

Pre-Promotion Review Policy  
Faculty in Non-Tenure Track Positions

Faculty who are not in tenure-track positions are eligible to apply for promotion within their title. 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 pre-promotion review occurs within individual Schools and should follow the process outlined in this document.

The purpose of the pre-promotion 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 pre-promotion 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 pre-promotion review, the promotion candidate will complete UF's tenure and promotion packet, excluding external letters of reference. Work artifacts may be different for faculty members in non-tenure track positions. For that reason, candidates are encouraged to also include the following:

1. A separate portfolio including evidence of professional accomplishments. The kind of evidence provided should be relevant and proportional to the candidate's assignment. <sup>1</sup>

The deadline for completion of the packet is February 1 of the year of the review. Faculty 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

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, a candidate with a heavy research assignment will provide more evidence of excellence in scholarship than in other domains. A candidate with a heavy teaching assignment will provide more evidence of excellence in teaching than in other domains.

recommendations for addressing these concerns should be documented. In discussing the pre-promotion 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 should be shared with the Dean. If the Dean provides additional input, the Director will incorporate it into the final version of the pre-promotion review letter.

Within 4 weeks of the faculty vote, the School Director will meet with the candidate to discuss the details of the pre-promotion review letter, including supports that may be available to help the candidate to address areas of weakness. 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 or Dean may add a response to the Director's letter to the personnel file. The letter of review and any related responses will not become part of the promotion packet.