

Summary of Changes to the 2023/2024 SAC Guide

** This revision of this SAC guide reflects key changes in the Collective Agreement between UBC and the UBCFA 2022-25 **

2 ABOUT THE PROCESS

2.2.2 Although different departments have different practices, the Agreement (Article 5.02) requires that the process begins with the Head's meeting with the pre-tenure faculty member during the first year of appointment and then each subsequent year, no later than June 30 of each year. [For tenured faculty, annual meetings are encouraged and, at a minimum, should occur at least in the two years prior to a promotion review.](#)

2.2.3 Candidates must supply [their](#) file to be reviewed no later than July 1 of the year in which the review takes place unless otherwise agreed to by the Head. A candidate is welcome to submit [their](#) file earlier. [Candidates are encouraged to provide their list of potential referees to the Head prior to July 1 and ideally between March 1 and May 15 of the year preceding the review.](#)

2.2.6 The Deans are encouraged to send in their recommendations as soon as possible and preferably by mid-March to allow the President to receive SAC's recommendations (where applicable) and to make [their](#) own decision well in advance of July 1st. See SAC's meeting dates (Section 8.4) to assist in your planning and preparation.

2.4.1 Pre-tenure faculty members may only be reviewed one time for tenure in the Professoriate or Educational Leadership stream ([Please refer to Article 2.03\(h and i\) of the Agreement](#)).

2.4.2 ... A decision to stop the review by the Head or the Dean is not subject to appeal ([Part 4, Article 13](#)) but is subject to the grievance procedure ([Part 1, Article 13](#)).

2.4.3 ... Extensions to the tenure clock for medical leave [or severe personal or professional disruption](#) will be considered on a case by case basis depending on the circumstances of each case.

... Once the faculty member has chosen to shift review schedules, it will not be [reversed](#).

2.4.4 Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of Teaching wishing to be considered early for tenure can do so by requesting an optional review for promotion ([sample letter request Appendix 5](#)), and with the consent of the Head, can be reviewed in any year (see section 2.5 below, and Article 9.01 of the Collective Agreement).

2.5.2 ... Sample Letter for Mandatory Reviews ([Appendices 6 and 7](#)). In cases of mandatory review, all recommendations, negative as well as positive, must be forwarded for consideration at the Faculty and Presidential levels.

2.5.3 ... A decision from the President to deny promotion shall not result in a terminal year for the Candidate. [Sample letter for optional review Appendix 5](#).

2.5.4 ... A decision to stop the review by the Head or the Dean must include detailed and specific reasons, and is not subject to appeal (See Articles 5.07(c), 5.11(c), and 13 of the Agreement) [but is subject to the grievance procedure \(Part 1, Article 13 of the Agreement\)](#). If a Head or Dean stops a review, the following optional review may only be stopped by the candidate. A decision to stop a review after referee letters have been obtained shall cause a 2-year delay ([from July 1 submission date](#)) before the next optional review. A decision from the President to deny promotion shall cause a 3 year delay ([from July 1 submission date](#)) before the next optional review. [Sample letter for optional review Appendix 5](#).

3 THE CRITERIA

3.1.1 ... [Under the Agreement, Indigenous scholarly activity “means research or creative activity of quality and significance that is partially or entirely in the field of Indigenous scholarship and/or in collaboration with Indigenous community partners and peoples; and the appropriate dissemination of the results of that scholarly activity.” \(Effective July 1, 2024\).](#)

3.1.6 ... [For Indigenous scholarly activity \(Article 4.03 of the Agreement\) “evidence may include a diverse set of outputs outside the general norms of any given discipline, such as but not limited to curation or creation of artistic or cultural exhibits, significant oral dissemination of research, policy development, and community engaged scholarship under the ownership of Indigenous nations. Evidence of oral dissemination shall be accessible for peer review and demonstrate impact.” \(Effective July 1, 2024\).](#)

3.1 ii) Scholarship of Teaching ~~and Learning~~

3.2.4 [The methods of teaching evaluation may vary in face-to-face, online and blended formats, but will normally include Student Experience of Instruction \(SEI\) survey results \) and a Summative Peer Review of Teaching. The summative review will normally be based on an examination of the following: quantitative Student Experience of Instruction \(SEI\) results for all six of – the University module questions including response rates, interpolated median, percent favourable, and dispersion index for each with comparative Departmental/Faculty aggregate interpolated median and percent favourable for comparable courses \(e.g. at the same year level, in a similar subject area etc.\); qualitative comments from SEI surveys about classroom](#)

teaching practices; the candidate's course materials, assignments and grading practices; the caliber of supervised essays and theses; peer reviews of teaching; and other relevant considerations. Please note UBC Vancouver's Senate Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (approved on May 16, 2007) is available on Vancouver Senate's website.

3.4.1 ... Evidence of educational leadership is required for [reappointment/tenure/promotion](#) in the Educational Leadership stream.

4 MEETINGS WITH THE HEAD

4.2.1 The Head must meet annually with all faculty members who are in pre-tenure appointments (see the Promotion Schedules in Section 2.5). While this meeting is not required by the collective agreement for post-tenure candidates for promotion, [it is best practice for faculty members to meet with their Head](#) prior to their promotion review.

5 THE CANDIDATE'S FILE

5.1.1 The CV and Publications Record should be in the UBC format. While the UBC format is [strongly recommended and preferred](#), it is recognized that the CV needs to accommodate a wide range of scholarship and [if necessary, may be slightly](#) adapted to most effectively reflect the candidate's scholarship.

5.1.3 ... Common Problems with CVs and Publication Records:

- [CV is not in UBC CV format](#)

5.2.1 ... Information gathered through Peer Review of Teaching and Student [Experience of Instruction](#) should be considered as part of the submission.

5.3.1 Evidence of educational leadership is required for [reappointment/tenure/promotion](#) in the Educational Leadership stream.

5.4.2 Both the candidate and the University have the right, up to the stage of the President's decision, to supplement the file by the addition of new information that has not been solicited for this purpose by the candidate (e.g., a new set of student [experience of instruction results](#), ...

5.5.1 External referee letters must be obtained on the quality and significance of scholarly achievements [or educational leadership achievements](#) when a review involves: (i) appointment or promotion to Associate Professor, [Associate Professor of Teaching, Professor, or Professor of Teaching](#) (ii) tenure, or (iii) denial of a reappointment (see Article 5.05 in the Agreement).

Internal referees may be used for Associate Professor of Teaching [reviews](#).

5.5.3 ...

In the case that the Head has a research affiliation with the candidate (i.e. shared publications or grants), an acting Head will be put in place for the entirety of the review process and will perform all tasks normally undertaken by the Head, including soliciting the referee letters, chairing the department meeting, communicating with the candidate if concerns are raised at the department level or additional information is required, and writing the recommendation letter to the Dean. [An acting Head may be an appropriate management plan in the event the Head has a Conflict of Interest with the candidate.](#)

5.5.11 For the purpose of considering scholarly activity [substantive](#), letters of appraisal from external referees regarding the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements must be provided when considering:

- Initial appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of Associate Professor, [or Professor](#)
- Tenure; or
- Reappointment, when the Head or the departmental standing committee considers that they may recommend denial of reappointment due to a deficiency of scholarly [activity](#).

5.5.13 ...

These letters should assess the candidate's educational leadership [achievements](#). ~~[involvement in curriculum development and innovation, and other teaching and learning initiatives. Such letters should be from referees with knowledge of the candidate's teaching contributions but not from someone with whom the candidate has co-taught; for example, a Associate Professor of Teaching or a Professor known for their outstanding teaching from another Department could be such a referee.](#)~~ Letters of appraisal should be from referees outside the candidate's immediate department. If referees external to UBC are available, such letters will be welcome and may help strengthen a case.

5.5.14 For the purpose of considering [an initial appointment at or promotion](#) from Associate Professor of Teaching to Professor of Teaching, four letters of appraisal assessing the candidate's achievements in [teaching and](#) educational leadership shall be obtained by the Head.

5.5.15 Referees in the [Educational Leadership](#) Stream should be well apprised of the different criteria that apply to this rank; in particular they should be aware that a record of scholarly publications is not required for tenure/promotions within this stream but may be included if the candidate wishes to present publications as evidence supporting their contributions to [teaching](#), educational leadership or maintaining currency in the field where appropriate.

5.5 c) Head's Letters to External Referees

Note: See Sample Letter of Request for External Referees for Review of Scholarly Activity (Appendix 7) and Sample Letter of Request for Referees for Review of ~~Teaching and~~ Educational Leadership (Appendix 8).

5.5.16 Letters of appraisal from external referees shall be obtained by the Head in consultation with the departmental standing committee when considering a candidate's initial appointment at, or promotion to, Associate Professor/~~Associate Professor of Teaching~~ or Professor/~~Professor of Teaching~~; tenure; or reappointment when either the departmental standing committee or the Head considers that they may recommend denial of reappointment ~~because of~~ deficiency in scholarly ~~activity or educational leadership~~ (see Article 5.05(a) of the Agreement).

5.5 c) ii)

- A request for the referee's ... a ~~traditional~~ research contribution).
- If the promotion in question is to Associate Professor, the referee should be made aware that at UBC this promotion includes the granting of tenure. ~~In a 7th year case, the referee should be informed that if promotion is unsuccessful, this is the final consideration for promotion and tenure at UBC.~~

5.5 c) iii)

- A request for the referee's independent opinion of the ~~candidate's educational leadership achievements~~. Reviewers should...

6 HEAD'S REVIEW AND DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION

Note 2: In the case ... ~~Appointing an acting Head may be an appropriate management plan in the event the Head has a Conflict of Interest with the candidate.~~

6.2.3 Faculty members eligible to be consulted are:

~~For initial appointments, all tenured and tenure-track members of the Department are eligible to vote on the question of initial appointment, regardless of the proposed rank.~~

~~For reappointments and promotions, those higher in rank than the candidate, except that in the case of a reappointment of a Professor those holding the rank of Professor, are eligible to be consulted.~~

~~In tenure cases, those who are tenured and of equal or higher rank. If tenure is part of an initial appointment, then a second vote must be held on the matter of tenure.~~

For the purpose of consultation, Professors and Professors of Teaching are of equal rank, Associate Professors and Associate Professors of Teaching are of equal rank, and Assistant Professors and Assistant Professors of Teaching are of equal rank.

~~On the question of tenure and promotion, only those of a rank equal or higher to the new position may vote.~~

6.2.7 Committee members at the Department level should not vote on a case unless able to participate in all formal meetings convened for that purpose at the Department level. While physical presence is preferred, [virtual attendance and participation may be an alternative](#). Eligible members who...

6.2.10 For Assistant Professors ... For pre-7th year [optional promotion](#) reviews, only one vote for promotion is required, and if successful, tenure is also granted.

6.3.2 The Head will then forward the recommendations to the Dean, including, at minimum, the following:

a) The Head's letter and departmental standing committee report as set out in Appendix 10. The letter should clearly identify the effective date of the decision in question. ~~(e.g. July 1, 2017 if review is conducted in 2018/19).~~

b) The report of the departmental committee's deliberations including a full statement by the Head of the majority and any minority opinions. This report should also contain a record of the vote [and include: the number of members eligible to vote \(not specific names\), the number present at a meeting, an explanation of absences of eligible members; and the number of votes for, against, and abstentions \(with an explanation of the latter\)](#).

[Prior to this report being forwarded to the Dean, it should be circulated to the committee for comments.](#)

c) Summary of Teaching evidence (see Evidence of Teaching in Appendix 2) ~~if included separately from the Head's letter.~~

6.4.2 In all cases other than an initial appointment, the Head must, at the time the recommendation(s) is forwarded to the Dean, inform the candidate in writing of the recommendation(s) being forwarded. (See Article 5.08 of the Agreement.) [The candidate should not be informed of the specific results of the vote.](#)

6.4.4 The Head ... [and the specific results of the vote](#). The candidate should be invited to make a timely written response to the Dean (e.g. 5-10 days), which should be added to the file.

6.4.6 In the case of an optional review, ... [but is subject to the grievance procedure, Part 1, Article 13.](#)

7 DEAN'S REVIEW AND CONSULTATION

7.1.8 For Assistant Professors ... For pre-7th year [optional promotion](#) reviews, only one vote for promotion is required, and if successful, tenure is also granted.

7.1.11 ~~It is recommended that~~ Where the Dean is considering a negative recommendation that is contrary to the recommendations from the Head and/or departmental standing committee, the Dean should provide the candidate an opportunity to respond to the serious concerns identified by the Dean prior to finalizing their decision. [Where serious concerns about the candidacy arise in the Dean's advisory committee the Dean shall inform the candidate of that fact and the reasons with sufficient particularity to enable the candidate to have a meaningful opportunity to respond and to introduce further relevant evidence. If the candidate has not already been provided with a summary of the referees' opinions \(or a redacted copy of the referees' opinions\), they shall be provided by the Dean. \(Article 5.10 of the Agreement\).](#)

7.1.12 The Dean, after considering ... Such a recommendation is not subject to Appeal as set out in Article 13 of the Agreement [but is subject to the grievance procedure pursuant to Part 1, Article 13. If an optional review is stopped by the Dean \(or Head\) only the Candidate may stop the next optional review.](#)

7.3.2 In all cases ... student [experience of instruction](#) results, ...

7.3.5 In the case of ... Such a recommendation is not subject to appeal as set out in Article 13 of the Agreement [but is subject to the grievance procedure pursuant to Part 1, Article 13 of the Agreement.](#)

8 SENIOR APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

8.1.2 SAC [normally](#) consists of [up to](#) 20 members...

8.2 Membership of SAC: [please see link for current membership](#)

8.4 Schedule of SAC ([link included instead](#))

9 NEW APPOINTMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY SAC

9.3 In the case of new appointments ... Peer [reviews](#) and student [experience of instruction results evaluations](#) from previous institutions should also be included if available. Not including these [evaluations](#) may result in delays in the review process.

10 STREAMLINED PROCESS FOR NEW SENIOR APPOINTMENTS

10.1 The streamlined process is intended for use in extraordinary circumstances only. It is designed to facilitate exceptional new senior appointments to UBC. Senior appointments include [appointments at the rank of Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Teaching, Professor, Professor of Teaching and any appointments with tenure.](#):

The streamlined process may [also](#) be used to appoint candidates to the above named ranks, [normally](#), where the candidate is being considered for a senior administrative position (i.e. Head, Dean, or Associate Dean).

[Where](#) the University may benefit...

APPENDIX 1 – GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OF TEACHING AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF TEACHING

Effective July 1, 2011, the rank of Professor of Teaching [was](#) been introduced

1. Introduction

The rank of Professor of Teaching ...

[Specifically, appointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor of Teaching requires:](#)

[...evidence of outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, distinction in the field of teaching and learning, sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, course design and other initiatives that advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandate. Initial appointments at this rank are normally tenured appointments \(Article 3.04 of the Agreement on Condition of Appointment for Faculty\) \(the "Agreement"\).](#)¹

[Candidates will also be assessed on their service to the academic profession, the Department, the University and the community \(Articles 4.01 and 4.04 of the Agreement\).](#)

2. Eligibility

[Associate Professors of Teaching are eligible for a mandatory review for promotion to Professor of Teaching beginning in the fifth year of appointment at or promotion to this rank. Candidates may request to be reviewed for promotion earlier than five years in the rank of Associate Professor of Teaching, \(i.e. an optional review\) with the approval of the Head and the Dean. However, if promotion is denied, an optional review will not be conducted for another three](#)

~~years. The case will be reviewed on the candidate's (1) achievements in teaching, learning and educational leadership and (2) service to the academic profession, the Department, the University and the community.~~

An Assistant Professor of Teaching ... of the Agreement).

An Associate Professor of Teaching may request a review for promotion in any year upon the request by the candidate. If a promotion is denied, another optional review will not be conducted for three years (Article 9 of the Agreement).

4. Candidate's File

The following list ... to document educational leadership:

- Significant contributions to curriculum development and renewal ~~that extend beyond the candidate's classroom and advance the University's ability to excel in its teaching and learning mandates.~~

APPENDIX 2 – TEACHING EVIDENCE – SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING FOR REVIEW BY SAC AND THE PRESIDENT

All recommendations ... In the case of Professors of Teaching, the higher standard of outstanding achievement in teaching. ~~which includes the development of the learning environment, is required.~~ For Associate Professors...

For candidates in either the **Educational Leadership** or Professoriate stream, the complete teaching dossier is often important in assessment for promotion and tenure by the candidate's Department, School or Faculty ~~and by the external referees.~~ However, the complete...

- Course outlines/syllabi;
- Assignments and handouts; and/or
- Full sets of **student experience of instruction results.**

In addition, SAC requests ... The assessment **should be** included as a separate document. The assessment...

Template for a Summative Review of Teaching

3. Summary of student experience of instruction (SEI).
 - a. Explanation of scale used in SEI questionnaires. E.g. ratings from 1-5, 5 is 'excellent'.
 - b. Explanation of departmental norms.

Specify how the norms are calculated. Standard deviations may be provided, if so desired.

- c. Tables of student SEI scores for all the University Module items for each course.

The tables should provide scores; if possible, for all course offerings in which the candidate teaches together with appropriate norms for those courses or level formats of instruction. If a questionnaire other than the standard SEI questionnaire is used, please provide a blank copy of the questionnaire.

“Example” Table deleted.

3 d. Replace ‘student evaluation’ with ‘SEI’.

3 e.

Examples of Summaries of Qualitative Comments from SEI

...

Assessment of Student Experience of Instruction results

7. Replace ‘evaluations’ with ‘reviews’.

8. Replace ‘teaching evaluations’ with ‘SEI’.

APPENDIX 3 – ANNOTATED CV FOR THE PROFESSORATE STREAM

8 (a) Candidates are encouraged to provide a concise statement of teaching philosophy or approach to teaching especially where such statements affect the way [peer reviews or student experience of instruction results](#) could be ...

APPENDIX 4– ANNOTATED CV FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP STREAM

8 (d) summary of student [experience of instruction scores](#) over the past five years (or since appointment if less than five years)

APPENDIX 5 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR A CANDIDATE REQUESTING AN OPTIONAL REVIEW

I understand that ... no later than [July 1](#).

APPENDIX 6 – SAMPLE LETTER FOR 7TH YEAR CASES MANDATORY REVIEW OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TENURE (AND PROMOTION)

Note: This letter must be sent by the Head between March 1 and May 15 ([or earlier](#)) to those ...

FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSORS HIRED AFTER JULY 1, 2017

Please provide ... possible referees must be provided to me no later than [July 1](#).

APPENDIX 8 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE FOR REVIEW OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY (for Professoriate stream)

2. If the potential referee is willing to provide a letter of assessment by the deadline, then the following letter can be used:

...

I would ask that ... [tenure decisions](#).

[Please select one of the following choices to include in the letter:](#)

2 (c) To what degree ...

It is recommended that Heads modify this template if there is discipline-specific wording that may be more appropriate [and remove the bold which is included to indicate options for the letter content](#).

Enclosures

1 c. Assistant Professor – Article 3.07 and [2.03 f](#)

APPENDIX 9 – SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR REFERENCE FOR REVIEW OF [EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP](#) (for Educational Leadership stream)

The University of British Columbia is considering [candidate name] for [decision option]¹ in the Department of __. I am writing to ask if you are willing to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] [educational leadership](#).

The University of British Columbia is considering [candidate name] for [decision option]¹ in the Department of __. I am writing to ask you to provide an arm's length assessment of [candidate name's] [educational leadership](#).

2. If the potential referee ...

~~Scholarly teaching (i.e. teaching informed by and based on scholarship of teaching, learning, and educational research,) is valued.~~ Scholarship of teaching and learning (i.e. discipline- situated research into effective curriculum and pedagogy to optimize student learning) is not required in this rank...

I would ask that you please ... curriculum vitae and [educational leadership](#) dossier.

We would appreciate you providing succinct, candid and specific comments on all aspects of the candidate's [educational leadership](#).

Please comment on:

a) [candidate's name]'s contributions to educational leadership, in a variety of its manifestations, and their value in the enhancement of teaching and learning within the university and beyond. [Please take into account that evidence of educational leadership contributions can include: Contributions to curriculum development and renewal \(curriculum design/re- design\) within the unit/Faculty; Pedagogical innovation; Applications of and contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning; Innovative use of learning technology; and Leadership and contribution to teaching and learning initiatives and programs.](#)

b) Please add any further comments you think might be useful in assessing [and/or contextualizing](#) the candidate's [contributions to educational leadership](#).

Enclosures

1. Excerpt from the Agreement
 - a. Associate Professor of Teaching – Article 3.04
 - b. Professor of Teaching –Article 3.05
 - c. [Assistant Professor of Teaching \(reappointment\) – Article 2.03f, 3.03 and 3.04](#)
2. Criteria for [Educational Leadership – Article 4.04](#)
3. Professor of Teaching or Associate Professor of Teaching Guidelines (if applicable) [attach a copy of Appendix 1]
4. Definition of Educational Leadership from Appendix 1
5. Candidate's dossier [highlighting their educational leadership achievements](#) (Appendix 1)

APPENDIX 10 – HEAD'S LETTER (SUGGESTED FORMAT)

Background and Process

- Number of votes for, against, and abstentions (with an explanation of the latter). [Unexplained abstentions are usually to be treated as tantamount to a negative vote.](#)

APPENDIX 12 – SAC’S PROCEDURES

2. Subcommittee screening

- Subcommittees will meet individually in the weeks alternating with full SAC meetings. Subcommittee members are expected to participate in the screening of cases assigned to that Subcommittee, by providing commentary and a pre-ranking of “A” or “B” on the SAC Dashboard, and by participating in Subcommittee meetings. Subcommittee meetings may be cancelled if all members give all files under consideration a pre-ranking of ‘A’.
- If the subcommittee ... is deferred (“D” classification).
- Subcommittees should ... the Faculty (a “D” classification). If at least one member of the subcommittee believes that the case should be classified as “B”, then the subcommittee should meet to discuss the case and arrive at a final classification of “A” or “B”.
- In the absence of questions ... full Committee. The SAC vote for “A” cases may be conducted online.

3. Expedited process

- If the two co-chairs agree, very strong cases with no flags or procedural issues will be sent directly to the President. Expedited cases will normally have unanimously positive recommendations from the department, the head or director, the Dean’s advisory committee, the Dean, and the external referees. Cases identified by the two co-chairs as expedited will remain on the SAC Dashboard until the following Friday, so that members of the respective subcommittee may have the opportunity to review the file. If a subcommittee member wishes to flag the file for discussion, they may do so; otherwise the case will be forwarded to the President’s attention. Cases with potential procedural errors will be sent to the SAC Chair to follow up with FR and/or the Faculties.

Last bullet point deleted (“Cases will continue...”)

4. Agenda

- By the Monday morning ... for voting by SAC. SAC voting on “A” cases may be conducted online.

6. Introduction of supplemental information

“twenty four hours” instead of “twenty three hours”

8. The role of Deans at full SAC meetings

- When discussion of a case(s) is completed, the Dean withdraws from the meeting so that a vote can be taken.
- After the Dean has left the meeting, SAC may conduct a brief in-camera discussion to summarize positive and/or negative views of a “B” case for the Chair’s report to the President, and to determine whether SAC requires further information or to clarify procedural issues.

10. Voting

Last bullet point:

During the summer months or when a meeting is cancelled, SAC may consider new appointments by viewing the full dossier on the SAC Dashboard and providing commentary and an initial pre-ranking of “A” or “B”. “A” cases may be voted electronically by SAC, with the recommendation to the President being provided by the SAC Chair. “B” cases will be deferred until the relevant Dean can participate in a formal meeting with SAC.

12. The Role of SAC Chair

The SAC Chair is expected to do the following:

1) Subcommittees:

- Meet with the subcommittee chairs before each SAC meeting if there are any matters to discuss

APPENDIX 14 deleted