

PDAD&C #134, REVISED 2004-05

MEMORANDUM

TO: Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs
FROM: Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost
DATE: October 7, 2004
RE: *The Tenure Review Process and Tenure Check List*

Note

This Memorandum replaces PDAD&C #134 which was originally issued on 15 June 1993. The Memorandum was updated in fall 1996 to take account of developments since 1993, including the decision of the Grievance Review Panel in May 1995, which clarified various aspects of the [Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments](#). In September 2003, the document was changed after discussion with the University of Toronto Faculty Association to include the procedures required under the new tri-campus framework and clarification on how referees may be identified. The current version has been changed to update contact information.

1. Introduction

Along with the hiring process, the review of each candidate for tenure is the most critical personnel decision we take as a University. The proper application of our procedures and standards for tenure is a critically important responsibility of all divisional academic administrators. The future of both the University and the doctrine of tenure depend on the proper and rigorous application of the [Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments](#) (the [Policy](#)).

It is important to emphasize that there is a dual responsibility placed on those who carry out the tenure review process. On the one hand we must ensure for the candidate under review a fair and objective assessment. This requires not only the involvement of the candidate under review but also the active assistance of the head of the unit in ensuring that a full and well developed file is assembled; and as well, every reasonable effort should be made to ensure that each individual involved in the evaluation process is objective in assessing the evidence. On the other hand, there is also an institutional responsibility embodied in the criteria for tenure as set out in the [Policy](#). The realization of our mission as an internationally significant research university with undergraduate, graduate and professional programs of excellent quality depends critically on the rigorous application of the tenure criteria. The quality of the tenure decision taken depends upon both of these responsibilities being discharged well; our goal as a University depends on our achieving the highest possible standards of quality and fairness in our tenure decisions.

Our review of tenure files has led us to think that we can do better in meeting these dual responsibilities. There has been substantial variation in the quality of documentation supporting the tenure recommendations. There have been a number of cases in which the evidence did not clearly support the tenure recommendation; in other cases, procedural errors were such as to cast doubt on the fairness of the review.

The President and I agreed that I should communicate to you the matters of concern and provide guidelines where divisional practice could be improved. We also felt it would be useful if I described briefly the nature of the review of each file that is undertaken after the file is forwarded to my Office. Finally, I enclose a revised tenure check-list. You should feel free to customize this list to your divisional needs if you have not already done so. Each division should have such a list.

Following are the matters that have come up in our review of the files in recent years.

2. Ensuring a Fair Review

It is evident that a responsibility that everyone shares in the review process is to ensure that a fair and objective review takes place. Throughout this memorandum a number of suggestions are made as to how this can be accomplished better. However, fundamental to all the suggestions is the necessity that the members of the tenure committee and those individuals who are asked as internal or external referees are able to make a judgment or a decision on the basis of the criteria and evidence in an unbiased manner and in conformity with the requirements of the [Policy](#). This necessitates the careful selection of individuals to serve and the preparation of a full and fair dossier. Much of the responsibility to ensure that this happens rests with the Chair of the department or the division head. A number of these responsibilities are commented on below.

(a) The Role of the Chair of the Tenure Committee

The [Policy](#) assigns to the chair of the tenure committee a number of specific activities and responsibilities. In particular, I draw your attention to section 14 of the [Policy](#). In addition to the specific responsibilities in section 14, I would like to underscore a number of other points.

First, prior to the beginning of the tenure review process the Chair of the department (or head of a non-departmentalized division) should review the candidate's personnel file to ensure that there are no procedural difficulties associated with earlier decisions such as the three year review. If any are found, the Provost's Office should be consulted before proceeding further. A major procedural error such as a late three year review may lead to setting aside the recommendation from the tenure committee. While the three year review is "different in purpose and procedure from a tenure review", it is an opportunity to provide advice to the individual, especially where problems of performance have been identified. In most cases this advice is contained in the letter of contract renewal following the review. The failure to have done this

may lead to appeals that the individual was misled. Please note that the three year review should *not* form part of the tenure committee's dossier or deliberations. If this early review reveals procedural errors, the Chair should contact the Provost's Office for advice immediately.

The second issue relates to the appropriate timing of the tenure review. It should be noted that the simple existence of performance failures on the part of the candidate is not itself grounds to delay the committee. However, in instances where maternity leave or events outside the candidate's control such as major illness reduce the time available to the candidate, a delay in the tenure review may be requested with the candidate's written approval. This question should be examined as early as possible, and in any case prior to beginning upon the tenure process. Paragraph 10 of the Policy does provide for delay for reasons such as maternity leave or severe personal circumstances, such as serious illness, with the consent of the candidate and the Vice-President and Provost.

Third, there are and will be tenure cases that are exceptional and where early review may be appropriate (for example, where an exceptional individual may have received an offer from elsewhere carrying tenure). However, more generally, experience suggests that early consideration does not necessarily serve the individual or the University well. Thus, I would request that only extraordinary cases be recommended for early review. Where the Provost's Office is prepared to approve an early review, we will require the candidate's consent in writing, and the assurance that the individual has been fully briefed as to the procedures of the tenure review and the consequence of proceeding early in terms of the lost opportunity to add to the dossier. The case coming forward early must meet the same standard as for cases brought forward on the usual schedule. No allowance can be made for the shorter period of time.

(b) The Preparation of the Dossier

The [Policy](#) requires both the Chair of the department (or Dean) and the candidate to participate in the organizing of the dossier. Where the chair of the campus department is not also the graduate chair, the graduate chair is involved in the preparation of the dossier. It is of critical importance to ensure that this task is carried out to ensure that the tenure committee has a full and complete dossier upon which to make a judgment. If the dossier is incomplete, the Chair of the tenure committee should take immediate steps to remedy the defect including, where necessary, adjourning the committee. A number of suggestions are made below for ways to improve the dossier.

(i) The Documentation of Teaching

There has been very considerable unevenness across the University in the quality and scope of the documentation of teaching. It is imperative that we as a University do a better job in evaluating and promoting teaching, as effective teaching is an essential requirement for the award of tenure.

There are three documents that I wish to draw to your attention.

First, of central importance is section 13 (b) of the [Policy](#) which sets out the definition of effectiveness in teaching. This definition should be before all tenure committees. It makes clear that "teaching" is an activity which is broader than lecturing in the classroom and this requires each division to be aware of and to document the full range of the responsibilities entailed. The dossier might contain, for example, any evidence of the impact of the candidate's teaching on the discipline or profession, or how the teaching is creative.

Second, I remind you of the University's "Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions" which provide a framework for the development by each division of the approved divisional guidelines for the evaluation of teaching. *Your approved divisional guidelines have the force of policy.* These guidelines must be followed and must be shared with the candidate and the members of the tenure committee, and should accompany each dossier sent to my Office. It is important that these teaching guidelines are made available to new faculty when they arrive at the University, and on a regular basis, including during the course of annual reviews and the third year review. The guidelines should also be explicit as to the method by which letters commenting on the teaching of the individual are solicited. There should be evidence about teaching that has been obtained from both current and former students.

Third, it is important to be aware of what is said in Article 5 of the [Memorandum of Agreement](#) about our responsibilities as teachers. In particular, the [Memorandum](#) provides that:

A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, taking care to make himself or herself accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of his or her students.

If you require a copy of any of the above documents I would be pleased to send them to you.

It should be clear from the dossier how much teaching the candidate has done at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Where the amount of teaching varies from the norms for the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained. The teaching dossier should also document the extent of the candidate's supervision of graduate students at both the masters and doctoral level.

Special difficulty sometimes arises in the assessment of teaching for candidates who are being newly appointed from outside the University and who are being considered for tenure. Typically they do have teaching experience. It is important to obtain information from the institutions in

which they have recently taught which conforms as nearly as possible to that which we develop for internal candidates.

Many divisions have incorporated in their Divisional Guidelines provision for classroom visits to observe first hand the effectiveness of the candidates teaching. This is, in my opinion, a good practice and I would ask that you review your Guidelines to ensure, where appropriate, that an effective procedure is in place for review. (If revisions of the divisional guidelines are undertaken, these must be sent forward to the Provost for approval.)

(ii) The Documentation of Research and Creative Professional Achievement

The documentation of research should include a full list of publications in the CV; all of these are to be made available for review. It is a best practice for the CV to be supplemented by the candidate with a general description of the direction that her or his research has taken. The candidate should be expected to include in his/her research dossier a statement of research work in progress and plans for future work, which is particularly relevant to assessing future promise. Upon request of the candidate, this material should be made available to referees.

In a few cases there have been files where there has been significant omission of work from the dossier. This is particularly the case where work-in-progress is not included in the file and yet has formed part of the committee's deliberations. Candidates should be encouraged to give all work to the committee for review even if an individual chooses to restrict work-in-progress to the committee. If any substantial reliance is to be placed on unpublished work, in the judgement of research accomplishments, it must be available to both internal and external referees.

For the most part, the documentation of creative professional achievement has not been as consistent as for scholarly research. Some divisions have developed and adopted guidelines based on the Hollenberg Report on Creative Professional Achievement that provide the candidate with information as to how the evaluation of creative professional achievement will be carried out in the division. These guidelines do not have the force of policy, but can be helpful. It is important that the dossier be constructed to show where the professional work has been *creative* and not just routine. Creative professional activity should also be distinguished from teaching, which should be evaluated separately.

(iii) Additional Documentation

The tenure committee, through the Chair, may under the [Policy](#) gather additional information at any time during the review process. This may be especially important where a candidate responding to a proposed negative recommendation provides additional work or additional information about the work which the committee believes should be evaluated by referral to the internal reading committee and/or to external referees. In the event that the tenure committee solicits additional information the candidate should be given a summary of the additional information and an opportunity to respond to the committee.

(iv) The Summary of the Evidence in the Dossier

The summary of evidence presented to the candidate must be in writing and must be given to the candidate before the tenure committee meets. It is important that the summary be sufficiently detailed that the candidate knows the evidence before the committee and could, if desired, supplement the dossier with a written response, or by appearing before the committee to make a statement. The information given to the candidate concerning the process and the evidence should be as complete as possible consistent with maintaining confidentiality (where possible, individual summaries of each letter or report should be given, but without attribution). The summary should also form part of the dossier forwarded to my Office together with the recommendation to grant or deny tenure.

3. The Evaluation of the Dossier

(a) The Internal Reading and Evaluation Committee for the Evaluation of Scholarly and Professional Accomplishments

The internal committee that provides a report on the candidate's research and/or creative professional achievement should include at least two members. *The members of the committee should meet and prepare a single report.* Each member of the internal committee should be competent to review the research dossier carefully and rigorously. Each committee member should read the candidate's published work and any other material submitted by the candidate for evaluation, together with material gathered by the Chair, such as opinions of other faculty members who are knowledgeable about the candidate's work. The internal reading committee should not receive the external referees' reports. It is for the tenure committee to receive and consider both the internal and external reports. A person who has supervised the candidate's graduate work or who has collaborated with the candidate should not serve as a member of the committee that prepares this report.

If the candidate has collaborators, information must be sought by the Chair from them and from the candidate about the nature of the collaboration and the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution.

With the candidate's permission, work-in-progress can be considered by the internal reading committee. However, it must be recognized that this work has not, as a rule, been subjected to full peer review; as such, in most cases, it deserves a lesser weight. Furthermore, given the absence of peer review, the members of the internal reading committee should read work-in-progress with particular care before concluding what weight it should carry in reaching a judgment on the candidate's work as a whole. Nonetheless, candidates should be encouraged to put work-in-progress forward as it is especially relevant in the assessment of future potential.

While the Internal Reading Committee may not make a recommendation for or against tenure it is imperative that the committee state clearly its evaluation of the candidate's work against the

stated criteria. The committee should advise whether in its view excellence, or competence, has been found or not found.

(b) The Committee to Evaluate Teaching

A thorough and arm's-length review of teaching effectiveness must be made for each candidate and the tenure dossier must include a written report on teaching effectiveness. The current [Policy](#) directs that divisional guidelines be followed in the preparation of the report, which should be prepared by a committee of at least two people who are in a position to evaluate the teaching of the candidate carefully and rigorously. The Chair of the Department or division head (who chairs the tenure committee) should not prepare the report on teaching.

The report should be more than a summary of student course evaluations. It is expected that the teaching evaluation committee will have received from the candidate under review a teaching dossier which includes course materials for all courses the candidate has taught and any other documentation which the candidate wishes to have taken into account. The committee will also have course evaluations and other materials collected by the Chair, such as letters from students and former students and opinions from colleagues who have first hand knowledge of the candidate's teaching. Furthermore, the success of the supervision and the candidate's future prospects as a graduate supervisor should be reviewed explicitly.

In cases where there are shortcomings in the candidate's teaching, the evaluation committee and the tenure committee should discuss and review the case with particular care. The judgment that the candidate's teaching meets or does not meet the standard of competence or excellence must have a clear basis. While the Committee to Evaluate Teaching may not make a recommendation for or against tenure it is imperative that the committee state clearly its evaluation of the candidate's work against the stated criteria. The committee should advise whether in its view excellence, or competence, has been found or not found.

In the cases where the evaluation committee is of the view that there is excellence in teaching it is important that the grounds for this view be explicit. Excellence in teaching might involve a level of creativity that has resulted in major contributions to the curriculum or major impact on how a subject is taught. It might be evidenced as well in contributions to journals devoted to teaching or in publications such as text books.

(c) External Referees

The effective and fair use of external referees is critical to ensuring that we make high quality tenure decisions. Towards this end, we need to be rigorous with respect to the number and the choice of referees. Referees should be individuals of international stature in their field and will normally be distinguished senior members of the faculty of universities which are major centres of activity in the candidate's field.

The dossier forwarded to the Provost's Office should contain a list of the referees proposed by the candidate and of those selected by the Chair and a brief explanation of the basis of choice of all of the referees who were selected and their qualifications. This explanation should be available for the tenure committee. The Chair may consult with members of the tenure committee to obtain suggestions for possible external referees. The number of external referees is not specified in the [Policy](#) other than to state that, at a minimum, one referee should be selected from the candidate's list and one selected by the Chair. A well documented file will contain six or more external references of which at least three are from outside of the candidate's list. Thorough reviews carry much more weight than cursory judgments and the views of senior scholars of international stature carry much more weight than those from individuals early in their careers or less well placed to assess accomplishments in an internationally significant research university.

An opinion may be sought from the candidate's former supervisor but, in general, external referees should be chosen for their ability to judge the quality of the candidate's work at arm's length. Collaborators should not be referees, although they should be asked to clarify the extent of the candidate's contribution to joint work.

The letter from the Chair to the referees should make clear that we are seeking an assessment of the candidate's work and request that they be specific about wherein and in what particular respects they find the candidate's contributions valuable or not.

It may sometimes be appropriate to use some referees who are not in the university milieu but who can comment on the candidate's creative professional achievement. (In the case of such referees, the explanation for choosing them is particularly important.) Such referees should be provided with a statement of what the division regards as creative professional achievement, which is to be distinguished from routine consulting or professional practice, as well as the description of creative professional achievement in the [Policy](#). In any case, no dossier should depend primarily on non-university referees. At least three letters should be from senior faculty members of other universities as described above. Where the dossier does not contain such letters the Chair must justify the choice of referees and the report of the tenure committee should demonstrate that the committee explicitly considered the slate of referees in its deliberation.

**(d) Evaluation of Past and Recent Accomplishments
and Future Potential**

The [Policy](#) requires that the candidate's accomplishments over the complete period of the professional career be evaluated. For some individuals, especially those who hold the rank of Associate Professor, this may span a considerable length of time. In the majority of cases it is clear that the individual has established a pattern of scholarly or teaching accomplishments, consistent over time. In this situation the tenure committee has little trouble in concluding that future potential exists. However in some cases the accomplishments of the candidate prior to joining the University, or earlier in their career, stand in marked contrast to the recent record at the University of Toronto. It is important in such situations that the evaluation committee

comment explicitly on the significance of recent work in assessing future potential. The tenure committee should also ensure that work-in-progress is considered and evaluated.

4. The Tenure Committee

(a) The Composition of the Committee

The Chair of the Department (or Dean of a non-departmental Faculty) shall chair the tenure committee. Only in exceptional circumstances should an alternate serve and only then with the written approval of the Dean (for a Chair) and the Provost.

The tenure committee itself should be constituted to avoid conflicts of interest and to ensure that the committee will be able to meet its dual responsibilities. Clearly, individuals who are not in a position to evaluate the candidate fairly should not be used in the review. A person who has collaborated with the candidate or who has supervised his or her work as a graduate student should normally not be appointed to the tenure or internal evaluation committees. If the Chair is in this position, this would be sufficient reason to seek permission from the division head and the Provost for the Chair of the department to be replaced as chair of the committee. This is an unusual circumstance, but one which is allowed for in the [Policy](#).

If it is difficult to constitute the committee from the tenured membership of the department, a tenured member of another university whose discipline is similar to the individual under review may be considered, as may tenured members in cognate fields in other departments of this University.

Where the Dean of a multi-departmental faculty, or the Dean of SGS, wishes to appoint a representative to the tenure committee instead of serving himself or herself, the decanal representative should not be a member of the candidate's department. In the case of multidepartmental faculties, then, the Dean would be represented by a tenured member from another department. In the case of non-departmental faculties, the Dean chairs the committee, which contains another five members plus the representative of the Dean of SGS. The [Policy](#) permits up to three of the five to come from cognate fields outside the faculty.

The University of Toronto Faculty Association has requested that we improve upon the steps provided in the [Policy](#) to ensure the absence of improper bias. Prior to forming the tenure committee, the internal evaluation committees, and the selection of referees, the Chair may wish to discuss with the candidate whether there are persons who are in the candidate's opinion clearly not able to make an unbiased judgement. This information may then be taken into account in the selection of individuals as seems appropriate. The candidate, of course, retains her or his right to challenge the selected members of the tenure committee.

(b) The Quorum and Confidentiality of the Tenure Committee

All members of the tenure committee must be present throughout any and all meetings of the committee. If a member is absent, the committee must not proceed. If a member leaves the meeting, the meeting must be adjourned. The meeting must be in person; conference calls and telephone participation are not allowed for in the [Policy](#).

With the exception of the specific provisions for the candidate to appear before the committee, only members of the tenure committee may be in attendance during discussions. Only tenure committee members may be present when decisions are being made. While you may wish to have an administrative staff member aid in the compilation of the dossier, that individual should not be present at the committee's deliberations.

The deliberations of the tenure committee are confidential. This should be stressed by the Chair of the committee at the outset. Whenever the committee's confidentiality breaks down, problems occur that can lead to unfairness. The system in place for review at the University of Toronto places the responsibility for the tenure recommendation not in the department as a whole, which is the practice at some other universities, but in the members of the tenure committee. This should be respected. Maintaining confidentiality is especially important in circumstances where an appeal of the decision may be launched and a second tenure committee may possibly be struck.

(c) The Tenure Committee's Recommendation

The committee is permitted only to recommend for or against the granting of tenure.

The question is sometimes raised whether the committee has within its power to recommend that the tenure decision be delayed because there has not been sufficient time for the results of the candidate's work to become fully apparent. Under the [Policy](#) the tenure committee must make a decision on the evidence before the committee and cannot recommend an adjournment or delay. If the committee is unable to come to a decision to recommend that tenure be granted or denied, the Provost's Office must be informed and a new committee must be established immediately, unless the Provost's Office is convinced that the circumstances are sufficiently unusual to delay the appointment of a new committee for a period of up to one year. This decision is for the Provost, not the tenure committee.

It may happen that during the deliberations of the tenure committee, an unfairness is discovered that had not been identified earlier. In these instances, the chair of the committee should raise the issue immediately with the Provost's Office.

Whether the recommendation is to grant or to deny tenure, the letter recommending the committee's decision should state clearly the basis of the decision with reference to the criteria laid out in the [Policy](#). The criteria as set out in section 13 of the [Policy](#) read as follows:

Clear promise of future intellectual and professional development must be affirmed for tenure to be awarded. Demonstrated excellence in one of research (including equivalent and creative or professional work) and teaching, and clearly established competence in the other, form the second essential requirement for a positive judgment by the tenure committee. Only outstanding performance with respect to University service should be given any significant weight and, even then, only if there are no substantial reservations relating to the research, teaching and future promise criteria.

It is very important that the reasons for the recommendation, whether positive or negative, be fully articulated both for the President and for the candidate (who may appeal once the President takes a negative decision). The reasons for the decision should be discussed by the committee and the draft report reviewed by each member of the tenure committee. The final written report is sent to the Provost's Office, through the division head. All members of the committee should be copied on the reporting letter (but not the enclosures).

The tenure committee recommends as a committee, not a collection of individuals. The written report for the President may record the vote of the committee itself; however the ballots showing how each member voted should be kept confidential within the committee, and are not to be transmitted to the Dean or the President.

(d) Application of the Criteria

All members of the tenure committee must specifically address the criteria for tenure; ensure that in the case of a positive recommendation the case for tenure is fully supported by the evidence presented by the candidate; and be persuaded that the candidate meets the criteria stated in the [Policy](#). Where the candidate fails to meet one or more of the criteria, tenure must be denied. When all of the criteria are found to be met, tenure should be recommended.

(e) Notification of the Candidate

While the [Policy](#) provides for advising the candidate of the tenure committee's recommendation, it is absolutely essential that the Chair make clear *that this is a recommendation, not a decision*. The final decision is made by the President. When told of the tenure committee's recommendation, the candidate should also be advised of the remaining steps in the approval process. A form letter to be used for this purpose is appended (see pp. xii and xiii).

5. The President's Review

Recommendations under the [Policy](#) are made to the President through the Provost. The file is reviewed first in the Provost's Office for completeness and to identify any procedural errors.

It has been my practice once the file is complete to provide advice to the President on the merits of the tenure committee's recommendation for or against the awarding of tenure. In the majority of files the recommendation is well supported and I have had no hesitation in endorsing it to the President. In a minority of cases I advise the President of my concerns about the recommendation.

Under both the University of Toronto Act and the Policy, the final decision on each tenure recommendation lies with the President. The President takes his responsibility under the Policy to approve or deny tenure as an important and central aspect of fulfilling the duties of his Office. This concern has been common to each of the recent Presidents of the University who have taken the time and care to read and review each file in considerable detail.

The majority of the recommendations that support the awarding of tenure attest to the significant contributions that the candidates make to their discipline and to the University. In these cases, the committee's recommendation is readily accepted.

Where there are major procedural problems, or where the case for tenure in light of the Policy's explicit criteria has not been clearly established, the President has intensified his review of the file. Depending on the nature of the difficulties, the President may take a series of steps. The President's review may disclose procedural problems and lead to referring the file back to the Chair of the tenure committee, normally with advice to reconvene and correct the problem. The review may on occasion indicate the need for additional information, and the President will direct this request in writing to the Chair of the tenure committee. The Chair will share any such communication with the members of the committee. The President will also inform the candidate in writing if the file is referred back in such cases.

The review may raise questions about whether the criteria for tenure have been met, and the President may wish to seek further clarification and explanation of the reasons given for either a positive or negative decision. In cases where the President has doubts about accepting a tenure committee's recommendation, then the President will communicate in writing the grounds for doubt to the chair of the committee, and also to the candidate. Before making his decision, the President will afford the candidate an opportunity to respond orally or in writing to the grounds for doubt; he will also give the committee the opportunity to respond in writing through the Chair.

In many such instances the President's review leads, with the fuller understanding of the file, to the granting of tenure. In other instances the case for tenure is not made out. While such instances are unusual, the President has declined to accept the recommendation in these circumstances. The President's decision to deny tenure may be appealed in accordance with section 23 of the Policy.

The final aspect of the President's review of the files is the provision of feedback to the division head concerning the quality of decisions taken and the opportunity to discuss how they reflect the academic aspirations and direction of the division.

6. Other Matters

**(a) Implications for the Position in the Department
in a Tenure Denial**

I am sometimes told that a reason for granting tenure is that if tenure is denied, the position may be lost due to financial constraints. This is not true; the Provost will always and automatically permit a replacement in the case of a tenure denial. It is in any case an irrelevant consideration in the tenure decision; the tenure decision must be made solely on the evidence before the committee as tested against the criteria stated in the [Policy](#).

The University's consistent and unequivocal policy is to permit an immediate search for a replacement in the tenure stream in cases where tenure is denied. To do otherwise would undermine the integrity of the tenure decision itself. We will continue this policy regardless of how challenging the University's financial circumstances may be. We will have no higher budgetary priority.

(b) The Role of the Vice-Provost

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic is available to all Chairs of tenure committees at any time for assistance. *When you are uncertain about any point of procedure or policy, please consult the Vice-Provost (edith.hillan@utoronto.ca / (416)946-0812).* It is much better to consult in advance of a decision rather than afterwards.

7. Conclusion

The decision concerning tenure is arguably the most important decision that we make, both for the individual faculty member and for the University. I am sure that you will agree that it is imperative that such decisions be of the highest quality. We seek your help in ensuring that this is the case. I trust that this memorandum and the accompanying checklist will be of assistance to you in this regard.