The ad hoc Drafting Committee to Review the Tenure and Promotion Policy Supplementary Policy Statements and Recommend Revisions and Additions (the Drafting Committee) was established by the Senate Committee on Appointments (SCA) and the McMaster University Faculty Association (MUFA) in January 2010. Del Harnish and David Wright were appointed by SCA. Lorraine Allan and Katherine Cuff were appointed by MUFA. Helen Ayre and Barb Campbell are Consultants to the Committee. At the Committee's first meeting on March 30 2010, Lorraine Allan was selected as Chair.

The Committee's Terms of Reference were reported to Senate on February 10, 2010: The University has regularly added supplementary policies to clarify administrative issues pertaining to the work of faculty members. This includes the range of Supplementary Policy Statements (SPS), administrative letters that clarify procedures (e.g. administrative leave for chairs) and a variety of guidelines. Newer policies are current but we have not had a regular review of many older policies.

The drafting committee is charged with:
1. a review of existing policies to identify required administrative changes and to recommend a procedure for regular updating of existing policies for minor changes.
2. developing and recommending new policies as identified and required (e.g. conversion of teaching track to tenure track or CLA to teaching track appointments)
3. identifying gaps in the application of existing policies and recommending remedies.

These Terms have been amended from the original. In a letter to MUFA, dated May 31, 2010, SCA proposed that the formulation of a Special Leave Policy for Academic Administrators be removed from the Drafting Committee's mandate. In their response to SCA, dated September 8, 2010, MUFA agreed to the SCA proposal with the stipulation that a new Joint Senate-Faculty Association drafting committee be struck to develop the Special Leave Policy. In a letter dated February 9, 2011, SCA informed MUFA and the Drafting Committee that the Special Leave Policy for Academic Administrators will be addressed by a separate drafting committee, which will be appointed by SCA, and that the Provost will consult with MUFA about the membership of that Committee. The membership of this committee was approved by SCA in March 2011, and consists of Lorraine Allan, Del Harnish, Les King and Steve Hanna, with Helen Ayre as the consultant.
The Drafting Committee’s Final Report contains four Parts:

I. Revisions to Appendix C (Supplementary Policy Statements, SPSs) of the McMaster University Revised Policy and Regulations with Respect to Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (Tenure and Promotion Policy)

II. Recommendations regarding a procedure for regular updating of the Tenure and Promotion Policy for minor changes

III. Revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Policy
    Some of the recommended SPS revisions have necessitated changes to the Policy. In addition, the Drafting Committee has made revisions to the Policy based on input from faculty and executive officers.

IV. Other Recommendations
    The Drafting Committee has made two recommendations to Senate for further action regarding matters related to the Tenure and Promotion Policy but that extend beyond the Committee’s terms of reference.

I. Revisions to Appendix C

The SPSs were added to the 1992 revision of the Tenure and Promotion Policy. At that time there were 22 SPSs organized into five categories. In the most recent revision (2007), there are 28 SPSs, numbered 1 through 30. SPS 1 was integrated into the text of the 2007 revision and deleted from Appendix C, and SPS 24 was merged with SPS 23 in 2001. SPSs added since 1992 are in a category labeled "Other". Aside from integrating SPS 1, the 2007 Drafting Committee did not revise the other SPSs.

The current 28 SPSs associated with the 2007 T&P Policy can be found at the following link http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/faculty/Appointments/SPSList.htm. The revised SPSs are attached to this report.

For ease of presentation, the 2007 numbering of the 28 SPSs has been maintained. After the revisions have been approved, we propose to regroup and renumber the SPSs. At that time, we will also attempt to bring some uniformity in the formatting of the SPSs.

There are extensive revisions to some of the SPSs, especially to those that were approved many years ago. Many of the revisions are editorial, however, in that there is no substantive change to the intent or the implementation of the policy. For example:

a) The definitions in the Tenure and Promotion Policy (Section I, clause 6) have been adopted throughout the SPSs.

b) Some SPSs have been re-titled to better reflect their revised content.

c) Some SPSs have been re-titled to indicate that they are policies rather than guidelines, and "guidelines" in the text has been replaced with
words such as "policy" and "procedures". Also, phrases such as "are encouraged to" have been changed to "should", "shall", or "must".
d) The SPSs have been revised to incorporate current government legislation.
e) Wherever appropriate, teaching-stream faculty have been incorporated, sometimes requiring a new SPS.
f) Paragraphs have been rearranged so that the SPS is better organized and easier to understand.
g) Some SPSs, especially the older ones, included commentaries. These, as well as redundancies, have been removed resulting in a more concise document.

Procedures in the Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS), especially with regard to appointments, sometimes differ from the procedures in the other five Faculties. We have noted these differences in the revised SPSs. In addition, four new SPSs (4B, 10C, 12B, 13C) have been added for the FHS.

In what follows, we highlight the substantive revisions to each SPS.

**SPS 2: Recruitment and Selection of Faculty Members**

- The following statements have been added to bring the SPS in line with current practice.
  - Accountability
    
    "Chairs must submit a recommendation to the Dean for each new faculty position, including rank expectations, salary expectations, space and other resource information, and expected start date, together with the draft advertisement. A budget form must be completed for approval and signed by the Provost and President (where applicable) before the search commences. In the Faculty of Health Sciences, advertisements must be approved by the office of the Dean. In all other Faculties, advertisements must be approved by the Provost's office before being posted."
  
  - Recruitment: Placement of advertisements
    
    "Positions must be posted on the Provost's web site under Academic Postings"
    "Advertisements must be provided to the Canadian Union of Public Employees (Local 3906)". This is required by the CUPE Unit 2 collective agreement.
  
  - The Employment Offer
    
    "In the Faculty of Health Sciences, employment offers are made by the Department Chair, with the approval of the Faculty Dean. In all other Faculties, employment offers are made by the Faculty Dean, with the approval of the Provost. Terms of employment in the offer must comply with all relevant University policies."

- The SPS has been revised to comply with current legislation.
- Section III, Preparation includes "Best practice suggests that before inviting a candidate for interview the Department should (a) invite the applicant to provide an up-dated CV and (b) verify significant features of the CV (e.g. publications)."
SPS 3: Conversion of an Individual Faculty Appointment

- SPS 3 now incorporates SPS 28 [Appointment of Persons from the Special Appointment or Continuing Appointment without Annual Review (CAWAR) Categories to Tenure-Track or Tenured Appointments]
- The Terms of Reference charged the Drafting Committee with "developing and recommending new policies as identified and required (e.g., conversion of teaching track to tenure track or CLA to teaching track appointments)."
  - The Drafting Committee recommends
    1) that the procedures for converting a CLA appointment to a teaching-track appointment be the same as the existing procedures for converting a CLA to tenure-track or to special. This recommendation is incorporated into SPS 3.
    2) that there be no conversions between tenure-track and teaching-track appointments. The recruitment for these two categories of appointments is different, necessitating a new fully advertised search. This recommendation, if approved, will be incorporated in a revision to the text of the Tenure and Promotion Policy.

SPS 4: Procedures for Part-Time Appointments (Except in the Faculty of Health Sciences)

SPS 4A: [Procedures for Other Appointments (Except in Health Sciences)] is the revision of the original SPS 4.

- Two categories of appointment have been eliminated: Teaching Appointments Without Rank are covered by the CUPE Unit 2 collective agreement, and Research Appointments Without Rank is a category that is not used.
- The category Industry Professor, which has been approved by Senate, has been added.
- The procedures for making Other Appointments are now at the beginning of the SPS rather than dispersed under each category. The description of the reporting structure is more explicit.

SPS 4B: [Procedures for Other Appointments within the Faculty of Health Sciences] is new.

SPS 5: Policy on Joint Appointments and Associate Membership

- SPS 6 has been merged into SPS 5

SPS 6: Senate Policy Governing Associate Memberships

- SPS 6 is now part of SPS 5. The Drafting Committee is recommending that SPS 6 be deleted.

SPS 7: Policy on Supervision of Graduate Work by Non-McMaster Faculty

- The section on Lecturers has been removed. Part-time instructors (Sessionals) are members of CUPE Unit 2.
• The preamble has been revised: "It is the responsibility of the department/program to ensure that every graduate student has, at all times, a faculty advisor or a properly constituted supervisory committee (see Graduate Calendar). The following regulations cover the involvement in graduate student supervision of persons who hold a part-time appointment as outlined in SPS 4(a) and 4(b)."

• With regard to being the Principal Supervisor (Section I), we have clarified that "Only former full-time McMaster faculty who are no longer employed by the University are qualified to continue as the principal supervisor of a graduate student, as an adjunct appointee. … In very exceptional circumstances, the case may be made for appointment as principal supervisor of an adjunct appointee who is not a former full-time member of the McMaster faculty. The appointment of such an individual as the principal supervisor of a graduate student is subject to the prior approval of the Dean of the relevant Faculty (or delegate) and the Dean of Graduate Studies (or delegate)"

SPS 8: Academic Appointment and Assessment of Relatives
• The content of SPS 8 has been re-written with a positive tone.

SPS 9: Re-appointment of Part-time Faculty at a Higher Rank and Promotion of Part-time Faculty – Guidelines
• Re-appointment and Promotion can be accommodated under SPS 4. The Drafting Committee is recommending that SPS 9 be deleted.

SPS 10: Policy on the Encouragement of Teaching Excellence
The current SPS 10 has had a major rewrite. It addresses two separate issues: procedures for the evaluation of teaching and the teaching portfolio. SPS 10 has been subdivided into SPS 10A and SPS 10B. SPS 10C has been added for the FHS.

SPS 10A: Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching
• The committee is recommending
  a) that the standard Faculty-wide student evaluation questionnaire includes as the first item a single summative question ("Overall for this course, what is your opinion of the effectiveness of the instructor?") that is common across the university (Section II, clause 2)
  b) that, at a minimum, the rating of this summative question, with departmental context, must be included in all tenure/permanence and promotion recommendations (Section II, clause 2)
• Provision has been made for on-line student evaluations. Such evaluations must be made available to students only during the last two weeks of classes before the commencement of the final examination period and before final course grades are known (Section II, clause 3b)
• added "annual review, and results of subsequent discussion with the candidate, of the Executive Summary (Part A) of the teaching portfolio. Results of this discussion will be recorded in writing and agreed to by both parties." (Section IV, clause 1)
• The current SPS 10 states "The same evaluation procedure may be used for
graduate courses if 10 or more scores are available or have been accumulated over a number of offerings of the same course”. The committee has deleted this statement from SPS 10A and recommends that SCA instruct Graduate Council to develop a policy on student evaluation of Graduate Courses.

SPS 10B: Teaching Portfolios
- "teaching dossier" has been replaced by "teaching portfolio" to minimize confusion with the departmental dossier in SPS 15B. We have emphasized that the construction and the maintenance of the teaching portfolio is the responsibility of the faculty member and that the portfolio is owned by the faculty member.
- We have clarified that there are two parts to the teaching portfolio, an Executive Summary and supporting documentation.

SPS 10C: Clinical Activities Portfolio – Clinical Educators, Faculty of Health Sciences
- The material in this SPS was approved by SCA in 2004.

SPS 11: Academic Collaborators in Appointment, Tenure, Permanence, and Promotion Proceedings
- "a faculty member who is a significant collaborator should not participate in discussions or vote in any committee (Departmental, Faculty or Senate) where the case of the candidate in question is being considered. An exception at the 'departmental' level should be made for very small departments or equivalent units"
  changed to
  "a faculty member who is a significant collaborator should recuse himself/herself from participation in any committee (Departmental, Faculty or Senate) while the case of the candidate in question is being considered and voted on".
- The procedure for deciding whether a committee member is a significant collaborator has been elaborated.

SPS 12: Procedures for Selection of and Communication with External Referees (except for Clinical Educators)

SPS 12A (Procedures for Selection of and Communication with External and Internal Referees (except those for Clinical Educators)) is the revision of the original SPS 12
- The procedures have been revised to accommodate teaching-stream faculty.
  - The number of letters and the type of letters (external/internal) for teaching-stream faculty differ from the requirements for tenure-stream faculty. Specifically, the Tenure and Promotion Policy specifies that promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of teaching-stream faculty who have achieved permanence requires at least two referees external to the Department or Program in which the candidate is employed, at least one of whom must be
external to the University. The Policy, however, is silent on the list of potential referees. The Drafting Committee is recommending that the list contain at least four possible referees (Section 2d).

- "The candidate also has the right to suggest appropriate additions to the list, with reasons" has been added (Section 3a).
- "a complete list of the candidate’s publications, and reprints (or copies) of recent publications and articles in press and submitted for publication" changed to "an up-to-date curriculum vitae (prepared in accordance with SPS 15A) which includes a complete list of the candidate’s publications. The candidate may indicate which papers should be sent to the referee (no limit) and the Department chair may send additional publications but, when doing so, must inform the candidate."
- added Section 2g and removed "(and, in the case of a faculty member who participates in a program, with the Director of the Program)” from the approval process described in the original SPS 12.

SPS 12B: Procedures for Selection of and Communication with External and Internal Referees for Clinical Educators

- The material in this SPS was approved by SCA in 2004.

SPS 13: Guidelines for External Referees

There are now three versions for different types of appointments. Each version includes information from the Tenure and Promotion Policy regarding the normal and accelerated timing at McMaster for that type of appointment.

SPS 13A (Policy for Referees – Tenure-Stream Faculty) is the revision of the original SPS 13.

- "Is the candidate's scholarship of a sufficient quality to be acceptable for tenure or promotion at your institution?" has been changed to "Is the candidate's scholarship of a sufficient quality to be acceptable for tenure or promotion based on the criteria detailed above?" (item e)

SPS 13B (Policy for Referees – Teaching-Stream Faculty) is new and is for teaching-stream faculty.

- SPS 13B incorporates the changes we are recommending to Section III, clauses 24 and 35 of T&P Policy regarding permanence and promotion of teaching-stream faculty.
  - 24. For a person appointed to a teaching-track position, promotion and permanence are not linked. Promotion may also happen, but is not expected to occur at the same time, except in very exceptional cases when a recommendation for promotion may be considered at the same time as a recommendation for permanence. In all other cases, promotion recommendations will be considered separately at the normal promotion period.
  - 35. For a person appointed to a teaching-track position, promotion and permanence are not linked. Promotion may also happen, but is not expected to occur at the same time. Promotion of an individual in a teaching-track position to Associate Professor must either follow or
(in exceptional cases) accompany a recommendation for permanence. A teaching-stream faculty member who has been awarded permanence without promotion and who wishes to be considered for promotion should notify the Department Chair in writing.

SPS 13C (Policy for Referees – Clinical Educator Faculty) is new and is for Clinical Educators.
- The material in this SPS was approved by SCA in 2004.

SPS 14: Material Required by Senate Committee on Appointments on Recommendations re Tenure, Permanence and/or Promotion
- Clauses 7 and 8 in the original SPS 14 are deleted since they are part of the dossier that is listed in Clause 6.

SPS 15A: Curriculum Vitae Requirements
- Material from SPS 15B concerned with the CV has been moved to SPS 15A.
- Modifications have been made to accommodate current legislation.
- The first paragraph has been amended to include "it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that it is accurate for cases of tenure, permanence, and promotion."
- Research Funding: SPS 15B specified "last five years". In the revised SPS 15A, this has been changed to "lifetime". (clause 13l)
- Presentations at Meetings: SPS 15B specified "at least the last five years". In the revised SPS 15A, this has been deleted. (clause 15)
- A section for "Patents, Inventions, and Copyrights" has been added (clause 16).
- A section for "Contributions to Teaching Practice" has been added (clause 11).

SPS 15B: Preparation of Dossiers for Tenure/Permanence, and/or Promotion
- All material related to the CV has been moved to SPS 15A.
- The preamble includes "It is the faculty member's own responsibility to prepare and keep the curriculum vitae up-to-date (see SPS 15A) and it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that it is accurate for cases of tenure, permanence, and promotion." as the second paragraph.
- "optional" has been deleted for the Candidate's submission.
- Sections 5 and 6 of the original SPS have been combined (new Section 4) which is titled Departmental Teaching Evaluation Report. The content of that report is described in the revised SPS 10A.
- The revised SPS
  - clarifies that the same biographical material is required for internal referees as for external referees
  - clarifies that the two page summary of research is the same one that was sent to the referees
  - stipulates that all letters (internal and external) must be solicited in
accordance with SPS 12
- includes the letter requirements for Clinician Educator
- removes the limitation of 3 internal letters

**SPS 16: Research Leave Policy**

- **Eligibility**
  - The exclusion of permanent teaching-stream faculty has been added.
  - Footnote 1 has been deleted and the intent has been incorporated by adding "Continuing Appointments without Annual Review (CAWAR) are similar in all respects to tenured appointments except for funding arrangements. Because funding arrangements for CAWAR appointments may vary considerably, individuals in this category should contact their Department Chair with any questions related to their eligibility for payment during their approved leave".
  - The following statements have been added to Principles Governing Research Leave to clarify issues that have arisen in the past.
    - 4. "Faculty members who for their own reasons wish to postpone taking a leave when they become eligible for one must discuss and document with their chair and dean the consequences of the deferral. If a faculty member defers a leave, the additional years before the leave is taken are not counted in the eligibility period for any subsequent leave."
    - 5. "... Given that CP/M is based on three categories, two of which cannot be measured during a leave, the faculty member will be assigned the average of his/her last three CP/M par increments for the period of the leave. For an academic year involving a six-month leave, two equally-weighted CP/M scores will be generated; the first will be based on the model outlined above and the second will be calculated by the Chair in the normal manner for the non-leave six months. These two scores will then be averaged."
    - 7. "A faculty member’s pregnancy or parental leave may overlap the period of an approved Research Leave. The usual practice is that the unused portion of the Research Leave is taken immediately following the end of the pregnancy or parental leave. Any departure from this practice requires the approval of the Research Leaves Committee." (see also SPS 19).

- Footnote 2 has been incorporated in the text.
- The policy on *Financial Procedure for Research Grants*, which is listed as SPS16A in the MUFA Handbook, is referenced and a link to the policy is included.

**SPS 17: Guidelines on Banking of Teaching in Relation to Research Leave**

- The essence of the material in SPS 17 is covered in SPS 16. The Drafting Committee is recommending that SPS 17 be deleted.

**SPS 18: Unpaid Leaves of Absence**

- Teaching-stream faculty have been included.
- The revised SPS specifies that if the tenure/permanence clock is stopped during an unpaid leave, that information will be communicated in a letter
from the President.

**SPS 19: Pregnancy/Parental Leave Policy for Faculty and MUFA Librarians**

This SPS is difficult for users and administrators to understand. Although this SPS is part of Appendix C, it was last revised by the Joint Committee. HR has produced a more user-friendly SPS and will bring that revision to the Joint Committee. In the interim, we have made the following revisions.

- Most Librarians are no longer members of MUFA and the language has been changed to conform to the MUFA constitution/bylaws.
- Option A has been rewritten to be clearer and to conform to practice.
- "A faculty member’s pregnancy or parental leave may overlap the period of an approved Research Leave. The usual practice is that the unused portion of the Research Leave is taken immediately following the end of the pregnancy or parental leave. Any departure from this practice requires the approval of the Research Leaves Committee." has been added (see also SPS 16).

**SPS 20: Procedures for Faculty Appeal Tribunals**

- In the original SPS, the request for an appeal is submitted to Senate at its next meeting and then forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Appeals Nominating Committee. The Drafting Committee is recommending that the appeal request be sent directly (within 5 business days of being received) to the Tenure and Promotion Appeals Nominating Committee, and then reported at the next Senate meeting. This sequence would shorten the process leading to the nomination of the Appeals Tribunal.
- The SPS has been reorganized so that the procedures are presented in sequence.
- Many of the other revisions were recommended by the University Solicitor.

**SPS 21: Faculty Association Observers at Appeal Hearings**

- No substantive changes

**SPS 22: Faculty Association Observers at Removal Hearings**

- No substantive changes

**SPS 23: Faculty Reduced Workload Policy**

The current SPS 23 is an amalgam of the now defunct SPS 24 (*Statement Regarding the Reduced Workload Policy, 1982*) and the previous SPS 23 (*Faculty Pre-Retirement Reduced Workload Policy, 1979*). The merging of these two SPS documents into the current SPS 23 was approved by the Board of Governors on October 25, 2001, on the recommendation of the Board Remunerations Committee, and at the request of the Joint Committee. On reviewing the current SPS 23, the Drafting Committee discovered that it does not accurately reflect the intent of the original recommendation. After receiving input from the Joint Committee (JC), the Drafting Committee is recommending that we have two SPSs for reduced workload.
SPS 23: Faculty Reduced Workload Policy – Phase-in to Retirement
SPS 24: Faculty Reduced Workload Policy

Comments
1. The two SPSs differ with regard to Pension contributions and benefits (Section 5ii). We were informed by HR that these differences are required by the Pension text.
2. The two SPSs differ with regard to the approval process – the Faculty Appointments Committee in SPS 23 and the Dean, in consultation with the Provost, in SPS 24. The Drafting Committee’s recommendation of the approval process in SPS 24 does not have the support of all members of the JC. Some members of the JC favour a committee approval process for reasons of consistency across Faculties. The Drafting Committee favours an approval process that involves a minimum number of people. SPS 24 covers reduced workload for health and personal reasons. Faculty are more likely to take advantage of this benefit if their personal problems remain private.

SPS 25: Statement on Academic Freedom
- The SPS has been clarified to indicate that academic freedom applies to faculty (not the entire university community) since it is faculty that are covered by the Tenure & Promotion Policy and its SPSs.
- In the third sentence “within the law” has been replaced by "within the terms of their appointment" and "external" has been deleted.

SPS 26: Procedures for Termination of Special or CAWAR Appointments when External Salary Support is Discontinued
- The revision includes Special Appointments as well as CAWAR.
- The revised SPS addresses notice and severance as well as phase-out funding
- Clause 4 allows for Faculty-wide policies. The FHS has developed a policy which is included as an Appendix to SPS 26. Clause 8 of this Appendix addresses the phasing in of the FHS policy.

SPS 27: Spousal Hiring
- No substantive changes

SPS 28: Appointment of Persons from the Special Appointment or Continuing Appointment without Annual Review (CAWAR)
- SPS 28 has been integrated into SPS 3. The Drafting Committee is recommending that SPS 28 be deleted.

SPS 29: Allocation of Teaching-Stream Appointments across Faculties
- The first two paragraphs have been deleted. The first paragraph, while of historical interest, is not relevant to the purpose of the SPS which is to limit and allocate teaching-stream appointments across the Faculties. The content in the second paragraph is similar to the content of Section III,
• In Section 2, "Section VI*" has been corrected to "Section VII".
• Section 3 has been deleted. That procedure is covered in the revised SPS 2.

SPS 30: Principles Governing Contractually Limited Appointments (CLAs)
• No substantive changes

II. Recommendations regarding a procedure for regular updating of the Tenure and Promotion Policy for minor changes

Section VIII, clause 4 of the Tenure and Promotion Policy states that "Proposals for amending this document [the Tenure and Promotion Policy] may be made by the administration, the Senate, or the Faculty Association. When such proposals are made, there shall be consultation among these parties and, if appropriate, an ad hoc drafting committee shall be established. The drafting committee, which shall consist of members named by the Senate Committee on Appointments and by the Faculty Association …". In the past, the procedure for making minor changes has involved a recommendation to Senate by SCA that carries the support of the MUFA Executive. The Drafting Committee recommends that Section VIII, clause 4 of the Tenure and Promotion Policy be amended to incorporate this practice.

4. Proposals for amending this document may be made by the administration, the Senate, or the Faculty Association. When such proposals are made, there shall be consultation among these parties.

a) If the Senate Committee on Appointments and the Faculty Association Executive agree that the revisions are minor and reach agreement on the revisions, the amendments will be presented to Senate by the Senate Committee on Appointments.

b) Otherwise, an ad hoc drafting committee shall be established. The drafting committee, which shall consist of members named by the Senate Committee on Appointments and by the Faculty Association, shall review the proposed amendments and formulate revisions for submission to the Senate and the Board of Governors for approval. During the course of its work, the drafting committee shall ensure that the parties mentioned in the first sentence of this clause are kept fully informed of any proposed revisions, and that their views on any such changes are properly considered.
III. Revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Policy

The substantive changes that we are recommending to the Tenure and Promotion Policy are described in this Section which is divided into 6 subsections:

A. SPS Driven Revisions
B. Committee Membership, Voting, Quorum
C. Material Available to the Candidate
D. Letters from the President
E. Teaching Stream Faculty
F. Clarifications


The revised Policy is attached to this report.

A. SPS Driven Revisions

These revisions are related to the recommended changes to the SPSs.

1. Section II, clause 4e
   "Teaching–track faculty are expected to keep abreast of developments in the discipline in which they teach, and are to consult colleagues with relevant specific research expertise." deleted from SPS 29 and added to clause 4e.

2. Section II, clauses 8b and 8c added
   8b. Faculty members appointed to tenure-track appointments do not have their positions converted to, or followed by, teaching-track appointments. Similarly, faculty members appointed to teaching-track appointments do not have their positions converted to, or followed by, tenure-track appointments. Rather, if such positions in the faculty member’s area of expertise become available, the faculty member applies to the advertised position on an equal footing as other candidates.

   8c. Faculty members appointed to special or CAWAR appointments normally do not have their positions converted to tenure-track or tenured appointments when external salary support is lost. Rather, if such a position in the faculty member’s area of expertise becomes available, the faculty member applies to the advertised position on an equal footing as other candidates. However, in exceptional circumstances, a Faculty Dean, on the recommendation of the Chair, may consider it appropriate to recommend that an appointment be converted without initiation of a new fully-advertised search. The protocol for such a conversion is described in Appendix C, SPS 3.

3. Section II, clause 16e
   Re-worded and re-organised to clarify the interviewing of candidates for various classes of appointment.
All candidates will be interviewed by members of the Faculty Appointments Committee (see 16 d. above). The Department Chair or delegate is responsible for scheduling interviews for each candidate and for ensuring that all members of the Faculty Appointments Committee receive complete files and references for each candidate prior to the interview.

- The Faculty Dean and the Dean of Graduate Studies (or an Associate Dean of Graduate Studies) must interview all candidates.
- Normally, the Provost (or delegate) will interview all candidates for tenure-track, teaching-track and special appointments.
- For potential appointments to the ranks of Professor or tenured Associate Professor, an interview must be arranged with the President and Provost.
- For appointments to the Special or CAWAR stream, where the primary responsibility will be as a Clinical Educator (see Appendix A), the individuals named in 16d. above who are outside the Faculty should be offered an opportunity for an interview, but such interviews are not mandatory as they are for other candidates.

4. Section II, clause 20 added
   A list of all Adjunct and Visiting appointments of three months and more also must be provided by the Provost to Senate in September of each year. Visiting appointments of less than three months are reported to the Dean for information (SPS 4A)

5. Section III – A paragraph has been added at the beginning of the section on Effective Teaching (before clause 5) to highlight the requirement that faculty maintain a teaching portfolio.
   All faculty are expected to maintain a Teaching Portfolio as outlined in SPS 10B. A teaching portfolio is a record of a faculty member's teaching methods, accomplishments and goals. One purpose of a teaching portfolio is to represent the faculty member's involvement in teaching to potential reviewers. The portfolio is owned by the faculty member and may contain any and all information that the faculty member wishes to document.

6. Section III, clauses 8(a) and 9
   Revised to make the assessment of teaching consistent with that outlined in SPS 10A.

7. Section III, clause 16
   Expanded to encompass the different types and number of letters required for the tenure, permanence and promotion.
   a. In the case of tenure-stream appointments, at least three external letters must be obtained, but all letters received must be made part of the file (SPS 12A).
   b. In the case of teaching-stream appointments, letters of reference from external sources are not required as part of the process for granting permanence.
   c. Promotion of teaching-stream faculty with permanence to the rank of Associate Professor requires at least two referees external to the Department or Program in which the candidate is employed, at least one of whom must be
external to the University. The referees must be experts with regard to teaching and learning who can assess whether the candidate is known widely on the basis of contributions to pedagogy (SPS 12A).

d. **Promotion of teaching-stream faculty to the rank of Professor** requires letters from at least three referees external to the University. The referees must be experts with regard to teaching and learning who can assess whether the candidate is known widely on the basis of contributions to pedagogy (SPS 12A).

e. In the case of **CAWAR or tenure assessments of Clinician Educators**, at least three letters must be obtained containing written judgements on the quality of the candidate’s clinical scholarly work. The referees in this case may be either internal or external to the University (SPS 12B) and will be asked to evaluate the candidate based on criteria consistent with clinical service activities within this academic setting.

f. In the case of **promotion to Professor of Clinical Educators**, at least three letters must be obtained from referees external to the University (SPS 12B). Referees will be asked to evaluate the candidate based on criteria consistent with clinical service activities within this academic setting. Such referees must be scholars with respected national and/or international reputations who can assess whether the candidate is known widely on the basis of scholarship; however that may be defined in the discipline in question. (An exception to this requirement is defined in clause 43(b) below.)

Although a minimum number of referees must be consulted, additional referees may be used. All letters solicited from referees in accordance with SPS 12A or SPS 12B must be made part of the file.

8. Section III, clause 26

An external assessment will be based on the teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate (see SPS 10)" deleted.

9. Section III, clause 37a revised

SPS 10 mandates that there be an annual review and discussion of the Executive Summary of the teaching portfolio and that the results of this discussion be recorded in writing and agreed to by both parties. A similar requirement has been added for research, and the annual review of the teaching portfolio and the candidate’s university service has been referenced.

Department Chairs should meet at least once each academic year with all potential candidates for re-appointment, tenure or CAWAR to review and discuss the progress of the faculty member’s research program, as well as their teaching and university service. Results of this discussion must be recorded in writing and agreed to by both parties.

10. Section III, clause 39a

Last sentence (In the case of a faculty member who holds an associate membership in another Department, the other Department shall be requested to submit an assessment of the faculty member’s performance when he or she is being considered for re-appointment, tenure, permanence, and/or promotion) deleted.
11. Section III, clause 39b revised to include the teaching portfolio.  
*It is the responsibility of each faculty member who is eligible to be considered for re-appointment, tenure, permanence, and/or promotion to prepare and maintain an up-to-date curriculum vitae in accordance with the requirements approved by the Senate Committee on Appointments (Appendix C, SPS 15A), an up-to-date Teaching Portfolio (see SPS 10A) and to ensure that all the relevant evidence is made available for inclusion in the dossier.*

12. Section III, clause 66 amended to be consistent with revised SPS 20.

13. Appendix A revised  
The designation "Clinical Educator" (SPS 10C) has been incorporated. The other changes are to make the descriptions compatible with SPS 10C.

14. Appendix B deleted  
Appendix B provided for reduced work during a tenure-track appointment. This provision has been incorporated into SPS 24.

**B. Committee Membership, Voting, Quorum**

1. The Tenure and Promotion Policy was not revised to incorporate the decision made by Senate on April 8, 2009 that the Dean of Graduate Studies is no longer an ex officio member of all Faculty T&P Committees. This change has been incorporated in the revision.

2. The 2007 Policy allows other faculty to be members of more than one committee, but to "exercise his or her opportunity to discuss and vote on a candidate at only one of these levels". The Drafting Committee is recommending that no faculty member be a member of more than one committee.

   a) Revised Section III, clause 38d
   *No faculty member shall be a member of more than one of the Departmental Committee, the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Senate Committee on Appointments. Where a Departmental Committee includes all tenured faculty and/or all faculty at a particular rank, a member who is also a member of the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Senate Committee on Appointments shall recuse himself or herself from any and all discussions at the Departmental level. Such a technical abstention shall not cause the Committee to lose quorum.*

   b) Revised Section III, 48c
   *No faculty member shall be a member of more than one of a Departmental, or Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee or the Senate Committee on Appointments.*
c) Section III, 48e
"Such a technical abstention shall not cause the Committee to lose quorum." added.

d) Revised Section III, clause 58
A member of the Senate Committee on Appointments who is a significant collaborator with a candidate for re-appointment, permanence, tenure and/or promotion, or a member of the same department, should not be present when that candidate’s case is discussed and/or voted on (Appendix C, SPS 11), and a technical abstention shall be recorded for the member in such a situation. Such a technical abstention shall not cause the Committee to lose quorum.

3. The tenure/permanence process often begins in the spring, and there could be a change in the Department chair and and/or the Chair and/or membership of the T&P Committee.

   Revised Section III, clause 38e
While the process of gathering information may commence earlier in the year, the final determination of all cases shall be the responsibility of the Departmental Committee in place as of July 1. A decision shall be by majority vote of the whole Committee. Non-technical abstentions count as negative votes. In the event of an equality of votes on tenure, permanence, tenure-track re-appointment, and promotion recommendations, the question is deemed to be decided in favour of the candidate and the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee.

4. Section III, clause 56 has been revised to add "Should the Provost or the Dean of Graduate Studies be unavailable, only a Senate-appointed Acting Provost or Acting Dean of Graduate Studies is an acceptable substitute".

C. Material available to the candidate

Under the 2007 Policy, the candidate can request unattributed copies of the referee letters when the department has made a negative recommendation. However, the Policy is silent on what other information can be provided to the candidate. The Drafting Committee is recommending the following revisions.

1. Revised Section III, clause 42c
Upon receiving such a request, the Chair shall discuss the matter with the faculty member concerned, and shall provide him or her with a copy of the material considered by the Departmental Committee, along with a copy of the Committee recommendation to the Faculty Committee. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Department to ensure that the confidentiality of the material is maintained. To this end, only unattributed copies of the originals of any external or internal letters of reference shall be provided. Any other written assessments shall be similarly redacted to maintain confidentiality. If the faculty member desires it, there shall be a meeting of the Departmental Committee to consider or re-consider the case. The faculty member shall have the right to appear before
this Committee and make submissions thereto; the faculty member may be accompanied by a faculty colleague acting as an advisor.

2. Revised Section III, clause 50 (last paragraph)
   The Faculty Committee also has the right to invite any candidate for an interview. A candidate may be accompanied at the interview by a faculty colleague acting as an advisor. If he or she requests it, the candidate must be provided with a copy of the material considered by the Faculty Committee, along with a copy of the Departmental Committee recommendation. It shall be the responsibility of the Faculty Dean to ensure that the confidentiality of the material is maintained. To this end, only unattributed copies of the originals of any external or internal letters of reference shall be provided. Any other written assessments shall be similarly redacted to maintain confidentiality.

3. Revised Section III, clause 60 (last paragraph)
   The candidate may be accompanied at the interview by a faculty colleague acting as an advisor. If he or she requests it, the candidate must be provided with a copy of the material considered by the Senate Committee, along with a copy of the Faculty Committee recommendation. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Senate Committee to ensure that the confidentiality of the material is maintained. To this end, only unattributed copies of the originals of any external or internal letters of reference shall be provided. Any other written assessments shall be similarly redacted to maintain confidentiality.

4. Revised Section III, clause 63c
   In both (a) and (b) above, the candidate must be provided with a copy of the material considered by the Senate Committee, along with a copy of the Faculty Committee recommendation. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Senate Committee to ensure that the confidentiality of the material is maintained. To this end, only unattributed copies of the originals of any external or internal letters of reference shall be provided. Any other written assessments shall be similarly redacted to maintain confidentiality.

5. Section IV, clause 11 revised in light of the above revisions to Section III, clauses 42c, 50, 60, and 63c.

D. Letters from the President

All letters concerned with appointments or changes to the timing of evaluations must be signed by the President. The following clause has been revised.
   Section II, clause 7 (last paragraph)

E. Teaching Stream Appointments

The teaching-stream appointment category is relatively new and a number of issues have arisen which are likely to result in changes to the T&P Policy in
the future. At this time, the Drafting Committee is limiting its recommendations to issues that can be easily incorporated into the Policy.

1. The relationship between permanence and promotion has been clarified.
   a) Section III, clause 24 revised
      For a person appointed to a teaching-track position, promotion and permanence are not linked. Promotion may also happen, but is not expected to occur at the same time, except in very exceptional cases when a recommendation for promotion may be considered at the same time as a recommendation for permanence. In all other cases, promotion recommendations will be considered separately at the normal promotion period.

   b). Section III, clause 35 revised and the requirement of a minimum of 6 years in rank for promotion has been removed.
      For a person appointed to a teaching-track position, promotion and permanence are not linked. Promotion may also happen, but is not expected to occur at the same time. Promotion of an individual in a teaching-track position to Associate Professor must either follow or (in exceptional cases) accompany a recommendation for permanence. A teaching-stream faculty member who has been awarded permanence without promotion and who wishes to be considered for promotion should notify the Department Chair in writing.

2. Section III, clause 36
   The last sentence ("The preceding sentence does not apply to teaching-stream appointments") deleted.

3. Section IV, clause 3
   The exclusion of faculty with permanence from serving on an Appeal Tribunal has been removed.

F. Clarifications

1. Section I, clause 6f has been amended so that changes to the Supplementary Policy Statements will be subject to the provisions of Section VIII, clause 4.
2. Section II, clause 4f
   "and eligibility for membership on Departmental and Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committees (Section III, clause 38b)" added.
3. Section II, clause 16c
   "SPS 2 specifies the requirements for the recruitment and selection of new faculty members." was added.
4. Section III, clause 20
   "This requirement for a McMaster based program of research does not imply that work done prior to the tenure-track appointment at McMaster should not be considered." was added.
5. Section III, clause 28d, Section II, clause 14 and SPS 3 describe conditions under which a faculty member could be considered earlier than the normal five years for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Text has been
added to clarify that even when early consideration is possible, the full six years remains.

6. Section III, clause 43b has been amended to clarify that it is the Departmental Committee that obtains the letters of reference.

7. Section VIII, clause 3b
   "However, in exceptional circumstances, a Faculty Dean may consider it appropriate to recommend that the appointment be converted without initiation of a new fully-advertised search. The protocol for such a conversion is set out in Appendix C, SPS 3." added

IV. Other Recommendations

1. The current SPS 10 states "The same evaluation procedure may be used for graduate courses if 10 or more scores are available or have been accumulated over a number of offerings of the same course". The Committee has deleted this statement from the revised SPS 10A and recommends that SCA instruct Graduate Council to develop a policy on student evaluation of Graduate Courses.

2. Section I, clause 5d states, among other things, that “The University’s financial circumstances shall not be a reason for withholding tenure from a faculty member qualifying for tenure by merit.” The Committee would encourage consultation around adding language here assuring departments that, in the event of a recommendation that tenure not be granted, they will still be able to make a case for retaining the faculty position. Such reassurance might discourage departments from pushing through for tenure a borderline candidate, rather than risk losing a faculty position.