

Adjudicating Committee Tip Sheet

To be read in conjunction with the *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures*, section F.3.1.2.

Expectations of Adjudicating Committee Members

Prior to meetings of the Adjudicating Committee, all members are expected to:

- Review the criteria and procedures.
- Carefully read each file, paying particular attention to:
 - the **File Preparation Committee** commentary, for contextualizing information and the procedures used in preparing the file.
 - **for tenure files:** the advancement to Candidacy letter which sets out the expectations to be met by the candidate if tenure and promotion are to be awarded.

Joint appointments

- The Adjudicating Committee should include at least one member from the second unit.
- To the degree appropriate with respect to proportionality of appointment, adjudication should take into account the standards articulated by both units.

Meeting Requirements

Quorum must be met for all adjudications. Only members present at the adjudication – in person or by teleconference – may vote. Members who have provided a reference letter to the file participate in the adjudication and vote on all criterion areas and tenure and promotion.

Committees shall apply standards in place at the time of hire/advancement to Candidacy. These standards are the unit-level standards which the Senate T&P Committee has found to be in accord with the University criteria or, until unit standards are found to be in accord, the University criteria are applied.

File Assessment

- Ground assessment of the file in the University criteria/unit-level standards for each criterion area.
- Inadequately documented files must be returned to the *File Preparation Committee* to ensure that there is sufficient evidence on which to base a recommendation.
- Strive for consensus in assessments. “Secret” ballots need not be used.
- Before voting, explore divergent views, always relating the evidence to the standards.

Voting

The only possible rankings for the three criterion areas in **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor** files are:

Excellence
High competence
Competence
Competence not demonstrated

These relate to the minimum standards for a recommendation of tenure and promotion. A candidate who has met the minimum standards is recommended for both tenure and promotion.

For **promotion to Full Professor/Senior Lecturer**, the committee votes only to *approve* or *delay* promotion. The three criterion areas are not ranked.

The final recommendation must reflect the committee’s discussion of the file.

Report

The report of the Adjudicating Committee must clearly make the case for its recommendation. It will:

- Include detailed results of votes in each criterion area (for tenure & promotion to Associate Professor) and the vote on the recommendation for tenure and for promotion
- Provide detailed reasons in relation to the University/unit-level standards for the rankings in each area and on the recommendation for tenure and promotion
- Address both positive and negative evidence
- Explain split votes

And – it will not identify referees with their respective comments, which is a breach of confidentiality.