

**Non-Tenure Track
Faculty Standards and Criteria for Promotion
College of Journalism and Communications
University of Florida**

November 24, 2021

Introduction

The University of Florida College of Journalism and Communications enjoys a strong and longstanding reputation for excellence, and our faculty aspire to continue that level of quality on behalf each member individually. A superior faculty is the surest guarantee of continued excellence.

To carry out its mission, the College considers it essential to hire a diverse group of individuals with diverse professional skill sets to work as non-tenure track faculty. Just as with our tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty seeking an even higher level of promotion are required to compile a record of achievement demonstrating distinction in two areas: teaching and service.

This document offers standards and criteria by which faculty before you have earned promotion within the College. The methodologies are extensive, but know that some of the ways faculty have achieved distinction will apply to your case and some will not. You are urged to meet as often as desired with your department chair to discuss the promotion process.

This document is provided as a supplement to and clarification of the College's application of Board of Trustees and University of Florida guidelines and policies regarding promotion. It is, thus, subservient to those policies and, therefore, should be used in conjunction with such documents as the UF Faculty Handbook and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida as well as the College's Constitution. Faculty members in each of the College's four departments are expected to meet the same criteria for promotion; hence, this document does not constitute department-specific clarification of the criteria.

Teaching and Learning

CJC Faculty recognize the distinction between “learning” and “teaching” and the collaborative nature of the teaching-learning process. For our part, College faculty strive to provide the best possible environment in which students may learn.

Faculty help create a productive teaching-learning environment by using teaching methods that are ethical; by delivering instruction in substance and through methods consistent to that promised by the faculty member according to course descriptions published by UF, and by developing a teaching process and its foreseeable effects in a manner consistent with institutional and professional goals and obligations.

CJC faculty recognize there are multiple outcomes of effective teaching, including (1) factual learning; (2) learning new ways of thinking; (3) developing an appreciation, or motivation to pursue a career or research question introduced in class. The faculty are committed to the highest standards for their own performance and depend on the active engagement of students for an effective teaching-learning collaboration.

Teaching and Learning Assessment for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty are expected to devote their time to teaching and professional advising as assigned by their respective department chair. They are expected to be excellent in these duties and to work continually to improve the education offered the College's students. The rapid pace of change in our professions elevates currency and contemporary relevance of learning outcomes as an important goal.

The evidence to be considered for promotion will be reviewed by voting members of the candidate's home department, the department chair, the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the dean. It shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Demonstrations that course outcomes reflect contemporary practice in the relevant industry/discipline.
- Professional assessment of course syllabi, assignments, and examinations, assembled by applicants into a "Teaching Portfolio."
- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness using UF's standard evaluation instrument
- Peer teaching evaluations.
- Development of new courses or revision and enrichment of established courses
- Development of innovative teaching methods.
- Efforts to enhance teaching through participation in seminars, workshops, and campus teaching- improvement programs.
- Receipt of awards or grants for teaching-related activities.

To demonstrate "distinction" in teaching, three general questions must be addressed: (1) Does the teaching and other instructional activities have merit? (2) Is the performance appreciably better than the average faculty member of the candidate's present rank and discipline as reflected in student evaluations and peer and administrative reviews? and (3) does the teaching and other instructional activities reflect contemporary industry standards and practice?

In determining "average faculty member," reviewers will consider faculty of similar rank and assignment in the candidate's field across the nation and at peer institutions – and not just faculty within the University or CJC or the candidate's department.

"Distinction" is demonstrated by above-average performance over the time period being reviewed for the candidate and not by above-average performance in any one class or academic year. Excellent performance in one class during one semester alone does not demonstrate "distinction." Likewise, below-average performance in one class during one

semester does not preclude “distinction.”

What Is Considered When Determining Distinction?

To earn “distinction” in teaching, faculty must demonstrate above-average performance in teaching quality in accordance with individual faculty assignments. Faculty teaching performance review will include:

- **Teaching and Other Instructional Activities:** Ordinarily, faculty are expected to be judged “above average” in productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit, and administrative reviews of teaching and other instructional activities.
- **Student Evaluations:** Ordinarily, faculty ratings from University’s official evaluation system should be substantially above “average,” that is, mean scores are 4.0 or above for instructor and course evaluations for 75% or more of the course sections taught.

When determining if faculty performance on student evaluations, teaching and other instructional activities is above average, reviewers will consider factors such as course size, level and difficulty, number of times a faculty member has taught a course, and innovative approaches being tested by faculty that might influence the ratings.

What Are Considered “Teaching” or “Other Instructional Activities”?

In accordance with individual faculty assignments, “teaching” or “other instructional activities” could include:

- Regular class instruction, including instruction in laboratory and professional work settings, and supervision, evaluation and grading of class-related work.
- If part of their assignment, direction of and serving on committees for student projects (for example, competitions, projects, independent studies, etc.) If not an express part of the faculty member’s assignment this is not an expectation.
- Student advising.
- Curriculum and program development.
- Other teaching-related activities, e.g., organization and participation in seminars on teaching; continuing education in the form of workshops and campus teaching-improvement programs.
- Organizing and conducting credit and non-credit workshops for practicing professionals. These activities could include both UF-sponsored programs as well as programs offered by outside companies and universities.

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching and Other Instructional Activities

Review of individual faculty teaching activities will focus on productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit, and the overall contribution of a faculty member’s teaching activities to accomplishing the teaching mission of the University and College. The following issues will be considered, consistent with the faculty member’s teaching assignment and nature of the courses. That is, not every criterion applies to every faculty member or every course.

Regular Classroom Instruction

- Course Syllabi: adheres to University of Florida syllabi policies.
- Course Syllabi: Do syllabi reflect current state of knowledge for the subject? Are they provided to students at the first class meeting each term?
- Course Objectives: Are the course objectives reasonable? Are the syllabus and course well organized? Are the objectives consistent with the mission of the department's curriculum? Does the course complement or needlessly replicate content of other courses in the department or College?
- Classroom Presentation of Content: Is the material logically arranged and consistent with stated course objectives? Is the content accurate, current and comprehensive?
- Materials provided to students: Are the materials relevant to the course objectives? Are they current? Are they easily understood and utilized by students?
- Text and/or Assigned Readings: Are the text and/or assigned readings appropriate to the course objectives? Are the text and/or assigned readings current?
- Appropriate emphasis will be given this criterion for faculty who are not solely responsible for selection of the text and/or assigned readings.
- Assignments and term papers/projects: Are the assignments/papers/projects appropriate to the course objectives? Are they challenging? Are they appropriate in frequency and length?
- Examinations: Is the content of the examinations appropriate for promised course content? Do the examinations focus on important aspects of the course with appropriate breadth and depth?
- Student performance: How well do students perform on assignments, term projects/papers? Were student efforts accepted for presentation or publication? Did the student work receive special recognition or win awards?
- Performance in assigning appropriate grades, including grade distribution and justification and comparison of a faculty member's grade distribution to comparable sections, the department, and the College: Was the grading fair and consistent? Were the standards for grading clearly presented to the students? Were the standards consistent with the department's and the College's?
- Performance in justifying grades to students via written comments or other helpful feedback, for example comments on projects or term papers: How did the faculty member provide feedback? Was feedback appropriate for the class objectives? Did the faculty member provide constructive comments on papers and tests?
- Originality/creativity: Did the faculty member make improvements or create new teaching techniques, policies, or procedures? Was the contribution significant?

Direction of Student Projects, Independent Studies and Team Competitions

If part of the faculty member's assignment:

- Productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit: How many projects has the faculty member directed? What was the quality of these projects or independent studies?

Were the projects accepted for presentation or publication? Did the efforts receive special recognition or win any awards?

- Originality: To what extent did the faculty member foster independent and original thinking among students and inspire them to pursue the subject on their own?

Student Advising

Productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit:

- Did the faculty member take an active interest in students' career mentoring? Did the member provide career counseling? Letters of recommendation? Resume building or reviewing?
- How many students did the faculty member advise? What was the quality of the product of these efforts?
- Did the instructor create materials, policies or procedures to facilitate and enhance the process and/or outcome of student advisement? Was the contribution significant?

Curriculum and Program Development

- Productivity and merit, with emphasis on merit: Did the faculty member contribute to the currency and comprehensiveness of curriculum and program development? Was the contribution significant?
- Originality: Did the instructor publish professionally related work or create materials, policies, or procedures that contribute to curriculum and program development? Was the contribution significant?

Additional Evidence of Teaching Accomplishment

Faculty members may provide additional evidence to demonstrate teaching merit. The following list of examples suggests the type of additional evidence that may be provided:

- Unsolicited letters from students.
- Letters from peers or professionals, including evaluations of guest lectures.
- Professionally oriented work or creative activities related to teaching journalism and communications.
- Service on student committees.
- Organization of and participation in seminars on teaching.
- Continuing education via workshops and campus teaching-improvement programs
- Organizing and conducting credit and non-credit workshops for professionals.
- Provide thought leadership as an expert in their field writing or presenting to professional organization on pedagogy.

Service

UF standards of service provide the basic foundation for the commitment to academic service in CJC. The broad criteria of service applied throughout the campus also apply here. In accordance with university policy, special emphasis is given to service that benefits community colleges and public schools in Florida. CJC also puts special emphasis on

service to communications media and related professions and to government agencies.

The College has historically gained a measure of recognition and respect from other similar academic institutions throughout the nation because of the very nature of our service mission. Faculty involvement in service directly related to professional and scholarly expertise in advertising, journalism, public relations and telecommunication has assisted this College in attaining a unique position among our peer groups.

The undergraduate area of our mission has been enriched through faculty participation in educational programs for newspapers, magazines, electronic publications, commercial and non-commercial broadcast facilities and production units, public relations firms, corporate communication and numerous similar entities in the government and public sectors. It is essential that this service continue and be recognized.

Evidence in this category must demonstrate the faculty member's leadership performance in service for promotion to master lecturer or senior lecturer.

Our College subscribes to the goal of providing service that furthers the mission of the university, including service on departmental, College, and university committees, councils, and senates; service in appropriate professional organizations; participation in professional meetings, symposia, conferences, workshops; and service on local, state and national governmental boards, agencies, and commissions. Service standards as set forth by the Florida Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida are fully supported by our College.

Highest priority is given these services in our College:

- Service directly related to the professional expertise of the faculty member.
- Service to the College and university through work and leadership on committees.
- Service to public schools and community colleges of Florida.

Non-tenure track faculty are expected to improve the practice and analysis of the professions affiliated with the College. They are expected to demonstrate contemporary expertise in their discipline through various activities. These could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Leadership roles at workshops, conferences, and webinars that improve knowledge of current trends in an affiliated profession (e.g., organizer or speaker).
- Reporting on new methods of teaching (e.g., articles published in *BEA Feedback*).
- Reports discussing or analyzing professional practice in the candidate's field
- Creation of online training modules to be used by both students and professionals in the candidate's field (e.g., courses for Poynter's NewsU or PRSA Webinars).
- Non-tenure track faculty are expected to provide service to their department, the College, the university, the community, and the professions affiliated with the College. Criteria are the same as those for tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Indicators of Service

Organization Officer

- Elected office, appointment, and membership in international, national, regional, state, or local professional or scholarly organizations including boards, agencies, and commissions.
- Priority given to the degree that such participation represents leadership and brings recognition to the university, College, and department.

Community Service

- Speeches, guest lectures, sponsorship of organizations and activities in the community directly related to the professional or scholarly expertise of the faculty member for community and civic organizations, including international, national, state, regional, or local entities.

Major Events Manager or Special Assignments

- Coordination of a major event, major contributor to the success of such an event, special assignments at the departmental, College, or university level.

Committee, Councils, Senates, and Task Force Assignments

- Meritorious and out-of-the-ordinary service on university, College, or departmental committees, councils, senates, or task forces including key chair positions.
- Recognition is given for committees that meet frequently and have active agendas or are charged with an especially demanding project as well as service on numerous committees, far beyond the normal assignment of a faculty member.
- Recognition is given for administrative service as director of university, College or departmental organizations and activities.

Student Organization Adviser

- Advisement to student organizations directly related to the professional or scholarly expertise of the faculty member

Review, Advisory Committees/Boards

- Service on editorial advisory committees or review panels in which the contribution is more appropriately defined as service than teaching or scholarship.
- Includes reviewing papers, articles and books for journals and/or conferences.

Conference Participation

- Participatory roles, including major speaking assignments, in professional meetings, conferences, symposia, and workshops and/or other contributions to organizations on an international, national, regional, state, or local level that demonstrate the professional expertise of the individual and bring credit to the university, College, and department.

Creative Activities and Professional Publications

- Publication in leading professional newspapers, magazines, broadcast and digital outlets, journals and books or book chapters directly related to the professional or scholarly expertise of the faculty member.
- Works in online media that demonstrate faculty member's professional or scholarly expertise and enhance the reputation of the university, College, and department.

- Interviews published/aired with media.

Consulting

- Paid and unpaid consulting, including proprietary research, creative consulting, and produced creative works, directly related to the professional or scholarly expertise of the faculty member that enhances the reputation of the university, College, and department and does not detract from the faculty member's primary academic assignments.

Service to Public Schools

- Service to public schools and community colleges in Florida, especially classroom, laboratory and special events directly related to the professional or scholarly expertise of the faculty member.

Service Awards

- Awards and other honors from student organizations, College and UF academic units, and international, national, regional, state, or local professional or scholarly organizations.

Professional Development/Program and Service-Related Grants

- Activities designed for professional development as a service provider, including formal courses or specialized training.
- Participation in educational programs for newspapers, magazines, electronic publications, commercial and non-commercial broadcast facilities and production units, public relations and advertising agencies, corporate communication and similar entities in the public and private sectors.
- Activities related to writing and/or execution, particularly in a leadership role, of program-based grants that provide service to professional or academic constituencies and enhance the reputation of the university, College, and department.

Process

Feedback to Faculty

All faculty receive feedback regarding their performance through annual written evaluations by department chairs. In addition to these evaluations, because promotion decisions represent a substantial commitment by the College and because time working toward promotion represents a large commitment of talent and effort by an individual, non-tenure-track faculty are provided with additional information about their progress through:

- Annual formal meetings with their department chairs.
- A pre-promotion review of their accomplishments from the department through the College level, usually performed during the third year.
- Classroom observations of teaching in the third year of service or the year before

- applying for promotion.
- Student evaluations.

All promotion reviews shall be based on the College “Faculty Standards and Criteria” document which complies with criteria set forth in UF Regulations (“Rules of Department of Education, Division of Universities, University of Florida”) and in the “Guidelines and Information” prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that the promotion packet is complete and contains all the information pertinent to the nomination.

Though non-tenure track faculty are not required to apply for promotion, the sixth year is the normal one in which to apply for promotion, although the university recognizes promotion when ready. The candidate remains at his/her current rank in the event of an unsuccessful promotion application.

Annual Meeting with Department Chair

Department chairs shall have a formal, face-to-face/virtual meeting with each non-tenure-accruing faculty member prior to preparing the annual evaluation. An interactive meeting permits the chair to obtain richer information than can be gleaned from a written report. It also permits the chair to provide specific feedback to the candidate about progress toward promotion. The chair may wish to discuss specific issues related to teaching and service contributions. The chair may also be able to offer specific advice about coping with teaching pressures, professional opportunities, etc. The outcome of this meeting should be noted in the annual evaluation letter that is prepared by the chair and it will become part of the candidate’s personnel file. The candidate should be afforded the opportunity to prepare a written response to the final evaluation letter which may also be added to his/her/their file.

Mid-term Reviews

Non-tenure-track faculty in the spring of their third year of service are required to prepare a packet documenting their accomplishments. These packets are reviewed at the College level in the same manner as promotion reviews.

Candidates will provide evidence of accomplishments in teaching, service, and research and/or creative activities in the format used by candidates applying for promotion. The critical difference in the type of information provided for the mid-term assessment versus the actual promotion review is that, for the early assessment, the candidate will not be required to solicit outside letters of recommendation.

This review process is confidential to the extent provided by law and is internal to the College. Therefore, no written appraisal of the candidate shall be placed in the faculty member’s evaluation file, included in the faculty member’s subsequent promotion dossier or used in any way in future evaluations of the candidate for promotion.

Candidates shall have the right to formally respond to the evaluations within five calendar

days of receiving the relevant assessment and shall meet with the dean to receive the dean's assessment and to discuss the committee's review and the dean's evaluations.

Early review may help some candidates decide whether they will apply for promotion. Early review also is intended to stimulate faculty to prepare and maintain materials that will be needed for the promotion application. The meeting with the candidate's department chair also will provide essential feedback on readiness for future promotion.

Early review provides the College with several important benefits as well. It allows the College to provide feedback about a candidate's progress toward promotion. Early review provides a way to ensure College standards of excellence regarding teaching, research and or creative activities, and service will be salient to beginning faculty members.

Classroom Observations

Faculty should be formally observed in each class they teach in the spring semester of the year prior to the mid-term review year and or the year prior to applying for promotion, respectively.

For the mid-term or promotion review, class observations will be conducted by (1) one faculty of higher rank from the candidate's department and (2) a faculty member of higher rank from within the College (associate professor or higher or senior lecturer or higher) and outside the candidate's department. Candidates and their department chairs will agree on potential reviewers. The chair will then ask the identified faculty to conduct the review.

Observers will work out a schedule for class observations with the faculty member. They may also wish to have a pre-observation or post-observation meeting with the faculty member. It is recommended that the faculty member be consulted concerning whether he/she/they would prefer that any specific College member not serve as a class observer.

Observers should discuss in advance a format for the visitation and should work from a set of guidelines dealing with what is to be observed (Class Instruction Peer Evaluation Form for on-campus classes is available at [Classroom-Observation-Form-Revised-1-12-2022 .pdf \(ufl.edu\)](https://ufl.edu/classroom-observation-form-revised-1-12-2022.pdf)).

Observations should result in a written appraisal detailing specific strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching style and skills. This document should also provide specific recommendations for improvement. The faculty member shall have one week from receipt of the peer evaluations of teaching to prepare written responses to each assessment document. The evaluators shall then have one week to amend their assessments, or to present written reactions to the faculty member's responses. Inclusion of peer observations in mid-term or promotion packets is optional for candidates.

Student Evaluations

Student evaluations must be administered for every class and section for each course taught during fall and spring semesters and summer sessions. Faculty are urged to have evaluations

from at least 60 percent of students who complete a course. They are encouraged to include in the syllabus that evaluations will occur in the last three weeks of the semester and or announce the evaluation date several times in class. Faculty are encouraged to provide in their packets their explanations of and comments on student course evaluations.

Departmental Action

The faculty member initiates the process for promotion. Eligible faculty members review the packets and vote by secret ballot, for or against promotion. Within five calendar days, the chair reports the results of the vote to the candidate, the dean, and the chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The department vote must take place prior to the review conducted by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

After eligible members of the department have voted, the department chair submits a letter including his/her written assessment of the candidate's qualifications with reference to the College's or department's written clarifications of the University's promotion criteria and makes his/her recommendation as to whether the candidate should be granted promotion.

The candidate then shall have 10 days from receipt of the department chair's letter to submit a written response. The candidate's response, if any, shall be included in the promotion dossier. The chair shall not forward the dossier to the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee until either the candidate submits a response, indicates in writing that he/she/they will not be submitting a response or the 10-day period for responding expires, whichever occurs first.

College Tenure and Promotion Committee

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee is an elected committee of eight tenured faculty, as specified in the College Constitution.

Faculty on the committee are elected for two years (followed by a minimum of one year of ineligibility for reappointment). Terms are staggered so that each department normally has one new and one second-year representative. This helps to ensure the committee possesses experience with procedures, criteria, and standards for promotion. It also helps to ensure stability and consistency in the committee's performance from year to year.

Committee members review the promotion packets, meet, and discuss the facts of each candidacy. Once the reviews are complete, the committee members provide individual assessments of whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion. The individual faculty members are not identified in connection with their assessments.

After having completed their review and the individual assessments, committee members meet with the dean and provide an oral summary of the review, including a summary of the individual assessments, to the dean. The dean forwards those assessments to the candidate and his/her department chair.

The candidate has 10 days from receipt of the Committee's assessments to submit a written response and or request a meeting with the dean to discuss the procedures used in the consideration of the candidate's case, the Committee's assessments, and the candidate's qualifications for promotion. The candidate's response shall be included in the dossier.

Dean's Review and Recommendation

After reviewing the candidate's dossier the dean shall submit an evaluative letter assessing the candidate's qualifications for tenure or promotion in terms of the University's criteria, the College's clarification of those criteria, and the department's written discipline-specific clarifications of those criteria and make a positive or a negative recommendation. The dean's letter shall explain or clarify such issues as exceptional assignments, unique contributions, or unusual assessments.

The candidate has 10 days from receipt of the Dean's assessments to submit a written response and or request a meeting with the dean to discuss the procedures used in the consideration of the candidate's case. The candidate's response shall be included in the dossier.

Outside Evaluators

The candidate, after consultation with the candidate's department chair, submits a list of seven potential outside reviewers and a brief bio sketch of each suggested reviewer to the chair. External reviewers should be individuals who do not have a personal and or professional relationship with the candidate that would bias their assessment. These evaluators must be from outside the College, but can be faculty elsewhere at UF; tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty from peer institutions; or professionals. If from peer institutions, candidates should strive to find reviewers from AAU and College-designated schools. Examples include the Universities of Georgia, Texas, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri and North Carolina as well as Michigan State, Penn State, Syracuse, etc. Candidates should clarify peer institution and appropriate College-designated schools choices with their chair.

Candidates should not contact potential reviewers about their willingness to serve. The chair also generates a list of potential reviewers to be combined with the candidate's list. The chair is responsible for choosing the individuals who will be requested to submit letters of evaluation, provided that at least one-half of the selected evaluators come from the candidate's list.

The candidate should clearly note in the descriptions of potential evaluators provided to the Committee information about the nature of the relationship between the candidate and evaluator. Faculty evaluators should be from a higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. At least three (but not more than five) evaluators will be required.

Access to Evaluations

Candidates have the option of waiving access to evaluations. The Committee should present

all candidates with a form including the following language when candidates and department chairs submit their list of proposed evaluators to the Committee.

Candidates applying for promotion at UF have the right to access all information that becomes part of their application packet. CJC, as part of its normal procedures for considering a candidate for promotion, solicits letters of evaluation from respected reviewers. Such letters are likely to be considered most informative and frank by departments and the College when an applicant waives his or her right of access. Please note that letter writers will be notified as to whether you have waived access to the letters.

Procedures and Timeline

Application for promotion for non-tenure track faculty typically occurs in the sixth year but can begin any time after the candidate's third-year review meeting with the department chair. During this meeting, the chair will discuss the process and the candidate's readiness for promotion.

Application and review of non-tenure track faculty for promotion will follow the same procedures and timeline as those for tenured/tenure-track faculty. These include the following:

- A dossier for review using the UF Online Promotion & Tenure (OPT) packet template and submitted through the OPT system.
- Peer reviews from outside the College follow the same procedures for internal teaching evaluations and letters from external reviewers as tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Documenting and Making Changes in Final Packet Submitted for Promotion

By university policy, once the candidate has submitted the complete promotion packet for review, normally only minor corrections or changes may be made to the packet and only if such changes have direct relevance to promotion packet and do not alter the substantive nature of the document. Conclusions about a candidate's merits reached at different stages in the promotion process must be based on substantially similar evidence.

Therefore, it is important to ensure that applicants present the most substantive case for promotion in the packet before the final submission date to the department, and before the review process begins at that level. The following procedures should be followed:

- Candidates should solicit feedback about promotion application materials as early as possible. Spring semester of the academic year before promotion review is ideal. Senior faculty, the appropriate department chair, and the dean's designee are all useful sources of feedback about the organization and constitution of a promotion packet. The university typically sponsors workshops on preparing the packet each year. Non-tenure track faculty planning to apply for promotion should be encouraged to attend these in the year prior to a review.

- Any changes to a promotion packet after the packet is declared complete by the department chair and dean's designee should be noted in a log to be included in the promotion packet. The log should note the reason for the change, the nature of the change, the person making the change, the date of the change, and the candidate's signature acknowledging the change. This log should be available to all subsequent reviewers of the packet. When any material is added to, deleted from, or changed by anyone other than the candidate, a copy of all additions and deletions and other changes must be sent to, or in the case of deletion, explained to the faculty member within five calendar days. Within ten calendar days, the faculty member may provide a brief response which is added to the packet.

To reiterate: Normally, substantial revisions or changes in the packet are advised only if they reflect information unavailable to the candidate at the time of final submission. In most cases, a packet that is seriously deficient or unpolished should be returned to the candidate, and the candidate should, if appropriate and permissible, consider reapplying the following year. In all cases, it is the responsibility of candidates applying for promotion to prepare packets that conform to departmental, College, and university standards.

The faculty member shall be informed of all decisions and the status of the promotion packet at each level of the College process within five calendar days of the completion of the review at that level. Within ten calendar days of being informed of the results of the department review, including the chairperson's and dean's recommendations, the faculty member may request a meeting with the appropriate administrator to respond. The dean shall provide to the candidate, in writing, reasons for the recommendation. All packets are forwarded to the Academic Personnel Board and to the president for final action.

Non-Tenure Track Progress Toward Second Promotion.

According to the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 19 (listed in section 19.8) the timetable for promotion within the non-tenure accruing ranks, progress should generally follow the same period of academic service in a position at the University of Florida as for tenure-track faculty.

A candidate applying for a second promotion is expected to demonstrate a continuing level of productivity that merits distinction in the primary assignment, as well as a high level of leadership in the primary area(s) of assigned duties of teaching, and/or professional service including administration.