

Guide to the Tenure and Promotion Process For Division and University Review Committees and Deans

Introduction and Overview

The system of Tenure and Promotion at the University of the Fraser Valley (UFV) has been developed to inform, support, and enhance the professional and intellectual growth of teaching Faculty at a primarily undergraduate, teaching intensive university.

This guide is designed to support Faculty, academic staff and administrators who participate in the review and evaluation of applications for tenure and/or promotion at UFV. While these guidelines are intended to summarize the main processes described in the documents below, they should also be read in close connection with the Individual Faculty Evaluation Procedures (IPEC). In the event of any inconsistency between the contents of these guidelines and these documents, the latter are the authoritative sources.

The documents that provide the framework for review, evaluation, and decision on all applications for tenure or promotion at UFV are the:

- a) UFV – UFV Faculty and Staff Association (FSA) [Collective Agreement](#);
- b) [Terms and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion](#), which govern the conditions and expectations of Faculty work, and define the *process and structure* of rank, tenure, and promotion; and
- c) various [Faculty and Division Standards](#), which are approved by Senate and define the *criteria and standards* of Faculty work upon which the review, evaluation, and decisions on any one application for tenure or promotion at any level are made.

The Goals of the Tenure and Promotion process at UFV

In general, the goals of the tenure and promotion process at UFV are like those at other universities. UFV's process enables you, as a Faculty member, to achieve your professional, academic, and personal goals, including, but not limited to the: a) building of a culture of quality and capacity; b) support and ownership of individual goals and aims; and c) reputation and peer recognition. The process encourages career advancement by providing a transparent, fair, and formative process for growth and development that begins at the time of your first appointment and carries on through your entire career at UFV.

From a university perspective, the system supports [UFV's mission](#): Engaging learners, transforming lives, building community – yoystexw ye totilthet, ayeqet kw'e shxwaylexws, thayt kw'e st'elt'elawtexw - that communicates in a single sentence who we serve, what we do, and what impact we make. UFV's system builds and maintains professional capacity, promotes its strategic goals, grows the professoriate, and enhances its reputation. UFV's process differs from other universities in that it has been developed and implemented with the clear understanding that UFV is a teaching intensive university.

Principles

Throughout, the implementation and application of UFV's system of tenure and promotion subscribes to the following principles:

- a clear, transparent, and confidential process for the review, assessment, and decisions on Candidates' applications;
- deliberations by Division Review (DRC), University Review (URC) and University Review Appeal (URAC) Committees governed by procedural fairness, and the highest standards of professionalism, discretion, and equity;
- full public knowledge of, and agreement on, the Standards of teaching, scholarship, and service set by the academic units and approved by Senate;
- assessment of Candidates' applications only on the Senate approved Standards specifically applicable to the Candidate's Faculty or division (or faculties or divisions in the case of cross-disciplinary applications);
- the even application of Standards to all Candidates' applications;
- evaluation of Candidates' applications based only on information in the Candidate's Tenure and Promotion File (TPF);
- decisions based on the evidence and without favour or prejudice;
- the right of Candidates to be heard and to know what is being decided and why; and
- decisions made in an efficient and timely manner.

University-Wide Principles

Below are excerpts from the [University-Wide Principles for the Establishment of Criteria for Faculty Standards](#) for each of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, which inform the Faculty/academic unit standards (pp. 3-4).

Associate Professor

For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the University places particular emphasis on the quality of work accomplished and meaningful contribution made to the areas of teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Standards for the rank of Associate Professor should stipulate the expectancy of progression from the baseline stipulated for the Assistant level.

An Associate Professor:

- a) demonstrates proficiency in teaching and provides evidence of effectiveness, creativity, and meaningful reflection on teaching and the support of student learning. They will have facilitated the students' own process of discovery and application of what they learn both within and outside the classroom. They set an example of ethical practice for students in the pursuit, construction, and application of knowledge.
- b) has established a record of achievement within an established program of scholarly activities. This will include critical review by peers and dissemination of one's research, scholarship, or creative work through professional networks appropriate to the field of practice.
- c) has established a record of sustained and meaningful contributions of service to the University, the academic community, and/or the community at large.

Professor

Promotion to Professor recognizes the exceptional contributions of Faculty members in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Standards for the rank of Professor should stipulate the expectancy of progression from the requirements stipulated for the Associate level.

A Professor:

- a) is recognized by students and peers for distinguished and innovative teaching. They contribute to enriching UFV's pedagogical practices through curriculum development and mentorship of peers in relation to teaching.
- b) has attained distinction and wide recognition in their scholarly activities.
- c) has established a record of substantial and meaningful contributions in service, including capacity building and leadership.

Appointment and the Initial Probationary Period

The following sections apply to new permanent full or part time teaching Faculty initially appointed to a Tenure-track position at the rank of Assistant Professor. They do not apply to sessional or limited term Faculty appointments, but they do apply, with some modifications, to permanent full or part time teaching Faculty who, at the date of appointment, already hold a Tenure-track or ranked Tenured position at another recognized university.

New Tenure-track Faculty initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor may apply for tenure during the third year of employment, but most will do so during the fourth, and, excepting in the case of an approved request for an extension or deferral, not later than the fifth. During this period, the normal length of which is five years of continuous employment, both UFV and the Tenure-track Faculty member are afforded multiple opportunities for mutual appraisal. Guidelines for applications by Tenured Associate Professors for promotion to Professor are addressed separately at the end of this document.

The Initial Probationary Appointment

For the first two years of the Tenure-track appointment the new Faculty member is appointed to an initial probationary position, which normally includes two teaching semesters in each year, and during which the university holds the right to dismiss or lay off the member for stated reason.

At the time of appointment, the Dean or Department Head will provide the Faculty member with the relevant Standards on which they will be evaluated. They will be informed that, for the purposes of Tenure and Promotion, their performance will be assessed using a weighting that allocates a minimum of 60% to teaching; a minimum of 20% to one of research, scholarship and creative activities or service; and a minimum of 10% to the remaining component.

At the time of hiring, the Dean, in consultation with the appropriate Department Head, will also appoint a three-member Individual Probationary Evaluation Committee (IPEC) comprising two departmental members,

one of whom will be the Chair, and one non-departmental member. The IPEC will meet with the Faculty member to review the criteria and explain what can be expected during the initial probationary period.

While it is the Tenure-track Faculty member who declares the weightings on how they wish to be evaluated, they do not have to make this declaration at the start. Following successful completion of the initial probationary period, the Faculty member will make that declaration when they apply for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and should be encouraged to think about how they wish to be assessed as they move through the Tenure-track process.

While the second probationary period leading up to the award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is continuous with, and informed by progress through, the initial probationary period, **they are procedurally two distinct processes**. The initial probationary period falls under the review of the Dean, with input by the Department and the IPEC. The award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor falls under the review of the DRCs and URC, with input by the Dean.

The initial probationary period is divided into two years (normally two teaching semesters in each).

During Year 1, the IPEC ensures that all data required for the Individual's Probationary Evaluation File (IPEF) is collected. This includes student evaluations; classroom observations by IPEC members; departmental colleague evaluations; course syllabi, exams, and assignments; records of service and scholarship; curriculum vitae; and self-evaluation. The IPEF is maintained in the Dean's office, but available at all times to the probationary Faculty member being evaluated.

Towards the end of Year 1, the IPEC reviews the data to ensure that the IPEF is complete and uses reasonable efforts to collect any information that might be missing; it is the probationary Faculty member who bears responsibility for providing almost all of the data required for the IPEF. The IPEC advises the Dean if any information is not forthcoming. The Dean will determine whether the absence of any required information reflects a concern with performance or extenuating circumstances beyond the immediate control of the probationary Faculty member.

At least **two weeks prior to the end of the first year**, or any other date established due to exceptional circumstances at the time of appointment, the IPEC prepares for the Dean a summary report of the probationary member's teaching, scholarship and service, based on all the data in the IPEF. The Dean decides whether to continue the probationary period and provides their decision, including reasons, to the Faculty member. The decision will be to either: a) continue to Year 2; b) extend the initial probationary period to include a third year (for effectively another two years) with reasons for same; or c) terminate the appointment.

During Year 2, the process of collecting all the required data remains the same. At least ninety (90) days prior to the completion of the initial probationary period (normally at the end of the fourth semester of regular teaching assignments [or equivalent]), the IPEC provides its second summary report of the probationary member's teaching, scholarship, and service – using the same criteria as in Year 1 but referring to only the data collected during Year 2 – to the Dean.

The Dean assesses the probationary Faculty member's performance, ensuring there is clear evidence of successful teaching as outlined in the IPEF and reflected in the scores on the [Faculty Student Evaluation Questionnaires](#), the [Probationary Faculty Classroom Evaluation Reports](#), the comments from the [Colleague Evaluation Reports](#), and evidence of contributions to research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service.

At least ninety (90) days prior to the completion of two years' full time academic work - allowing for any extension at the end of Year 1 and/or extension of the initial probationary period on account of unusual hiring date – the Dean will recommend whether the probationary Faculty member should be: a) appointed to the second probationary Tenure-track period, specifying any conditions or expectations attached; b) appointed, with tenure (if eligible under CA 12.7 (a)); or c) terminated.

Second Probationary Period

In these guidelines, the second probationary period refers to the period immediately following, and continuous with, the Dean's confirmation that an Assistant Professor on Tenure-track has successfully completed their initial probationary evaluation. Unless shortened because the Tenure-track Faculty member held tenure or rank at a previous university, or because the Tenure-track Faculty member applies for early tenure and promotion, this period normally constitutes Years 3, 4, and 5 of the entire process, and normally involves application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in Year 4, with the decision made by the President no later than June 1 in Year 5.

Substantively and in terms of process and structure, it is during this period that the responsibility to review, assess, and make a determination to award tenure and promote an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor passes to the DRCs and University Review Committee (URC) constituted under the authorities of the Procedures and the applicable Standards approved by Senate.

Responsibilities of the Dean

The Dean has two primary responsibilities under the Procedures: a) the creation of the Division Review Committees (DRCs) in their Faculty; and b) in collaboration with the DRC Chair coordinate, as required, all applications for tenure and promotion.

Between February 1 and February 28 of the fourth year of the Tenure-track appointment (normally during the eighth full semester of teaching assignment since the date of initial appointment), the Dean sends written notice to the Faculty member that they are expected to apply to be reviewed for tenure and promotion in the following year. The Faculty member is expected to confirm to the Dean their intention to apply on or before March 31. If the application is not made, employment will cease at the end of the fifth year.

Deans are reminded to confirm:

- a) whether the member is or will be on maternity, parental or long term approved disability leave and, if so, has applied to defer consideration for tenure and promotion for one year (for maternity or parental) or two years (for long-term disability) by providing written notice at least four (4) weeks prior to commencement of the leave (notice may be waived on medical grounds); or

- b) whether the member has justified exceptional circumstances to delay the consideration for one year and, if so, has applied to the Dean for such extension by March 31 of the fourth year and has been granted approval for same. Faculty members will not be granted this extension more than once except by express written permission of the President.

After the Tenure-track Faculty member has confirmed their intent to apply for tenure and promotion, the member submits **a formal letter of application** to the Chair of the relevant DRC, and their **Dossier** to the appropriate tenure and promotion file (TPF) by **May 31**.

Between March 1 and 31, Deans may also receive applications from Tenure-track Faculty in the third year of their employment who wish to apply for early tenure and promotion. If the member subsequently decides to withdraw an application for early tenure and promotion, they also need to send written notification to the Dean **before May 31**.

Prior to the first meeting of the Division Review Committee (DRC) (normally towards the end of Year 4), the Dean will provide the Candidate and DRC Chair with a **written assessment of progress since the end of the initial probationary period** (pending exceptions due to circumstances occasioned by the date of hiring and conclusion of the initial probationary period) and informs that Candidate that they can respond in writing to this assessment. Both the assessment, and the Candidate's response, if any, will be added to the TPF.

It is the primary responsibility of the Candidate to ensure that the TPF is complete prior to the first meeting of the DRC (typically in October). The [TPF should include:](#)

- Letter of Application
- Tenure and Promotion Dossier
- Dean's Summary Report of the Initial Probationary Period
- Dean's Written Assessment of Progress Since the End of the Initial Probationary Period (and the Candidate's response to it, if any)
- Student Evaluations
- Peer Evaluations
- Letters of Assessment from External Reviews (**Promotion to Professor only**)

In addition to the Dean's Summary Report and Written Assessment listed above, the Dean must also provide any required student evaluations the Candidate may be missing to ensure the Candidate is able to submit a complete TPF. The Dean is also responsible for including any other materials relevant to the decision-making process, such as disciplinary actions, in a sufficiently timely manner so that the Candidate can respond to them and have those included in their TPF as well.

During all deliberations of the DRCs or URC, Deans may be asked to appear before the committee to answer questions about the application. A written record of all questions and the Dean's answers will be included in the TPF.

Additional roles of the Dean (and DRC) in applications for promotion to Professor

No later than May 31 of the year of application, an Associate Professor applying for promotion to Professor must submit the names and contact information for two external reviewers to the Dean of their Division. Without consultation with the Candidate, the Dean will consult with the head of the Candidate's Division to obtain the names and contact information for two external reviewers. Each name must be accompanied by a brief description of the individual's qualifications to serve as a reviewer.

- Reviewers should normally be recognized academics who hold or have held the rank of Professor.
- In exceptional circumstances, the Dean may consider up to one external reviewer with equivalent expertise of Professor. For disciplines where appropriate external reviewers do not normally hold the rank of Professor, the Dean may consider reviewers with appropriate expertise.
- External reviewers cannot be members of the Candidate's family and they cannot have held or currently hold appointments at UFV.
- Reviewers cannot have served as the Candidate's graduate and/or postdoctoral supervisor or have collaborated with the Candidate in a meaningful way in five years prior to the application.

The Dean will ensure that recommended reviewers **have no material or perceived conflicts of interest** with the Candidate. The Dean will inform the Candidate of the names of the reviewers recommended by the DRC. The Candidate has the opportunity to challenge any name by stating substantial reasons. The Dean will consider the Candidate's challenge before making a final decision. The Dean will then select one name from each of the two lists and send a Letter of Request to Review to both.

If none of the reviewers are able to provide an assessment, the Dean will ask the Candidate and the head of the Candidate's Division to provide a supplementary list of two potential reviewers each (including names, contact information, and brief description of their qualifications to serve as reviewers). If the Candidate and the head of the Candidate's Division are unable to provide supplementary names that are available to serve as external reviewers, the Dean will make all reasonable efforts to identify and secure two suitable reviewers.

The Dean will forward the Candidate's Dossier, in PDF format, along with **the collated numeric results of the Candidate's teaching (student) evaluations**, to the two external reviewers who agree to provide an assessment of the Candidate. The Dean will inform the external reviewers that UFV is primarily an undergraduate teaching institution and that the Dossier and teaching evaluations must be evaluated according to the Standards. The Dean shall make reviewers aware that they need not evaluate areas or components on which they may not feel qualified to comment.

The Dean will provide the Candidate with anonymized copies of the external reviewers' assessments and offer the Candidate an opportunity to respond in writing to the assessment. If any external assessment is not submitted by the time the DRC begins its deliberations the lack of assessment will not prejudice the Candidate and the DRC will proceed with the review.

Responsibilities of the DRC Chair

Throughout the review process, it is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the:

- a) contents of the TPF are known and made available at all times to the Candidate;
- b) TPF is closed five (5) business days prior to the first meeting of the committee; and
- c) TPF is available to all members of the DRC reviewing the application.

The Procedures require that all applications for tenure or promotion proceed in a timely manner. As described in the [Timelines for Tenure and Promotion Process at UFV](#), this means that the initial meeting of a DRC will normally be **on or as soon possible after October 1 of the review year**. A DRC may meet earlier, provided the Candidate and/or Dean have included all the required components of the TPF and the Candidate knows when the TPF will be closed.

Prior to the opening of the TPF, the Chair contacts all committee members, including alternates, to confirm they have completed the required UFV training, informs them that the TPF is ready for review, and provides them with a copy of the Senate-approved Standards for that Division.

The Chair calls the first meeting of the DRC – to be held no sooner than five (5) business days after closure of the TPF – and confirms that all members have had an opportunity to review the TPF and understand the criteria and how they are to be applied. The Chair reminds all members of the requirements for confidentiality and need to declare if they are in a conflict of interest on the application.

All DRC members shall endeavour to participate in all meetings of the Committee. A member who misses two consecutive regular meetings will be deemed to have resigned from the DRC and will be replaced by the alternate. No DRC member present (physically or in exceptional cases by technological means) at the deliberations of a DRC may abstain from voting, even if the DRC member has not been present at all previous meetings where the application was considered. No DRC member may vote unless they are present at the meeting.

Throughout the review process, the Chair ensures that the TPF is available to all members at all times. They prepare the agenda and minutes of the meeting, circulating them to members for approval as required, and keeps a record of attendance. They lead the discussion of the application for tenure or promotion, reminding members that their assessment of the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service must be restricted to, and justified according to the criteria in the Senate-approved Standards.

If, at any time, the majority of the committee deems it necessary, the Chair may ask the Dean or Candidate in writing to provide clarification of any information and/or material contained in the TPF. Both the request for and the response, if any, will be included in the TPF. Similarly, if, at any time, the majority of the committee deems it necessary, the Chair may request that the Dean or the Candidate appear before the committee at a subsequent meeting. It is the Chair's responsibility to keep a record of all questions and answers posed to, and received from, a Candidate or Dean by committee members and include these in the TPF.

After deliberating on an application and determining whether or not the Candidate meets the Standards, all the committee members present, with the exception of the Chair and with no abstentions, vote on a motion framed in the affirmative: **that the Candidate will be granted tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; or promotion to Professor.** The DRC's recommendation will be determined by a majority of the ballots cast and each member will, after the ballot is taken, state the reasons that were persuasive in their vote. The Chair will ensure that the committee's recommendation is substantive and relates to the Standards.

The **Chair completes the Recommendation and Report** of the Division Review Committee and ensures that it accurately reflects the DRC's majority recommendation. They also request that any member dissenting from the majority recommendation state their reasons in writing and ensure that the dissent is appended to the

report. The Chair **forwards the DRC Recommendation and Report** to the Dean of the Division and to the URC Chair, with copy to the Candidate, ensuring that the names of the committee members are not attached to either the majority recommendation or any dissenting opinions. If the DRC recommendation is to deny tenure or promotion, the Candidate may **within fifteen (15) work days** of having received the recommendation and report provide a written response that will be included in the TPF.

Responsibilities of the DRC members

Members on all committees must familiarize themselves with UFV's policies on conflict of interest and institutional ethics. In particular, committee members cannot have acted as a supervisor of the Candidate's teaching, scholarship or service in any way that would have had a direct impact on the Candidate's employment; and they cannot have served as the Candidate's graduate or postdoctoral supervisor in the last five years. All members must hold to the requirement of strict confidentiality and declare any potential conflict of interest to the Chair in advance. **Any communication between committee members and a Candidate must be only through the Chair.**

In advance of the first meeting, all DRC members are expected to have completed the required UFV training and review the TPF on the designated secured site. During this review and at all meetings of the DRC, committee members must restrict their assessments of the Candidate's teaching, scholarship and service to the contents of the TPF and in accordance with the Senate-approved standards and criteria for each Candidate in their Division. **Members must not copy, transmit or otherwise reproduce the contents of the TPF.**

At any time, a committee member who desires further clarification of the contents of the TPF by the Candidate or requires an appearance by the Dean or the Candidate to respond to requests for clarification, will raise the question with the Chair. If it is the majority view of the committee, the Chair will either notify the Candidate in writing of the need to reply to the request for clarification or ask the Dean or the Candidate to appear before the committee.

After deliberating on the application and determining whether the Candidate meets the Standards, all DRC members present, with the exception of the Chair, vote on a motion that is framed in the affirmative: that the Candidate will be granted tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; or promotion to Professor. The DRC's recommendation will be determined by a majority of the ballots cast without abstentions and each member will, after the ballot is taken, state the reasons that were persuasive in their vote. Members dissenting from the majority vote shall provide their reasons in writing. No committee member names are attached to either the majority report or any dissenting opinions.

Responsibilities of the URC Chair

The University Review Committee (URC) is the university level committee that receives recommendations for tenure or promotion from the DRC. The URC is formed and chaired by the Provost and Vice President Academic in accordance with the requirements of the Procedures and its membership made known to the President of the UFV FSA. If the Provost is unable to Chair the committee, the Vice Provost will assume this responsibility.

Upon receipt of a Candidate's Recommendation and Report of the DRC, the Chair contacts all the URC members prior to the first meeting to ensure they have completed the required UFV training and provides each member with a copy of the Senate-approved Standards that apply to the Candidate's Division.

At the first meeting, the Chair reminds all members of the need for strict confidentiality and to declare any conflict of interest. The Chair ensures that all members have received and understand how to apply the Senate-approved Standards of the Candidate's Division, and that they have had the opportunity to review the TPF and Recommendation and Report of the DRC.

The Chair calls all meetings of the URC and ensures that a quorum of two thirds of the membership is in attendance for each. The Chair keeps a record of attendance; prepares the agenda and minutes of all meetings, circulates them for approval as required; and ensures that any member who misses two consecutive meetings is deemed to have resigned from the URC and will be replaced by an alternate. All members in attendance will be required to attest to whether the deliberations were conducted in accordance with the Procedures.

Throughout the review process, the Chair ensures that the TPF is available to all members at all times. They lead the discussion of the application for tenure or promotion. The URC will review the DRC's report and the Candidate's TPF to determine whether or not the Candidate meets the Senate-approved Standards.

If, at any time, the majority of the committee deems it necessary, the Chair may ask the Candidate to provide clarification of any information and/or material contained in the TPF. The request and any written responses to it will be included in the TPF. Similarly, if at any time, the majority of the committee deems it necessary, the Chair may request that the Dean or the Candidate appear before the committee at a subsequent meeting. It is the Chair's responsibility to keep a record of all questions and answers posed to and received from a Dean or Candidate by committee members and include these in the TPF.

After deliberating on an application and determining whether the Candidate meets the Standards, all the committee members present will vote on a motion that is framed in the affirmative: that the Candidate will be granted tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; or promotion to Professor. The URC's recommendation will be determined by a majority of the ballots cast and each member will, after the ballot is taken, state the reasons that were persuasive in their vote. The Chair will ensure that the committee's recommendation is substantive and related to the Standards.

No member present (physically or in exceptional circumstances by technological means) at the deliberations of the URC may abstain from voting, even if the URC member has not been present at all previous meetings where the application was considered. No URC member may vote unless they are present (physically or in exceptional circumstances by technological means) at the meeting. The Chair will not vote except to break a tie.

The Chair completes the URC Recommendation and Report and ensures that it accurately reflects the recommendation of the majority. They request that any member dissenting from the majority recommendation state their reasons in writing and ensure that the dissent is appended to the report. The Chair then **forwards the URC Recommendation and Report to the Dean of the Division and the President**. They will also provide a copy of the Recommendation and Report to the Candidate, ensuring that the names of the committee members are not attached to either the majority recommendation or any dissenting opinions.

If the recommendation is to deny tenure or promotion, the Candidate may submit a Notice of Appeal, including a statement of their case, to the President of the University within fifteen (15) work days.

Responsibilities of URC members

All members of a URC must have completed the required UFV training before the first meeting of the committee and be prepared to provide evidence of completion as requested by the Chair. All members must hold to the requirement of strict confidentiality and declare any potential conflict of interest to the Chair in advance. **Any communication between committee members and a Candidate must be only through the Chair.**

In advance of the first meeting, all URC members are expected to access and review the TPF on the designated secured site. During this review and at all meetings of the URC, committee members must restrict their assessments of the Candidate's teaching, scholarship and service to the contents of the TPF and in accordance with the Senate-approved standards and criteria for each Candidate in their Division. **Members must not copy, transmit or otherwise reproduce the contents of the TPF or the URC's Recommendation and Report.**

At any time, a committee member who desires further clarification of the contents of the TPF by the Candidate or requires an appearance by the Candidate or Dean to respond to requests for clarification, will raise the question with the Chair. If it is the majority view of the committee, the Chair will either notify the Candidate in writing of the need to reply to the request for clarification or ask the Candidate or the Dean to appear before the committee.

After deliberating on the application and determining whether or not the Candidate meets the Standards, all URC members present, not including the Chair and without abstentions, vote on a motion that is framed in the affirmative: that the Candidate will be granted tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; or promotion to Professor. The URC's recommendation will be determined by a majority of the ballots cast and each member will, after the ballot is taken, state the reasons that were persuasive in their vote. **Members dissenting from the majority vote shall provide their reasons in writing.** No committee member names are attached to either the majority report or any dissenting opinions.

Role and responsibilities of the University Review Appeals Committee (URAC)

It is the responsibility of the UFV President to form a University Review Appeals Committee (URAC). The URAC hears and reviews appeals from Candidates in receipt of a denial of tenure and/or promotion by the URC. A Candidate in receipt of a negative recommendation from the URC has the right to appeal that decision based on one or more of: a) a material procedural irregularity or defect in the application of the Procedures; or b) an unreasonable decision on the basis of the evidence of the improper application of the Standards. Your appeal cannot be based on the contents of the Standards themselves.

In such cases the Candidate can, **within fifteen (15) work days** of having received the URC's recommendation, submit a Notice of Appeal, including the statement of their case, to the President of the University. At that time, the Candidate must indicate whether they wish to appear before the Review Panel. Such a request will not be denied. The President will forward the Notice of Appeal to the Chair of the URAC within five (5) workdays of having received it. Your TPF will be made available to the URAC Chair within the same timeframe. The Candidate will be informed of the names of the members of the Review Panel and within three (3) work days have the opportunity to challenge those names stating substantial reason. The URAC Chair will consider the challenge and within three (3) workdays make a decision.

As may be needed, or on request of any panel member, the Review Panel will invite the Candidate to a meeting to receive additional clarification on any aspect of the appeal. Review Panel will complete its review, and the Chair will write a report and recommendation that is an accurate reflection of the Panel's deliberations, stating its reasons with specific reference to the contents of the Notice of appeal, within twenty-five (25) work days of having received the TPF. The report and recommendations of the Review Panel will be added to the TPF and submitted to the President. The recommendation to the President will be either that: a) the URC's negative recommendation be upheld; or b) the URC's negative recommendation be reconsidered.

If the URAC Review Panel determines that the grounds for the appeal have been substantiated, then it must refer the matter back to the subset of the URC that made the recommendation, giving specific reasons and any recommendations pertaining to them. The URC must address the reasons and recommendations of the Review Panel and report to the President the actions it took.

The President reviews the recommendations of the URC, or if applicable the URAC, and decides that tenure and/or promotion be granted or denied on or before June 1 of the review year. The President may not capriciously overturn a recommendation of the URC and if their decision is to deny tenure and/or promotion, must specify the reasons in writing. While the President's decision is final and not subject to appeal, the decision may be grieved as described in Article 7 of the CA.