

Memorandum

To: **LA&PS Department Chairs**

From: Stevie Bell, Chair, Tenure and Promotions Committee

Date: February 11, 2025

Subject: Support for FPC and AC Committees

Dear colleagues,

I hope this note finds you well. I am writing at the outset of the File Preparation Cycle to introduce myself as the new Chair of the LA&PS Tenure & Promotion Committee. It's an honour to take on this role and to work alongside all of you in supporting our colleagues.

The T&P Committee plays a critical role in ensuring procedural fairness for colleagues' progress through the ranks. This work is essential in fostering a fair, transparent, and supportive environment. I have attached the checklist used by the T&P Committee to review files to provide insight into our role and to further help you anticipate any procedural issues we may flag in a letter back to the unit. Unfortunately, some procedural irregularities (e.g., the application of unapproved departmental standards) may warrant a delay in the process until they are rectified.

If you have any questions about policies or procedures for preparing or adjudicating tenure and promotion files, please do not hesitate to reach out to me and the Tenure and Promotions committee. We are happy to support.

As you may know, there are many helpful documents available via the Secretariat [T&P Toolkit](#) and the [LA&PS T&P Toolkit](#). The T&P committee has also put together a list below of issues we flagged in files during the last cycle for your reference.

All my best for a smooth file preparation and adjudication process. Please reach out with any questions or concerns you may have.

Best regards,



Professor Stevie M. Bell
Chair, Tenure and Promotion committee
Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies



Issues Flagged by Senate Review Committees in Recent Files

File Preparation and Documentation (Senate Policy section F.3.1.)

- FPC letter includes evaluative commentary with the potential to bias the AC (Relevant [FAQ: 3.4.1](#); See policy section F.3.1.1.(c))
- Inconsistencies across the file (e.g., number of letters, vote counts), including on cover pages, AC and FPC letters, and the checklist
- Missing or incomplete teaching evaluation data without context or rationalization (See policy section F.3.1.2.(b).(iv))
- Solicitation of student letters from students currently under the supervision of the candidate (See policy section F.3.1.2.(b).(i)(c))
- Inclusion of unsigned student letters and unsigned student comments in teaching evaluations in the file (digital signatures or email credentials are acceptable “signatures”) (See policy section F.3.1.2.(b))
- Candidate is reported to have removed or “vetoed” names from lists of referees for teaching, service, or professional contributions and standing without adequate rationale (Relevant FAQs: [FAQ 3.3.1](#))
- Candidate is reported to have removed or “vetoed” names from lists of students without adequate rationale and with potential to undermine the random selection of students (See policy section F.3.1.2(b).(ii) and policy section F.3.1.2.(b).(i)(b))
- Procedures for the random selection of students from which to solicit letters are not clarified (See policy section F.3.1.2.(b).(i)(b))

