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The entire Tenure and Promotion Policy, including Appendix C (the SPSs) is attached to this report. In the attachment, all additional revisions to SPSs made by the Drafting Committee after the October Senate meeting are indicated by revision marks. The Tenure and Promotion Policy shows all revisions being proposed. In this supplementary report we summarize the substantive revisions we made based on the discussion at the Senate meeting and the comments and suggestions sent to the Committee after the Senate meeting.

With the exception of the comments in this supplementary report, the comments on specific SPS and on Policy in the Final Report, also attached, remain valid.

SPS Policies

SPS 7: Policy on Supervision of Graduate Work by Faculty with Other Appointments, as defined in SPS 4A and SPS 4B

The Drafting Committee revised this SPS before we added SPS 4B: Procedures for Other Appointments within the Faculty of Health Sciences. Unfortunately, we did not revisit SPS 7 to mesh the text with the new SPS 4B. As the revision marks indicate, the revised SPS has been vetted by the FHS. The SPS is available with all revisions tracked and also in its final form.

During the discussion in Senate, it was suggested that since the material in SPS 7 is indirectly related to T&P, the SPS should be deleted. While The Drafting Committee agrees that the material in SPS 7 is better suited to a Policy statement related to Graduate Supervision, we recommend that the SPS not be deleted until the current Policy statement, "Ph.D. Supervision at McMaster University (1998)", is updated. We recommend that Senate direct Graduate Council to update this policy and to include the material from SPS 7 in the updated Policy.

SPS 12A: Procedures for Selection of and Communication with External and Internal Referees (except those for Clinician Educators)

The discussion at the Senate meeting resulted in the following revisions.

1. Section II, clauses 4 and 5

   These clauses describe the generation of the list of potential referees for the promotion of faculty with permanence. To emphasize that the referees are evaluating scholarship in teaching and learning, "in the relevant field" has been replaced by "in the field of teaching and learning".

2. Section IV, clause 3

   This clause describes the material to be sent to the referees for the promotion of faculty with permanence. "the executive summary of the candidate's teaching portfolio" has been replaced with "a statement by the candidate on his/her pedagogical research/scholarship, such statement not to exceed two pages in length" (see item 3, SPS 15B).
SPS 15B: Preparation of Dossiers for Tenure/Permanence and/or Promotion
The revisions to Section 3 of SPS 15B derive from the revisions to SPS 12A.

SPS 16B: Research Leave Policy – Permanent Faculty
On September 22 the Joint Committee approved the following motion.
After the first six years of full-time service at McMaster University, a full-time teaching-stream faculty member who has attained permanence is entitled to apply for a one-term (Fall, Winter or Spring/Summer) Leave. During their first Leave, 100% of salary will be maintained. Upon completion of the first and any subsequent Leave and after six additional years of full-time service at McMaster University, a full-time teaching professor with permanence is entitled to apply for another one-term Leave at 90% salary.
Approval is required by the Research Leaves Committee and will be conditional upon the presentation of a clear need and an acceptable plan of activities. A report of achievements during the leave must be submitted to the Dean at the end of the Leave.
This proposal was given to the Drafting Committee on October 4. At its post-senate meeting on October 18, the members of the Drafting Committee decided that they were not prepared to make a recommendation regarding this proposal. The Drafting Committee has added SPS 16B that encompasses the boundary conditions in the Joint Committee proposal. We leave it to Senate to decide how it would like to proceed.

SPS 16A: Research Leave Policy – Tenured and CAWAR Faculty
The creation of SPS 16B necessitated minor changes to SPS 16 (now SPS 16A). Also, it was brought to the Drafting Committee’s attention that CP/M is based on the calendar year, whereas most full-year Research Leaves cover the academic year. Clause 5 in SPS 16A has been revised accordingly.

Tenure and Promotion Policy
During Senate’s deliberations, issues were raised (such as concerns about the nature of the Appeal Procedures, Section IV) that were beyond the mandate of our committee. Senate could decide to strike a committee to consider these issues at a later date.

1. Section II, clause 16e
With regard to decanal interviews of applicants, "(or in the case of the Faculty of Health Sciences, a delegated Associate Dean)" was added.

2. Section III, clause 38d
At the October meeting Senate voted to allow membership on multiple T&P committees and the Drafting Committee was instructed to bring back a proposed wording.
Normally, 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. A member of the Faculty Committee or the Senate Committee on Appointments must recuse himself or herself from any and all discussions at the Department level. If the member is asked by the Department Chair to participate at the Department level and the member chooses to serve at the Department level, he or she must recuse himself or herself from all discussion and voting concerning the tenure/permanence and promotion of all the candidates in his or her department at the higher levels, and also when those candidates are compared with other candidates. Such a technical abstention shall not cause the Committee to lose quorum.

3. Section III, clauses 59 - 61
A number of senators commented that these clauses needed revision. The concern is the situation when SCA initially agrees with the Faculty Committee that an appointment be allowed to lapse, but after the mandated interview required in clause 60, is considering overturning the Faculty recommendation and awarding tenure or permanence. Clause 59 requires communication between the two committees but only when SCA initially disagrees with the Faculty Committee. Clause 60b has been added to address this issue (resulting in minor revisions to clauses 59, 60a and 61).

b. The Senate Committee must, at an appropriate time, invite the Faculty Dean and elected colleague back to meet with them if there was initial agreement between the Senate and Faculty Committees that an appointment be allowed to lapse but, after interviewing the candidate, the Senate Committee intends to decide against the Faculty Committee’s recommendation. If the Faculty Dean so chooses, he or she may submit written representations in place of the meeting with the Senate Committee.

4. Section II, clause 8b
A senator proposed that we insert "normally" in the first two sentences of clause 8b and that the conversions follow the protocol in SPS 3, Section I, Clause 1c and Section II, Clause 1c. These sections mandate that if the advertising and interview procedures used at the time of the original appointment deviated significantly from those followed for the new appointment stream, the position must be re-advertised. The advertising for teaching-stream faculty would always deviate significantly from the advertising for tenure-stream faculty. Thus the protocol in SPS 3 would always mandate an open search (to which the incumbent faculty member could apply). Since there are no exceptions, the addition of "normally" would be misleading.