### Part I
**Reason for Procedure**

1.1 To set out procedures secondary to the Policy entitled “Promotion of Senior Academic Administrators Outside the Faculty Bargaining Unit”.

### Part II
**Procedural Content**

2.1 These procedures are to be read in conjunction with the Promotion of Senior Academic Administrators Outside the Faculty Bargaining Unit Policy, and all capitalized terms used herein shall have the meaning given to them in that Policy.

**Procedures for Applying for and Awarding Promotion**

2.2 Procedures for applying for and awarding promotion from one academic rank to another are as follows:
(a) An Applicant who wishes to be considered for promotion will make a written application to his or her supervisor, which will include the appropriate application form and supporting documentation (normally a teaching dossier, a research dossier, and a service/leadership dossier) demonstrating that the criteria for promotion have been met as outlined in the Policy and in any existing Unit-level criteria for promotion. The Applicant will also include with the request the names and brief biographies of five (5) external referees who can speak to the Applicant’s accomplishments.

(b) The supervisor or designate will be the non-voting Chair of the Peer Review Committee. The Peer Review Committee will normally be comprised of:

(i) three (3) faculty members from the Unit at or above the rank being applied to; and

(ii) two (2) members appointed by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic).

The Peer Review Committee must have at least one (1) member who is also a Senior Academic Administrator. Gender parity will be sought on all Peer Review Committees. Where gender parity is not feasible, there shall be at least one (1) member of each gender on the Peer Review Committee.

(c) The Chair will choose three (3) names from the Applicant’s list of referees and will ask them to assess the application in accordance with the criteria from the Unit and the Policy.

(d) The Chair will send a notice to all members of the applicable Unit and others inviting confidential feedback with respect to the Applicant’s scholarship, teaching and administrative service.

(e) All documentation, including letters, will be provided to the Peer Review Committee and to the Applicant with identifying marks removed. The Peer Review Committee will review the application and make a written recommendation that is forwarded to the dean/director of the Unit, who will then forward the Peer Review Committee’s recommendation along with his or her own independent recommendation for consideration by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Where the Applicant is the dean/director of the Unit, or an associate vice-president or vice-provost, the Peer Review Committee’s recommendation will be forwarded by the Chair directly to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic).

(f) Should the Peer Review Committee be unable to make a positive recommendation, prior to providing their report to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Chair will meet with the Applicant to discuss the concerns and will then provide the Applicant with an opportunity to meet with the Peer Review Committee to respond to their concerns.
reasonable time will be allowed to the Applicant to seek, solicit opinion and provide further documentation in order to prepare for such a meeting.

(g) The Peer Review Committee will evaluate the application and supporting evidence and make its recommendation in writing, together with the specific reasons therefor related to the applied criteria, to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), with a copy to the Applicant.

(h) The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall transmit his/her own written recommendation, together with the specific reasons therefor related to the applied criteria, and those of the Peer Review Committee, to the President of the University, unless he/she believes that the Peer Review Committee has misapplied the criteria and weightings established pursuant to the Policy, in which case he/she may refer the matter back to the Peer Review Committee for clarification and/or review. The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall deliver a copy to the Applicant of his/her recommendation to the President.

(i) The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will make the final recommendation on promotion and forward it to the President. If the Applicant is not to be recommended for promotion, the President shall notify him/her in writing of this decision, within thirty (30) working days of the decision and shall, at the same time, advise him/her of the right to appeal in accordance with the grounds set out in section 2.5 of this Procedure. Denial of promotion must be approved by the Board of Governors.

2.3 Applications for promotion can be withdrawn at any time without prejudice.

Appeals of Negative Recommendations Regarding Promotion

2.4 The Applicant may appeal a negative decision by delivering a written notice of appeal to the President within fifteen (15) working days of the receipt of such notice of his/her decision. The written notice of appeal shall specify the grounds for appeal and the evidence supporting it.

2.5 The Applicant may appeal only on the grounds of procedural defects which affected the intended recommendation to the Board of Governors. Procedural defects include, but are not limited to, misapplication of the criteria and weightings, bias, or denial of natural justice in the recommendation for promotion procedures.

2.6 The President shall refer the appeal to the Appeal Committee. The Appeal Committee shall meet within ten (10) working days of receiving the notice of appeal. The Appeal Committee may make whatever investigations it deems necessary in order to make a decision.

2.7 The Appeal Committee shall inform the Applicant and the Chair of the Peer Review Committee in writing of the substance, but not the source, of any evidence
submitted to it during the course of its investigations. All such evidence shall be treated as confidential by all members of the Appeal Committee, by the Applicant and by the Chair of the Peer Review Committee. Proceedings of the Appeal Committee shall be confidential.

2.8 The Applicant and the Chair of the Peer Review Committee shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Appeal Committee after five (5) working days have elapsed from receipt of the documentation referred to in section 2.7 above in order to respond to the evidence before the committee and to answer any questions put by the Appeal Committee.

2.9 The decision of the Appeal Committee, together with a written statement of its reasons including dissenting or minority opinions, shall be delivered by the chairperson of the Appeal Committee to the Applicant and to the President within forty (40) working days of receiving the Applicant's notice of appeal. At the same time, the President shall also be given the written statement of appeal.

2.10 The Appeal Committee shall have the following two (2) options open to it, and its decision concerning these options shall be final. It may:

(a) dismiss the appeal; or

(b) if it finds that any grounds in section 2.5 above are substantiated, remit the case to the President who shall, within fifteen (15) working days of the date of receipt of the Appeal Committee’s decision, initiate repetition of the promotion recommendation process. In circumstances which it considers exceptional, the Appeal Committee shall have the power to direct, in general terms, the composition of the second Peer Review Committee. In cases where only technical or procedural matters are at issue, the President may recall of the original Peer Review Committee to reconsider its decision. Such action would require prior agreement from the Applicant. This second review process shall be completed within sixty (60) working days of the date of the receipt of the decision of the Appeal Committee by the President or within such additional time as is mutually agreed to by the appellant and the chairperson of the Appeal Committee. There shall be no right to appeal the decision arrived at as the result of repetition of the promotion procedures.

Part III
Accountability

3.1 The Office of Legal Counsel is responsible for advising the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) that a formal review of this Procedure is required.

3.2 The Vice-Provost (Academic Affairs) is responsible for the implementation, administration and review of this Procedure.
3.3 Senior Academic Administrators are responsible for complying with this Procedure.

**Part IV**

**Review**

4.1 Governing Document reviews shall be conducted every ten (10) years. The next scheduled review date for this Procedure is June 22, 2026.

4.2 In the interim, this Procedure may be revised or repealed if:

(a) the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) for Approving Body deems it necessary or desirable to do so;

(b) the Procedure is no longer legislatively or statutorily compliant;

(c) the Procedure is now in conflict with another Governing Document; and/or

(d) the Parent Policy is revised or repealed.

**Part V**

**Effect on Previous Statements**

5.1 This Procedure supersedes all of the following:

(a) all previous Board of Governors/Senate Governing Documents on the subject matter contained herein; and

(b) all previous Administration Governing Documents on the subject matter contained herein.

**Part VI**

**Cross References**

6.1 This Procedure should be cross referenced to the following relevant Governing Documents, legislation and/or forms:

(a) Promotion of Senior Academic Administrators Outside the Faculty Bargaining Unit Policy.