

Progress toward Promotion (PtP) Review  
Faculty in Non-Tenure Track Positions

Faculty who are not in tenure-track positions are eligible to apply for promotion within their title. Such non-tenure-track positions include but are not limited to Clinical, Assistant In, Professors of Practice, Lecturers, Scholars, and Research Scientists. For example, a Clinical Assistant Professor may apply for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, and a Lecturer may apply to be a Senior Lecturer. (See <http://regulations.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/7003.2016final4-8-16.pdf> for listing of university titles and ranks within titles.) The College of Education requires a comprehensive review of tenure-track faculty in their third year at UF. For faculty who are not in a tenure-track position, the College requires a comprehensive review be conducted in advance of the application for promotion. This review will occur in the faculty's third year in position, unless the School Director and faculty member agree to a different timeline. The progress toward promotion review occurs within individual Schools and should follow the process outlined in this document. A faculty member who declines to be reviewed under this PtP process must do so in writing by submitting a letter to their Chair/Director.

The purpose of the PtP review is to (a) provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate's progress toward the first promotion (i.e., assistant to associate), (b) provide the candidate with detailed feedback on the status of his/her progress toward promotion, and (c) put in place, when deemed necessary, procedures that will assist the candidate in meeting the School, College, and University requirements for promotion. The PtP review should be conducted with the promotion criteria in mind. Essentially, the criteria require *distinction* in the area of primary assignment and at least satisfactory performance in any other assigned areas.

When the faculty member and School Director have agreed to proceed with a PtP review, the School Director shall provide to the faculty member the College criteria for promotion and the process to be followed by the School. The promotion candidate will then complete UF's promotion packet, excluding internal/external letters of reference. When completing the promotion packet, a candidate with a heavy research assignment will provide more evidence of distinction in scholarship than in other domains. A candidate with a heavy teaching assignment will provide more evidence of distinction in teaching than in other domains. A candidate with a heavy service or administrative assignment will provide more evidence of distinction in those areas than in other domains.

The deadline for completion of the packet is February 1 of the year of the review. Faculty in tenure and non-tenure positions whose rank is higher than the promotion candidate shall review the packet before they meet to discuss the candidate's progress toward promotion. The primary purpose of the meeting of the eligible faculty is to discuss the candidate's progress toward

promotion and advise the School Director on what might be included in his/her letter of review to the candidate. The outcome of the meeting should be a detailed and candid assessment of the candidate's progress toward promotion. Any concerns over the candidate's performance in any area should be clearly stated and specific recommendations for addressing these concerns should be documented. In discussing the PtP case, eligible faculty must be sure to attend closely to the candidate's assignment. That is, what percentage of the person's time was assigned to teaching? What percentage was assigned to scholarship? What percentage was assigned to service? The discussion will aim to determine if the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward promotion, in light of his or her assignment. Depending on the candidate's assignment and the criteria for promotion for non-tenure track faculty, School faculty may consider questions such as the following:

- ❖ Is the candidate's teaching at or above School norms and expectations or making steady progress in that direction?
- ❖ Has the candidate presented papers in appropriate venues and are the number and quality of those papers acceptable?
- ❖ What significant contributions has the candidate made to course and/or program development?
- ❖ What evidence is provided of excellence in the domain of teaching?
- ❖ Does the candidate's record suggest a teaching and/or research trajectory that is likely to lead to promotion?
- ❖ Is the candidate appropriately involved in professional service activities?

No sooner than one day following the meeting of eligible faculty, the faculty will participate in a secret ballot to vote on whether they feel the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward promotion. The results of the balloting should be determined within a week of the faculty meeting.

Based on input from the meeting of eligible faculty, the School Director will draft a letter to the candidate within two weeks of completed balloting. In addition to addressing the results of the faculty vote, the letter should identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's record and make clear recommendations on how the candidate may improve her/his packet and performance. The goal is to provide thoughtful, constructive, and specific assessments and suggestions to the candidate beyond the yes/no vote of faculty.

The draft of the School Director's letter should be shared with the Dean, with any additional input incorporated into the final version of the PtP letter.

Within 4 weeks of the faculty vote, the School Director will meet with the candidate to discuss the details of the PtP review letters, including supports that may be available to help the

candidate to address areas for improvement in their record. The candidate and Director are encouraged to include the candidate's mentor in this meeting. A copy of the review letter will be placed in the candidate's personnel file. The candidate may add a response to the personnel file related to the School Director's letter. The letter of review and any related responses will not become part of the promotion packet.