

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Date: _____

To: Simon Peacock, Dean
Faculty of Science

From: Head
If a joint appointment, please list both Heads

Re: The following Faculty Member:
Dr/Prof/Mr/Ms _____

Department(s) of _____
If a joint appointment, please list both Departments

1) I recommend

I do NOT recommend

NEW APPOINTMENT AS:

Professor Professor of Teaching Associate Professor Senior Instructor

PROMOTION TO:

Professor Professor of Teaching Associate Professor Senior Instructor

2) I recommend

I do NOT recommend

TENURE:

Tenure Only (*including new appointments*)

Automatic Tenure linked to Promotion

Tenure Track

For new non-tenured appointments at the rank of Associate Professor & Professor

Tenure as Senior Instructor

3)

Periodic Review? Yes No

Seventh (7th) Year Periodic Review

Tenure effective date _____

Promotion effective date _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Dear Dean Peacock,

I am writing to recommend the promotion of XXXXXXXX to Full Professor in the Department of Mathematics. Dr. XXXX is currently an Associate Professor with tenure in this department.

Departmental Votes

A meeting of tenured Full Professors of Mathematics was held on November 3rd, 20XX to consider the case for promotion to Full Professor of XXXXXXXX. They voted unanimously in favour of promotion by a vote of 23-0-0.

The DACOPAT representative and Acting Head were present, but did not vote.

I am in complete agreement with this decision and strongly recommend that Dr. XXXXXX be promoted to Full Professor. The following is a summary of the case.

Background

Dr. XXXXXX obtained his Ph.D. in 19XX at the University of XXXX under the supervision of XXXX. He was a XXXXX from 19XX to 20XX and was appointed Assistant Professor at UBC in July 2001. He was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure on July 1, 20XX.

Research

Dr. XXXXXXXX works in

His earlier contributions are on

Upon joining UBC, XXXX tackled

This work is quite remarkable and technically impressive, as

Publications

In XX years since his PhD, Dr. XXXX has published XX papers in some of the strongest and most prestigious mathematical journals in the world. These include papers in . He also has 1 submitted paper and two papers near completion

He has published a book and has a patent pending.

Referees' Letters

The six referees form a stellar cast of mathematicians with excellent international reputations.

All letters are arms' length. The letters are unanimous in their strong support for his promotion to full professor.

XXX XXXX is a Mathematics Professor at the University of XXX, and an expert in . He says: "These studies have revealed new phenomena in the setting of XXX and motivate many questions for future research." He goes on to say "My view is that XXX has rare vision: he sees past the research frontier."

XXXX, a Professor of Mathematics and Canada Research Chair at XXXX is an expert in XXX and a XXXX. According to him, "The thread connecting these directions of inquiry is precisely the elements of deep mathematical analysis of XXXXX. This exhibits his exceptional taste in mathematics, along with his depth and broad knowledge of the analysis of XXXXX." Furthermore, he adds "He could generally be compared to XXXX, now a full professor at the XXXXX, or to XXXX, who is a full professor at XXXX, at the analogous point in their careers."

XXX XXXX, a Professor of Applied Physics at XXXXX, and an expert in XXXX, says that "He is recognized as one of the most active mathematicians of the highest standard."

XX XXXXX, a Professor of Mathematics at XXX XXXX is an expert in XXXX. He says "In a field which is very crowded and often exceedingly technical, he always manages to focus on some crucial effect or issue and to contribute to our understanding of it in some fundamental way."

XXX XXX is a Professor of Mathematics at XXXX University, and an expert in XXX. He notes that "These are groundbreaking papers." Furthermore, "In the course of the past decade XXXX has become one of the world leaders in the theory of XXXX. In my opinion, he richly deserves promotion to a full professorship."

XXX XXX XXX is a Professor of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics at XXXX and an expert in XXXX. He says "His reputation and research achievements are at a level appropriate for promotion to the rank of Full Professor."

Teaching

XXX XXXX is an outstanding teacher with an exemplary record of high quality teaching. He has taught classes at many levels, from large first-year (Math XXX - 1XX students, Math XX with sections of 1XX and 1XX students). He has also taught specialized graduate courses (Math XXX, XXX). He is a clear, motivational, interesting lecturer, who can get at the heart of the core ideas and convey them with particular talent.

Student evaluations of his recent teachings are consistently above the departmental averages on the "taught effectively" question, Q6, and in some cases (e.g. Math XXX 20XXW, Math XXX 20XXW) significantly above. He scored well over 4 out of 5 points on Q6 in every course on the list. This is also true of all other metrics, Q1-Q5 where his scores are either well above 4 or very close to 4 out of 5 points.

Two colleagues each visited two of the lectures taught by Dr. XXXX. Both provide evidence of his excellence as an instructor, with comments such as: "... the best part of all was the

relaxed pace that encouraged broader thinking outside the immediate mathematics. He is a very good teacher." "It is clear that the students appreciate his efforts - on both days the classroom was packed and attentive."

In assembling this case for promotion, we also recognized that this is a compelling case for a teaching award nomination.

Supervision

XXXX has successfully supervised and co-supervised trainees at all levels, from USRA (X), through MSc (X), PhD (XX). Many of his trainees have been jointly supervised and this is a testament to the culture in the group where collaborative research and similar interests, as well as pooled funding has been the rule. XXXX more than "pulls his weight" in this co-supervision. His extremely clear and deep insights, and his love of teaching make him a terrific role model for young scientists.

The post-doctoral supervision is particularly notable, as all four of his previous postdocs have gone on to continued good career steps. XXX also has a long record of participation in thesis defence/examiner committees at UBC.

Service

XXXXX has a record of willing and excellent service to the department, the university, and the community. At the department level, he has served on both Hiring Committee, Research Affairs Committee and the Merit Committees over the past years. All these require significant work and fairness of approach for which he is well-known. He has also served as an undergraduate advisor, editor of several scientific journals and as a conference organizer.

Summary

XXXX has an excellent record of research, with superior results in top mathematical journals. He is also a terrific teacher, whose style and clarity are appreciated across the many types of teaching, from service courses to highly specialized graduate offerings. He is a dedicated colleague with a strong record of service to the department, to UBC, and to the Mathematical Community. I am happy to strongly recommend his promotion to Full Professor.

Sincerely yours,

Leah Keshet
Acting Head, Department of Mathematics

Candidate's Response(s) – (if concerns)

If any, please place in reverse chronological order (most recent on top)

Head's Letter to Candidate – (if concerns)

Addendum to CV –

Please ensure each addendum to CV & Publications Record is dated. Do not update the full CV and add that. SAC needs to see what was sent to the referees and department committee.

CV & Publications Record –

Please follow guidelines found in Appendix 3 – Annotated CV of the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC 2011/12 at the following link:

<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/files/SAC-Guide.pdf>

NOTE: SAC has asked that the CV does not exceed the 150 word limit for the following entries:

8. Teaching and

9. Scholarly and Professional Activities

The candidate can use entry #13. "Other Relevant Information" for any additional information from the previous two entries or for their Research Statement but has to keep to the one page limit.

Summative Assessment of Teaching –

As per the guidelines, “Summative Assessment of Teaching Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure July 2012” sent out in the spring.

Teaching Statement / Teaching Philosophy

EXAMPLE TEACHING REPORT FOR XXXXX -

Since his promotion in 2007 he has taught six undergraduate courses and three graduate courses. He was on study leave in 2008. For all nine courses statistics from the Course Evaluation teaching questionnaire are presented below. The undergraduate and graduate courses are in chronological order.

1. Undergraduate Student Evaluations

The six undergraduate courses were evaluated using the Course Evaluation teaching questionnaire in which students rate instructors on the following attributes, on a scale of 1-5, and also provide written comments.

1. The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.
2. The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.
3. The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter.
4. Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations, etc.) was fair.
5. The instructor showed concern for student learning.
6. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

The average score for each of these attributes (the Q1 to Q6 columns) as well as the overall average for all attributes (the Ave column) are given below. Also given in the Q6 column in italics is the average across all sections of the course taught in the Mathematics Department in the previous three years (on a per-section basis) and the number of such sections.

Course	Session	Enr	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Ave
MATH xxx	2007W	34	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.5 (<i>4.314</i>)	4.4
MATH xxx	2009W	122	4.3	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.2 (<i>3.7/37</i>)	4.1
MATH xxx	2009W	22	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.3	4.6 (<i>4.5/4</i>)	4.4
MATH xxx	2010W	55	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.5 (<i>3.9118</i>)	4.4
MATH xxx	2010W	42	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5 (<i>4.2118</i>)	4.4
MATH xxx	2010W	18	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.7 (<i>4.514</i>)	4.6

Math XXX and Math XXX were taught as one course. The Q6 scores consistently exceed the department average performance on these courses. Math XXX is honours calculus while Math XXX is the standard course. When considering the difference in approval ratings recall the different student population in these two courses and look at the student comments given below.

The table below gives Q6 distribution data for these courses. The average score and standard deviation are reported for each section, and the number of respondents is given in the Resp column. Counts are given for the various responses: SA means "strongly agree" and has a numerical value of 5; A (4) means "agree," N (3) means "neutral," D (2) means

"disagree," and SD (1) means "strongly disagree."

Course	Session	QG Ave	Std Dev	Resp	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
MATH xxx	2007W	4.5	0.67	29	15	13	0	1	0
MATH xxx	2009W	4.2	0.78	76	29	40	4	2	1
MATH xxx	2009W	4.6	0.61	15	10	4	1	0	0
MATH xxx	2010W	4.5	0.50	42	23	19	0	0	0
MATH xxx	2010W	4.5	0.70	25	15	9	0	1	0
MATH xxx	2010W	4.7	0.45	11	8	3	0	0	0
TOTAL		4.5		198	100	88	5	4	1

Of the 198 total responses above, 95% are positive, 2.5% neutral, and 2.5% negative.

The following comments are samples (good to negative for each course in the same chronological order as in the tables. An absence of definitely negative comments on some courses means that there were no such comments.

MATH XXX. "The instructor is fun, helpful and very precise in all areas of his teaching. I don't really see anything that should be done differently." "Really enjoyed the casual friendly environment and the tangents on which we went off. Could improve by writing out steps for solving different types of questions as well as saying/demonstrating them." "Gives good lecture notes but the test often cover different themes compared to the one discussed in class."

MATH XXX. "He was a great professor. Also the fact that he puts up his notes and examples before class so that we can print them off to follow his lecture is really effective." "Professor XXX was a very straightforward teacher teaching us problems and proofs. I think this approach is very effective but it is also very uncreative. Thus it took away from the students effective participation during the lectures." "I understand that he is trying to be funny or witty in class but sometimes it is like he doesn't necessarily want to be there and that he is bored with the material."

MATH XXX. "No complaints, my best prof." "It was very well taught and the material was really interesting; but sometimes the homework assignments were so difficult and required so much insight I think it would have been better if the homework assignments didn't require so much 'extrapolation' of what was taught in class since they were always interesting variants of the things taught in class." "Although I think that the homework assignments are a fundamental part of learning the material in this course some of the later assignments were a bit too long."

MATH XXX. "Dr XXX is a knowledgeable well spoken professor. Course material is

presented in a way that promotes understanding and lecture time was well managed between different topics/learning objectives. Full marks for him!" "Appreciated his humour and down to earth style (an anomaly in the mathematics department!)" "WOULD HAVE LIKED TO GET HOMEWORK BACK (AND MORE IMPORTANTLY) MIDTERMS BACK SOONER. How about after a week after instead of 2 or 3? It does not take that long to mark exams!!"

MATH XXX. "Best math professor I have ever had. He made everything that's complicated seem very easy!" "I felt that the instructor was genuinely interested in the course material and his enthusiasm toward math showed, which made the lectures more enjoyable. He was humorous and made material, that would otherwise have been very bland, tolerable." "Good teacher but sometimes did not seem very interested in the topic. I think if he was a bit more interested or tried to be a bit more enthusiastic about explaining the deeper meaning of some aspects of the course it would have been more 'enriching' experience."

MATH XXX. "I was very pleased with this course. Lectures were excellent, notes were excellent and easy to follow and the material as a whole was very interesting to me. Dr XXXXX did a fantastic job." "Very few complaints here....If anything, maybe a LITTLE more rigor." "Exam: the midterm was way too rushed. Perhaps have a TA do the exam before it is written to gage the time. If there were a bit longer time to complete the exam it would have been fair."

2. Graduate Student Evaluations

Course	Session	Enr	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Ave
MATH	2007W	6	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
MATH	2009W	7	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.6	4.5
MATH	2010W	3	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.95

MATH XXX was assessed by a 10 question survey of which the first six questions coincided with the ones listed above.

The table below gives Q6 distribution data for these courses. The average score and standard deviation are reported for each section, and the number of respondents is given in the Resp column. Counts are given for the various responses: SA means "strongly agree" and has a numerical value of 5; MA (4) means "mildly agree," Neu (3) means "neutral," MD (2) means "mildly disagree," and SO (1) means "strongly disagree."

Course	Session	Q6 Ave	Std Dev	Resp	SA (5)	MA (4)	Neu (3)	MD (2)	so (1)
MATH	2007W	4.8	0.40	5	4	1	0	0	0
MATH	2009W	4.6	0.49	7	4	3	0	0	0

MATH	2010W	5.00	0.00	3	3	0	0	0	0
------	-------	------	------	---	---	---	---	---	---

The following comments are samples (good to negative for each course in the same chronological order as in the tables. The enrolments are small and in some cases only two comments were made.

Math XXX. "Dr XXX is very good at delivering the main ideas and to motivate the topics during his lectures. His approach helps tremendously with the understanding of the material, as the course was quite abstract and challenging. Having taken his course I was able to understand a lot more about POE's than ever before and he has sparked a new interest for me in terms of research."

Math XXX. "The blackboard writing is very lucid and organised. And very kind to students." "Nice combination of rigor versus handwaving."

MATH XXX "Excellent presentation of material by lecturer. Lecturer showed great concern for student learning and made a lot of Lime available to students for office hours. Course was interesting and well put together and paced." "Professor XXX is a very good teacher. I like his course. Most of my opinion can be found above."

3. Class Visits

Note: Include a summary statement from all classroom visits rather than individual reports or a separate teaching report

4. Other Teaching Contributions

Since 2007 he has supervised the research of the following graduate students

5. Summary

The scores are very high and the comments are very positive. To some students he may give some impression of detachment but to see this one has to hunt for a very small signal hidden behind overwhelming evidence that he has unusual rapport with the students and a great gift of teaching.

EXAMPLE TEACHING REPORT FOR XXXXX -

Preamble

This report presents a summative assessment of the teaching contributions of **Dr. XXX XXXX** since he was appointed as Associate Professor in the Computer Science Department, in July of 20XX.

As required by the UBC Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty, this report assesses Dr. XXXX's entire teaching contribution. The evaluation is based on effectiveness "as indicated by command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students."

The body of this report is structured in accordance with the guidelines of the Senior Appointments Committee, as set out in the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC 2009-10 (Appendix 3- Teaching Evidence)

Attached to this report are three appendices

+Appendix A describes the procedures followed by the Computer Science Department for collecting (including, in particular, procedures for conducting peer evaluations of classroom teaching performance) and assessing the effectiveness of teaching.

+Appendix B contains all of the raw data available on the student evaluation of Dr. XXXXX's teaching. This includes numerical scores and a full list of student comments, for each of six different course offerings (four undergraduate and two graduate).

+ Appendix C contains all of the reports prepared by peer evaluators of classroom teaching performance (two reports for one of the undergraduate course offerings).

In addition to the material contained in the appendices, the Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee reviewed the sections of Dr. XXXXs CV that relate directly to teaching, broadly interpreted, including graduate supervision and teaching awards, as well as Dr. XXXX's Teaching Statement

I. Summary and assessment of the amount of teaching of all kinds performed by the candidate.

(a) Courses taught

Since being tenured in 2007, at the undergraduate level Dr. XXX has taught four courses: a third-year course (CPSC XXX) with 39 students, a third-year course (CPSC XXX) with 27 students, a fourth-year course (CPSC XXX) with 11 students, and a fourth-year course (CPSC XXX) with 20 students. He has supervised three directed studies projects and two full-time student interns; of those, one was funded by NSERC USRA program. At the graduate level, Dr. XXXXX has taught two offerings of the same course (CPSC XXX) with class sizes of 6 and 21.

(b) Ability and willingness to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction.

Dr. XXX's teaching load is standard for the Department. He is now teaching a required first-year undergraduate course (CPSC XXX). In addition to the courses described above, Dr. XXXX has expressed willingness, and has the requisite expertise, to teach two required courses at the undergraduate level, the first and second year theoretical foundations courses (CPSC XXX and XXX).

II. Summary and assessment of the candidate's student evaluations

Dr. XXXX's teaching performance was evaluated by students in each of six different course offerings. The evaluations are included in full in Appendix B.

(a) Student evaluation scores

The table below provides Dr. XXXX's student evaluation scores for each term, for both undergraduate and graduate courses. Note that in the 2007--2008 academic year, the Faculty of Science switched to UBC's newly introduced, university-wide on-line evaluation system. The questions have changed and the on-line data collection methodology might have changed the cohort of students who choose to respond and the nature of those responses. Consequently, care should be taken in comparing numbers from before and after this changeover.

Term	Course	Size	Student Evaluations
Undergraduate Courses			Q6 "Overall Effective"
2007-2008 Term 1	CPSC xxx	39	Score
2009-2010 Term 2	CPSC xxx	28	Score
2009-2010 Term 2	CPSC xxx	11	Score
2010-2011 Term 2	CPSC xxx	20	Score
Graduate Courses			Q6 "Overall Effective"
2007-2008 Term 2	CPSC xxx	16	Score
2010-2011 Term 1	CPSC xxx	21	Score

The scatter plots in Figs. 1 and 2 show how the scores in Dr. XXXX's courses compare to those of the other courses offered by Computer Science Department during the same

terms. The vertical axis is course number, to permit distinctions between courses at different levels. The horizontal axis is the class (section) average score to Question 6 "Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher." Very Poor" and 5 being "Excellent". The circle area is proportional to the number of evaluations returned, and Dr. [REDACTED]'s course is plotted as the solid circle. The scatter plots facilitate a visual analysis of the student assessment of Dr. [REDACTED]'s teaching.

It is readily apparent that Dr. XXXX's undergraduate teaching evaluation scores are considerably higher than the departmental averages, and fall into the top quartile range. In general small courses tend to have higher evaluations: this trend can be seen in the scatterplots as a tendency for the small circles to fall on the right. Nevertheless, Dr. XXXX's graduate teaching evaluation scores again place him near the top of our range. In 2007 Fall he received a perfect score of 5.0

(b) Student comments from undergraduate courses

Student comments are summarized according to the principles set out in the UBC Senate document

Principle 1: sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning

The strongest comments were positive: "The explanations were so clear that this course is effectively the best mathematics-related course I have ever taken", "Probably one of the best profs I have ever had..", "Very clear, very easy) to understand".

There was one negative comment about expectations (does not mention at all what to expect on the midterm"), and some concerns about connecting the course material to the rest of the curriculum ("sometimes difficult to discern how the topics could be applied").

Principle 2: employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners

There were conflicting comments on lecture style. Positive comments included "Excellent lectures" and "The lectures were fairly easy to follow, as [REDACTED] keeps his promises on what topics he will cover each day", "Very good at engaging the class". negative [sic]. It was like a train running without brakes. It was hard to follow him", "I find it very difficult in class to follow the lecture slides", "goes over material too fast and does not slow down for students", and "illustrate more of the underlying mathematical problems". Several comments alluded to a certain level of disorganization ("please be more organized in lectures").

Similarly, there were mixed comments on the course notes, ranging from positive ("course notes ... are well done and have concrete and useful examples") to negative ("I wish our notes would be more useful", "I suggest you provide more examples",

"class notes are not good").

Principle 3: *communicates and interacts effectively with students*

Many students appreciated his humor and rapport: "Thanks for bringing your sense of humour to class with you every day!" "showed a keen desire to establish rapport with his students", "his little jokes and analogies make the course material much easier to digest", "the awesome sense of humor and detailed yet effective style of presentation made learning the material very easy to comprehend".

Some students appreciated his style even as they pointed out areas of imperfection: "sometimes was confusing \With descriptions. But in the end it was always cleared up", "while his lectures may not have been re in the subject and a familiarity with the material that overcame the. sometimes obvious, difficulties in teaching this course for the first time".

Principle 4: *attends to intellectual growth of students*

Several positive comments, including: "An amazing prof..there was no weak point about this course or the prof. He motivated me to go to grad school.", "█████ cared for his students"

Principle 5: *respects diverse talents and learning styles of students*

Comments on pacing and workload were mixed, with some students noting a heavy workload. but others finding the pacing slow. Several students noted that the course was rewarding despite being challenging: "Some parts of the class were really hard, but I get the idea that you really care about students success, which is encouraging. The assignments were sufficiently terrifying in the beginning, and I considered dropping the class. but I'm glad I stayed."

Principle 6: *incorporates learning beyond the classroom*

Many students praised his availability outside the classroom: "Every time I ask questions through email, he responded ver; quickly and was very patient about explaining everything", "very available and approachable even out of office hours".

Principle 7: *reflects on, monitors and improves teaching practices*

A few favourable comments address this point directly: "he likes to receive feedback from students, and always willing to make change to make the course better".

Summative comments:

Comments on Dr. █████ attitude, concern, knowledge of the subject and approachability \were overwhelmingly positive. A few students remarked that Dr. █████ was the best professor they have e\er encountered. Overall the student

comments portray a knowledgeable, engaging, caring, enthusiastic teacher, albeit one who could benefit from a bit more organization.

(c) student comments from graduate courses

Positive comments included: "amazing teacher, one of the best in the faculty of science", "motivated the material immensely", "effective and enjoyable", and "a great instructor". Several students remarked on his willingness to spend time outside of class helping students: "his passion for the course goes beyond the classroom and he often responds to questions at all times of the day and night to help students", "he is very kind to spend a lot of time outside the classes helping and inspiring the students".

Negative comments included: "the material was confusing at times" and "the style of XXXX's notes were difficult to adapt to. They seemed disorganized". A related suggestion was "to improve the whiteboard presentation". One student expressed a concern that the workload was not consistent and changed from the expectations communicated earlier in the course.

Overall, the comments seem to reflect the usual diversity of background and interests of the students. While students did offer suggestions for possible improvements these were given in the context of what seems to be general satisfaction with the content and conduct of Dr. XXXX's courses.

III. Summary and assessment of qualitative peer evaluations of teaching performance

Dr. XXXX's in class teaching performance was evaluated twice for one of the undergraduate course offerings. The evaluation are included in full in Appendix C.

The summary comments of peer evaluators were very positive, emphasizing in particular Dr. XXXX's solid preparation of clear and well organized lectures, and his rapport with the students. There were a few minor criticisms about mechanical aspects of whiteboard use and missed opportunities to tie theoretical problems more to real-world applications, but in general the lecture content and structure, the presentation and, particularly, the notable level of student engagement were well appreciated. The evaluators both noted the effectiveness of presenting material almost completely from memory without consulting notes. An impressive feat that clearly communicated his confidence and mastery of the material to his students.

IV. Candidate's performance as a graduate student supervisor

Since 2007, Dr. [REDACTED] has supervised one Ph.D. student and three M.Sc. students to completion. He has also completed the supervision of two postdoctoral fellows. In addition, he supervised two M.Sc. students to completion before tenure. He is currently supervising one Ph.D. student, three M.Sc. students, and two postdoctoral fellows.

Overall Dr. ██████'s record with graduate supervision is very reasonable for his current career stage and research area.

V. Other major teaching or educational activities

Dr. XXX has written an undergraduate textbook, in collaboration with Dr. XXXX that was published earlier this year. The book has already been used at several leading universities when in draft form, and was also tested by Dr. XXXX in his own undergraduate teaching.

VI. Teaching awards

Each year the Computer Science Department makes a small number of "Incredible Instructor" awards, based primarily on outstanding student evaluations. Dr. XXXX given an "Incredible Instructor" award in Spring 20XX for his teaching of CPSC - XXX.

VII. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness or quality

No additional evidence was made available to the Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee for its assessment.

VII. Overall summary of the candidate's performance

It is clear that Dr. XXXX's survey scores and written evaluations are as strong as, and in several instances stronger than, those of colleagues who in the recent past have been deemed to meet the university standard for excellence in teaching for the purposes of promotion to full professor. Dr. ██████ has been diligent and effective in discharging his teaching responsibilities. While there are a few areas of potential improvement in his teaching, we have every reason to be confident that he will continue to devote considerable effort to both the performance and enhancement of this facet of his responsibility as a faculty member .

Head Secretary

From: Head Secretary <headsec@cs.ubc.ca>
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2011 11:05 PM
To: XXXX@XXXXXX
Cc: Request for External Reviewer - Dr. XXXX
Subject: XXX CV 2011.pdf
Attachments:

Dear Professor XXXX XXXXX

The University of British Columbia is currently considering the case for promotion to Full Professor of Dr. XXX XXX. Dr. XXXX is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Computer Science. Letters by outside experts commenting on Dr. XXXX's scientific and professional contributions are undoubtedly the most important documents in our review process. You have been selected as one of the potential reviewers and I am writing to seek your evaluation.

Clearly, providing an evaluation of Dr. XXXX's scientific and professional contributions takes a great deal of time and energy. Given the importance of the promotion decision to the candidate, to our department and university, and to our discipline as a whole, we would very much appreciate your time and professional judgment.

To assist you in performing your evaluation we would send you a package containing:

- Dr. XXXX's curriculum vitae
- a research statement
- a teaching statement
- a copy of several of Dr. XXXX's papers
- the UBC criteria for the rank of Full Professor.

As a technical matter, external reviewers for promotion at UBC are required to be at "*arm's* length". According to UBC policy this is defined below.

"The external reviewers should be persons whose impartiality cannot be doubted. Clients, former associates, former research directors, and co-authors would not generally be regarded as being at *arm's* length. They must also be at the equivalent rank or higher rank than the position being considered."

If you believe that you are not at *arm's* length, please advise us of this when replying.

I would very much appreciate a reply to this request within a week's time. To assist you in your decision, Dr. [REDACTED]'s curriculum vitae is attached. If you are willing, we will send you a complete package after we hear back from you.

We would look to have your completed evaluation by November 4.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Anne Condon

Professor and Head

Department of Computer Science

University of British Columbia

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mathematics Department
Room 121, Mathematics Building
1984 Mathematics Road
Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z2
Tel: 604-822-2666
Fax: 604-822-6074
E-mail: math@math.ubc.ca

September 1, 2011

Professor XXXXX
Dept. of Mathematics & Statistics

Sample

Dear Professor XXXXX,

The Department of Mathematics is reviewing the record of xxx xxxxx to determine whether to recommend him for promotion to Professor. Promotion is based on research, teaching and service records, and we seek advice on these from independent arm's length referees from outside the University.

On behalf of the Department I ask for your appraisal of Dr. XXXX scholarly work, and for a recommendation concerning his promotion, in the context of the UBC Faculty Agreement, and based on the evidence available to you.

We will particularly value any comments you can make about the significance of his work, especially that of recent years. It would be helpful if you would point out specific results, which you feel have had an impact on his field. Please also indicate in your letter whether you know the candidate, and if so in what capacity.

I realize that this request will make some demands on your time but I am sure you understand the importance of frank, professional opinions in arriving at a decision of this nature. In order to meet our deadlines, we would appreciate your response by October Xth. (You may wish to send me an advance copy by FAX: 604-or e-mail). I am enclosing a copy of Dr. [REDACTED]'s C.V. for your information as well as copies of some of his recent papers. For your reference, I am also enclosing a copy of the relevant pages of the UBC Faculty Agreement, which deal with criteria for promotion.

It is the policy of the University to treat as confidential letters of reference, which it receives. It can, however, be required under Freedom of Information legislation to disclose the substance of any letter of reference but only where that can be done without disclosing the identity of the writer. In addition, if in the course of consideration of a candidate a negative recommendation is made within the University, the candidate is entitled to see a summary or an edited version of letters, but again the summary or editing is done so as not to disclose the identity of the writer.

We are extremely grateful for your assistance and timely response. Your opinion and contribution is crucial part of the process and of great value.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Leah Edelstein-Keshet". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Leah Edelstein-Keshet, Associate Head for Faculty Affairs
Department of Mathematics

Enclosures

CV

Research Statement

Publications (5)

Excerpts, UBC Faculty Agreement

XXX XXXX

What was sent to referees September 1, 2011

Publications:

5.

6.

9.

21.

3.

REFEREE BIOS

XXXXX:

XXXXX: Professor,

XXXXX: Senior leading researcher,

XXXX: Professor (emeritus),

XXXX:

XXXX: Professor,

Referee Letters –

Please bookmark the first page of each letter as:

Ref Letter – Jones

Ref Letter – Smith

Ref Letter – etc.

Etc...