

Recommended Timeline for Candidates for Professor of Teaching

- December^{*} : Candidates nominated or self-nominated
 - ^{*} The candidate can defer the decision to June; however, this implies a summer or very early fall in-depth teaching evaluation (IDTE), which may be unsuitable for some candidates.
- December^{*} : Select Mini-Committee
 - Candidate suggests 3 names (they must be Full Professors or Professors of Teaching)
 - FAC then makes recommendation of composition of Mini-Committee to Head
- January^{*} : Select IDTE person from the Mini-Committee
 - If the candidate is being evaluated in the summer or fall, a Mini-Committee member could be assigned to the Peer (Teaching) Evaluation Committee, effective July 1st, although it is *not* a requirement that he/she person be on the Peer Evaluation Committee.
 - If the candidate is being evaluated in the fall, the Mini-Committee technically won't have to form until the summer. We recommend that the IDTE person be selected no later than mid-June, just in case the Mini-Committee member is being assigned to the Peer Evaluation Committee.
- January-April: First window for IDTE
- May-July: Second window for IDTE
- August and earlier: Mini-committee and candidate iterate over dossier
- **August 27: Dossier submitted for review to Standing Committee**
- Early to mid-September: Standing Committee selects external referees
- September 15: UBC's official deadline for final dossier
- September to early October: Last window for IDTE
- September to early October: Forward IDTE to external referees
- October or November: Standing Committee meets, having referees' letters
- Later:
 - FoS DACOPAT Committee
 - UBC SAC
 - President's office
 - June/July: Outcome known

Rationale for Dates:

1) UBC's agreement (www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/collective-agreements/appointment-faculty/, section 5.03) has a deadline of September 15 ("unless otherwise agreed by the Head") for the **final** file. Since our process allows candidates to change the file after the Standing Committee reviews it and selects external referees, candidates should submit their file for review by the Standing Committee by **August 27**. (This applies to all promotion candidates, not just those going up for Professor of Teaching.)

This date will greatly relieve the stress on the Head Secretary, and increase the likelihood of getting good referees (many decline when we ask in late September because they are already swamped).

2) The suggested deadline for nominations is December because a candidate will not know what fall courses he/she is teaching until well into spring. A fall in-depth teaching review may be risky because the candidate could be assigned: a brand new course, an existing course that the candidate is teaching for the first time, or a course outside the candidate's primary area of interest. It makes more sense to evaluate the instructor in a course for which he/she has done a substantial amount of development, and that course may be scheduled for January-April. Candidates should strongly consider being evaluated in the classroom during January-April or the summer, but not everyone teaches in the summer, and a 6-week summer course may be too rushed. Some discretion should be allowed for nominations as late as mid-June, in the event that a candidate is OK with a fall teaching evaluation.

3) With respect to having the Mini-Committee do an "in-depth" review of the teaching (as opposed to having the Peer Evaluation Committee do this on a random, one-time basis), this is fair game since the Mini-Committee for promotions for research faculty would ordinarily be doing an in-depth review of that candidate's research. The in-depth review should involve a discussion of lesson plans and learning goals with the candidate. The evaluator should observe the candidate over 2-3 lectures, review the course notes (lecture slides), review Web site contents (e.g., Blackboard), etc.

4) There was some discussion about whether it would make sense to have the Carl Wieman Science Education Initiative and other departments (Science, Arts, etc.) help to evaluate a candidate. This is not necessarily a good idea since "good practices" in other departments may not be relevant/useful in Computer Science (e.g., using concept maps, running labs in certain ways, using specialized assessment techniques).