (c) The only commentary provided by the File Preparation Committee shall be factual information required to contextualize the evidence in the file (e.g., background information on external referees). The candidate will be given the opportunity of reviewing any such contextualizing commentary before the file goes to the Adjudicating Committee.

F.3.1.2. Teaching

F.3.1.2(a). Evaluation by Collegial Referees

- (i) Two referees will be selected by the File Preparation Committee and one by the candidate. Such referees will be internal to York; however there may be cases where it is appropriate to solicit the opinions of referees outside the University.
- (ii) Referees for teaching shall be provided with copies of course outlines, assignments and handouts, and such other materials as the candidate deems relevant.
- (iii) Candidates may wish to prepare a teaching dossier for the use of referees, encompassing course materials, a statement of teaching philosophy, reflections on pedagogical strategies and other relevant information. The teaching dossier shall not ordinarily become part of the tenure/promotion file. Candidates should consult the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning's *Guide to Teaching Assessment and Evaluation* and *Teaching Documentation Guide* for more details and may seek advice from the Centre for the Support of Teaching.
- (iv) The three referees shall visit classes taught by the candidate and observe his/her teaching, taking care to ensure coverage of all relevant teaching formats (e.g., lecture, seminar, studio, etc.).
- (v) When the File Preparation Committee determines it is appropriate, the Committee will solicit letters of reference on teaching from those faculty members and teaching assistants with whom the candidate has taught.

F.3.1.2.(b). Evaluation by Students

- (i) The File Preparation Committee will:
 - (a) ensure that teaching evaluation is conducted wherever the candidate teaches;
 - (b) compile a random sample of student names from the candidate's most recently taught graduate and undergraduate classes and solicit letters from the students commenting on the candidate's teaching;
 - (c) invite graduate students who have previously been supervised by the candidate to write letters of reference concerning the candidate's teaching.

- (ii) The candidate may add additional names to comprise up to one-third of the students solicited.
- (iii) Only signed letters and comments shall be included in the file.
- (iv) Units are encouraged to ensure that student evaluations of teaching are collected in each year for probationary faculty. Such evaluations shall include an opportunity for students to provide confidential signed comments.

F.3.1.3. Professional Contribution and Standing

- (a) The File Preparation Committee shall compile a list of potential referees for professional contribution and standing, and the candidate will be permitted to add further names not to exceed one quarter of the total names on the list.
- (b) The File Preparation Committee shall solicit references from a minimum of three referees, external to York and at “arm’s length” from the candidate. Referees are not at “arm’s length” if the candidate has had a prior professional involvement with them (e.g., as thesis supervisor, co-author, close colleague within the field, etc.) or has had a significant personal relationship with them.
- (c) Exceptions to the “arm’s length” rule shall be made only if, in the opinion of the File Preparation Committee, the only referees available to assess work done in a particular field are persons with whom the candidate has had a prior professional involvement. The reasons for choosing such referees should be explained in the file.
- (d) It will rarely be the case that references should be sought from more than five or six referees. However, applications for promotion to senior ranks may require more external references than those for tenure and promotion. When the breadth or interdisciplinarity of a candidate’s work is such that few, if any, referees will be expert in all areas of the candidate’s scholarship, it may be necessary to share responsibility for the assessment of professional contribution and standing among more than the minimum number of referees.
- (e) The File Preparation Committee shall solicit comment from co-authors/co-investigators on the nature of the candidate’s contribution to joint work (or work produced as part of a team or group).
- (f) Although no maximum number of references is specified, the File Preparation Committee shall endeavour, to the extent consistent with fairness to the candidate and with an accurate assessment of their scholarly or creative work, to limit the number of references sought.
- (g) Candidates will be advised what material is being sent to external referees and may add such other material as they believe is relevant.

F.3.1.4. Service

- (a) The File Preparation Committee shall compile a selection of referees (from both units, where a candidate is joint or cross-appointed) familiar with the candidate’s service to the University, and the candidate may add up to one-third more names (up to one-quarter of the total names on the list). Normally such referees will be internal to York; however there may be cases where it is appropriate to solicit the opinions of referees outside the University.
- (b) When it determines that it is appropriate to do so, the File Preparation Committee may solicit the opinions of referees outside of the University.

- (c) Unless the File Preparation Committee is of the opinion that the candidate has an extraordinary breadth of service that should be reflected in full in the file, references need not be solicited from more than three referees.
- (d) Candidates shall advise the File Preparation Committee of any material they believe is relevant and must be sent to referees, and provide such material to the File Preparation Committee who shall in turn provide copies to referees.

F.3.1.5. Contents of the File

The contents of a candidate's application file for tenure and/or promotion will be determined by the File Preparation Committee, in consultation with the candidate and according to Faculty and (where relevant) department/division/school guidelines, and as a minimum will include:

- (a) Copies of tenure and promotion guidelines of the candidate's Faculty and (where relevant) department/division/school;
- (b) (Candidates for Tenure) A copy of the letter advising the candidate of their advancement to Candidacy for tenure (or letter of appointment, if the candidate was appointed in Candidacy) which normally shall indicate the standards that the candidate is expected to meet if tenure and promotion are to be granted;
- (c) A *curriculum vitae* designed to provide a comprehensive record of the candidate's teaching, professional contribution and standing, and service;
- (d) A list of referees whose letters are included (with an indication which referees were selected by the candidate);
- (e) Sample copies of letters sent to solicit references;
- (f) Letters of reference;
- (g) Reviews (if available) of published scholarship or creative production;
- (h) Statements from co-authors/collaborators on the nature of the candidate's contributions to joint work;
- (i) Statistical summaries and analysis of all quantifiable material, together with any signed comments, from student teaching evaluations;
- (j) A candidate's personal statement, if any. Candidates will be encouraged to include a brief personal statement (normally not more than 2000 words). Such a statement will normally provide an assessment of one's career progress and an explanation of any anomalies (e.g., career interruptions);
- (k) If applicable, any other material about their joint or cross-appointment that the candidate thinks is appropriate should be included.

F.3.1.6. Confidentiality and the Candidate's Right to Know

- (a) The candidate shall be apprised of the names of all referees solicited on their file. (Referees are to be identified in the file as being nominated by the candidate or the initiating unit.)
- (b) The candidate may review all material in their file, except for original copies of letters of reference from colleagues or students, or original copies of signed student comments from course evaluation questionnaires.

F.3.1.7. Letters of Reference and Evaluations

- (a) The File Preparation Committee shall inform referees that letters of reference must be written in such a form that the writer's name, address and all contextual information will be contained in a header and shall inform referees that the header and signature will be removed or masked and the remaining text of the letter will be photocopied and provided to the candidate.
- (b) In order to be used as part of the tenure/promotion file, comments on teaching evaluation forms shall be signed. The comments will be presented in their entirety to the candidate, minus contextual identifiers and student signatures. Comments included in tenure/promotion files will indicate from which courses they were drawn. Teaching evaluation forms shall inform students of this procedure.

F.3.2. Adjudication of the File

F.3.2.1. Adjudication

- (a) The principal substantive assessment of a candidate's file takes place in an Adjudicating Committee within the candidate's home unit.
- (b) In Faculties with departments/divisions/schools, files will be assessed by a committee constituted at the level of the department/division/school. In Faculties without departments/divisions/schools, files will be assessed by a committee constituted at the Faculty level.
- (c) For tenure files, the Adjudicating Committee will review the evidence in the file and include in a report the detailed results of votes on professional contribution and standing, teaching and service rated as excellence, high competence, competence or competence not demonstrated, and the vote on the recommendation for tenure and promotion. For promotion to Full Professor files, the Adjudicating Committee will review the evidence in the file and vote only to promote or delay.
- (d) An Adjudicating Committee will consist of a minimum of six and a maximum of eight probationary/tenured faculty and normally two, but not more than three students. A majority of faculty members on the Adjudicating Committee shall have tenure.
- (e) In units where the size of the unit makes it impossible to appoint enough members to the Adjudicating Committee, and in such other circumstances as they and the candidate agree are appropriate, the Chair (where applicable) and Dean of the unit, in consultation with the candidate, will strike a special Adjudicating Committee on an *ad hoc* basis.
- (f) Small Faculties with departments/divisions/schools may elect to constitute the Adjudicating Committee at the Faculty level, in order to avoid the problem of finding enough people to make up the Committee in very small units.
- (g) The level of achievement required for the granting of tenure and promotion is identical for first, second and third year Candidacy consideration.

F.3.2.2. Adjudicating Committee's Recommendations

- (a) The Adjudicating Committee report shall contain a decision to recommend tenure and promotion, tenure without promotion, promotion (in the case where a candidate already has tenure), delay, or rejection, with detailed reasons for the decision. In exceptional cases tenure without promotion may be recommended (see C.2. *The Relation of Promotion to Tenure*).
- (b) The Adjudicating Committee shall make a recommendation of delay in the second year of Candidacy only when a file falls significantly short of the required standard.

When the Adjudicating Committee concludes that a file falls short of the required standard but the shortfall is not significant and there is clear evidence that the file will be of satisfactory strength by the following year, it shall weigh that evidence against the disadvantage to the candidate of a delay and determine whether tenure and promotion should be recommended. However, a shortfall in meeting the standards for tenure and promotion is not grounds for recommending tenure but delaying promotion which, in accordance with Section C.2., is to be recommended in exceptional circumstances and is normally reserved for candidates in their final year of Candidacy.

F.3.2.3. Adjudicating Committee's Report

- (a) The Adjudicating Committee's written report of its determination shall be sent to the Dean of the Faculty, setting forth a decision to recommend one of tenure and promotion, tenure without promotion, delay or rejection, or in cases where the candidate already has tenure, promotion or delay with clear and detailed reasons for the decision.
- (b) The report will be added to the file and copied to the candidate.

F.3.2.4. Reconsideration

- (a) The Adjudicating Committee's report will constitute notice of recommendation and the candidate will have 15 days from the date of mailing to add material in writing to the file for consideration by a Review Committee and/or, in the event of a negative or delay recommendation, to request reconsideration by the Adjudicating Committee.
- (b) Following any reconsideration, the Adjudicating Committee will add its recommendation to the file, copy it to the candidate, and send the file to the Dean for transmittal to the Senate Committee.

F.3.3. Dean's Letter

1. The Dean will write a letter of transmittal to the Senate Committee, in which they will either concur in the judgement of the Adjudicating Committee or dissent from that judgement. In the latter instance, the Dean will give reasons for their recommendation.

In cases where the file has been referred back to the Adjudicating Committee by the Senate Committee for reconsideration pursuant to F.3.4, the Dean will write a letter of transmittal to the Senate Committee as follows:

- (a) if the Adjudicating Committee did not change its judgement on reconsideration they will simply note without reasons concurrence or dissent in the judgement of the Adjudicating Committee on reconsideration;
 - (b) if the Adjudicating Committee changed its judgement on reconsideration they will either concur in that judgement of the Adjudicating Committee or dissent from that judgement. In the latter instance, the Dean will give reasons for their recommendation.
2. The Dean's letter will be copied to the candidate.
 3. The candidate will have 15 days from the date of mailing to add material in writing to the file for consideration by a Review Committee and/or, in the event of a negative or delay recommendation, to ask the Dean to reconsider their recommendation.

F.3.4. Review of Adjudication by a Senate Review Committee

1. Where the Adjudicating Committee is constituted at the level of department, division or school, the Review Committee will be constituted as a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions and composed of the Faculty Tenure and Promotions Committee with the addition of two members of the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions.
2. Where the Adjudicating Committee is constituted at the Faculty level, the Review Committee will be a duly constituted panel of the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions. Quorum for a panel will be the panel less one.
3. The Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions will consist of at least six members, elected by Senate in accordance with Senate's general procedures for election to committees and particular criteria for election to this Committee, as they may be amended from time to time by Senate.

[Note: For purposes of reviewing files, two members of the Senate Committee will be seconded to each Faculty in which files are adjudicated at the department/division /school level. Those members will also take part in review of files from non-departmentalized Faculties by the Senate Committee.]

4. In reviewing recommendations from the Adjudicating Committee, the Review Committee will not consider a file *de novo* but will evaluate the recommendation of the Adjudicating Committee to ensure that the procedures set out herein have been followed and that the criteria used in the evaluation of the file have been applied fairly and in accordance with University standards.
5. When material is added to the file after a recommendation of the Adjudicating Committee, the Review Committee shall determine whether the additional information constitutes *substantive new evidence* which might affect the Adjudicating Committee's assessment and recommendation. If the Review Committee determines that the material may affect the assessment and recommendation, it shall return the file with the additional material to the Adjudicating Committee for reconsideration.
6. When the Review Committee determines that the procedures have been followed in all material respects, that the appropriate criteria have been fairly applied and that the judgement of the Adjudicating Committee concerning application of University standards is correct, it will concur in the judgement and forward the file to the President.
7. (a) If the Review Committee concludes that the criteria and procedures have been fairly applied, but that the evidence in the file does not support the judgement of the Adjudicating Committee in that the candidate recommended for tenure and/or promotion has not met the University's standards, or that the candidate recommended for rejection or delay has in fact met the University's standards, it will add its recommendation to the file and forward it to the President.
(b) Where the Review Committee dissents from the recommendation of the Adjudicating Committee, it will provide reasons in writing.
8. When the Review Committee determines that procedures have not been followed and /or that the appropriate criteria have not been fairly applied, it shall send the file back to the Adjudicating Committee and require that the proper procedures be followed and the file be reconsidered with the criteria being fairly applied. Upon receipt of a file from the Review Committee for reconsideration, the Adjudicating Committee will meet as soon as is possible and reconsider the file in accordance with the directions of the Review Committee, make a decision, report, and return the file to the Review Committee who will review it and act in accordance with the procedures above.
9. When the Review Committee finds that there are procedural irregularities but they were not such as may reasonably be determined to affect the outcome in the particular case, it will concur in the recommendation, forward the file to the President and convey its

procedural concerns to the Adjudicating Committee for its information.

10. The Review Committee will copy the candidate on its report to the President. The candidate will have 15 days from date of mailing to, in the event of a negative or delay recommendation, request a reconsideration, to appeal where permitted (see F.3.6.) to the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee and/or to add material to the file before the file is considered by the President.

F.3.5. Senate Committee Report to Senate

The Committee shall report to Senate on its work, and that of its Sub-Committees, at least three times each year.

F.3.6. Appeals to the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee

1. Appeals against recommendations of a Review Committee shall be heard by the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee in the following circumstances: a negative recommendation by the Review Committee for tenure, or a delay decision for promotion to full professor.
2. Membership of the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee shall be six members, elected by Senate in accordance with Senate's general procedures for elections to committees and particular criteria for election to this Committee, as they may be amended from time to time by Senate. Normally nominations for election to this Committee should be of persons who have previously served on the Senate Tenure and Promotions Committee or Sub-Committees.
3. Upon receipt of the Review Committee's recommendation, a candidate may appeal to the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee and shall have 15 days from mailing of the Review Committee's recommendation to give notice in writing of such an appeal to the Secretary of the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee.
4. (a) Upon receiving notice of an appeal, the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee shall expeditiously meet and consider the candidate's file and the decisions and reasons of the preceding committees and make a decision as to the disposition of the appeal.
(b) The Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee may concur in the judgement of the Review Committee or may substitute its judgement as to the recommendation for that of the Review Committee.
(c) The Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee will provide the appellant, the Review Committee and the Adjudicating Committee with a letter setting out the disposition of the appeal and the reasons for its decision, and will report its finding to the President.
5. The Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee shall consider and rule on challenges to the participation of a member of the Adjudicating or Senate Review Committees on the basis of reasonable apprehension of bias.
6. Through its Chair, STAPAC may seek information from the Senate Review Committee (SRC) if it deems it necessary to do so. In this event:
 - (a) the appellant will be notified that submissions from the SRC will be sought and of the reasons for doing so;
 - (b) a copy of the notification to the appellant will also be provided to YUFA or OHFA as may be applicable;
 - (c) the appellant will be provided a copy of any submission received from the SRC and will be given 15 days to provide a reply, or such longer period as STAPAC determines is reasonable in the circumstances; the appellant will also be advised of their right to seek advice from YUFA or OHFA as may be applicable:

G. President

The President may exercise discretion to seek advice as they deem appropriate prior to making the final decision on a tenure and/or promotion application.

H.T emporal Equity

1. Any changes to the procedures set out herein, or to the University's criteria or standards, shall of necessity evolve slowly and incrementally. Every Faculty and (where appropriate) department/division/school shall from time to time establish explicit written standards on the basis of which the University criteria for tenure and/or promotion shall be amplified and applied.
2. The initiating unit shall advise faculty members in writing of the standards expected of members of the initiating unit, at the time of their appointment and again when they are advanced to Candidacy for tenure. The Chair of each department/division/school, or the Dean of the Faculty in non-departmentalized Faculties, shall write to each candidate advising of their advancement to Candidacy and shall, in that correspondence, assess the candidate's career to that time and indicate as specifically as possible what expectations will have to be met if tenure and promotion are to be awarded.