

# Proposed changes to Procedures Governing Decisions on Advancement to Candidacy

## Background and Rationale

The existing procedures which govern Faculty decisions on advancement to candidacy of untenured members of faculty in the pre-candidacy phase are contained in the document “*Procedures to Govern the Non-Renewal of Untenured Members of Faculty or their Advancement to Candidacy*”, originally approved by Senate in 1972 and amended in 1973 and 1974.

When the new *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures* (hereinafter called “the *Procedures*”) was approved by YUFA and the Administration and accepted by Senate in 2002, other documents to which the *Procedures* refer were not updated at the same time. Accordingly, when an *ad hoc* tenure and promotions implementation working group was struck, it decided to examine each of the supplementary documents to which the *Procedures* referred and to propose minor revisions to bring those documents into line with the new *Procedures*.

However, when the *Procedures to Govern...* document was reviewed, it was considered to require major revisions to simplify both the language and the procedures themselves, and to ensure that the principles of transparency, equity and clarity underpinning the new T&P *Procedures* were extended to these procedures, which govern decisions on advancement to candidacy. The attached document represents a revision of the current procedures.

## Overview of changes

The revised procedures keep a number of positive elements already in the current procedures, but they recognize, and propose solutions for, a number of problems inherent in the current procedures.

### **Current Procedures – Positive Elements**

- They ground the decision-making on advancement to candidacy in the initiating unit – Department or Faculty, as appropriate.
- They allow a substantive appeal by the pre-candidate, department/division/school Chair or Dean.
- They allow a final appeal on procedural grounds to the Senate Tenure Appeals Committee.

### **Current Procedures - Problems**

- The current procedures are negative in tone, emphasizing situations where individuals are not advanced to candidacy, whereas the majority of decisions to advance to candidacy are positive.
- They are convoluted, contain confusing and unnecessary verbiage and are not written chronologically.
- It is not always clearly stated which deadlines apply at which stage(s) in the process.
- While the unit Dean or Chair (as applicable) can initiate a recommendation to the T&P Committee on advancement to candidacy or termination, there is no specification of the material on which such a recommendation is based.
- While the current procedures allow for an independent review of a negative decision on advancement to candidacy in the case of departmentalised Faculties, in non-departmentalised Faculties the review of the decision is by the same committee which made the original decision.

### ***Proposed Procedures – Solutions***

1. The procedures take a step-by-step, chronological approach to decisions on advancement to candidacy so that committees know what decisions are to be made, when, by whom, and who communicates the decision.
2. A diagram showing the usual progress through Pre-Candidacy and Candidacy is included.
3. The requirement from the *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures* – that pre-candidates are to be advised at specified intervals of the standards which are expected if they are to achieve tenure and promotion – has been included in this document.
4. Deadlines are clearly expressed, and it is clear when they are to be applied.
5. The Dean/Chair may still make a recommendation to the Adjudicating Committee on whether or not an individual should be advanced to Candidacy; if he/she chooses to do so, that recommendation must be based on a review of the same materials that the Adjudicating Committee considers, and the Dean/Chair's recommendation must be considered by the Adjudicating Committee before it makes its decision.
6. The decision-making on advancement to candidacy remains within the T&P committee structure by having the unit level Adjudicating Committee make the decision; having a Faculty or Senate level committee hear a substantive appeal, as appropriate; and having the Senate T&P Appeals Committee (STAPAC) hear a final appeal on procedural grounds.
7. The basis for substantive appeal has been simplified; it is made only on decisions not to advance to candidacy. Appeal is made to the Faculty T&P Committee in departmentalised Faculties. Non-departmentalised Faculties may choose either to have all such appeals considered by a Faculty committee constituted to hear such appeals (whose membership is specified so as to avoid any conflict of interest), or to have appeals heard by the Senate T&P Committee.
8. The powers of STAPAC are now spelled out in these procedures – and they are the same as for appeals on denial of tenure or delay of promotion to senior ranks.