

GUIDELINES AND INFORMATION REGARDING THE TENURE, PERMANENT STATUS AND PROMOTION PROCESS FOR 2025-2026

<http://www.aa.ufl.edu/tenure/>

May 20, 2025

CONTENTS

- I. About Tenure, Promotion & Permanent Status
- II. Eligibility for Tenure and Permanent Status
- III. Procedures
- IV. Additional Information for Chairs and Directors
- V. Additional Information for College Committees and Deans
- VI. Tenure upon Appointment
- VII. Annual Evaluation and Progress Toward Tenure, Permanent Status, and/or Promotion
- VIII. Distinguished Professor/Curator Award
- IX. Using the Template
- Appendix A

I. ABOUT TENURE, PROMOTION & PERMANENT STATUS EVALUATION PROCESS

Deadline for Submission by Colleges for University Level Review: January 15, 2026

- 1. The governing regulations and collective bargaining provisions on tenure, promotion and permanent status can be found in:
 - a. Faculty not in bargaining unit: University of Florida Regulations (Regulations) 6C1-7.003, 7.010, 7.013, 7.019, for faculty; and 6C1-7.025 and 6C1-6.009 for County Extension Faculty (<http://regulations.ufl.edu/chapter6/> and <http://regulations.ufl.edu/chapter7/>); and
 - b. Faculty in bargaining unit: Collective bargaining agreement at, <https://admin.hr.ufl.edu/compliance/employee-relations-and-ethics/union-negotiations/united-faculty-of-florida-contract/> and relevant Regulations above.

Please reference these documents for more complete information on the evaluation process. Each year eligible faculty should receive a notice of the availability of these “Guidelines,” including the related “Promotion, Tenure, and Permanent Status Template,” departmental and college clarifications of the University criteria, and any other relevant materials. Departmental clarifications of University criteria must be posted on department and college websites, made available in department and college offices, and provided to the Office of Academic Affairs. The only materials that can be considered in the evaluation process are those contained or referenced in the packet. The absence of information or materials that are not required in the packet will not be held against the candidate.

Candidates must use the Faculty Excellence and Advancement (F.E.A.) system for initial generation of their dossier and all reviews unless otherwise instructed.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that their packet is complete and contains all the information pertinent to their case. The Department Chair should provide advice on the preparation of the packet, and the candidate is also encouraged to seek advice from their faculty mentor(s) or other individuals knowledgeable about the process.

References to “days” in these “Guidelines” mean calendar days.

2. The University’s criteria for granting tenure, promotion, or permanent status shall be relevant to the faculty member’s assignment and to their performance of the duties and responsibilities expected of a member of the university community. These criteria recognize three broad categories of academic engagement:
 - (A) Teaching – Instruction, including in person classroom teaching, online/distance/executive/continuing education/laboratory/field/clinical/performance instruction, direction of theses and dissertations, and extension education programs.
 - (B) Research – Research or other scholarship and creative activities. Reminder: All tenure track faculty must have a minimum of 10 percent of their time assigned to research.
 - (C) Service – Public and professional.

Each faculty member shall be given assignments that provide equitable opportunities, in relation to other faculty members in the same department, to meet the required criteria for promotion, tenure, and permanent status. Extension contributions in academic service may be inclusive of the three broad categories described above.

In most cases, tenure and promotion require “distinction” in at least two areas, teaching and research, unless the faculty member has an assignment that primarily reflects other responsibilities, such as the Cooperative Extension Service or a clinical assignment. Merit should be regarded more important than variety of activity. “Distinction” is defined by the University and clarified by each college and department in terms tailored to the college and department disciplines consistent with University standards.

3. A faculty member in a tenure-eligible position must pursue nomination for tenure no later than the beginning of the last year of the tenure probationary period. Consideration can be given to an earlier date if the candidate’s record meets criteria for distinction (a determination made by the faculty member in consultation with the Chair).

The tenure or permanent status probationary periods in each unit are as follows:

- College of Agricultural and Life Sciences – 7 years (tenure; or permanent status for Extension faculty)
- College of Business Administration – 7 years
- College of Dentistry – 7 years
- College of Design, Construction, and Planning – 7 years
- College of Education – 6 years

- College of Engineering – 6 years
 - College of the Arts – 7 years
 - College of Health and Human Performance – 7 years
 - College of Journalism and Communications – 6 years
 - College of Law – 6 years
 - College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – 7 years
 - College of Medicine – 10 years
 - College of Nursing – 7 years
 - College of Pharmacy – 7 years
 - College of Public Health and Health Professions – 7 years
 - College of Veterinary Medicine – 7 years
 - Florida Museum of Natural History – 6 years
 - University Libraries – 7 years
4. An eligible faculty member may initiate the application for promotion whenever they believe they have met the criteria for promotion (a determination made by the faculty member in consultation with the Chair) by notifying the Department Chair before the annual evaluation cycle begins on July 1st. As this is an extensive process for both the candidate and the department, candidates are encouraged to notify the Chair as early as possible.
 5. Although the annual evaluation cycle officially begins on July 1st, solicitation of external letters and preparation of packets should begin earlier. Thus, Colleges and departments may provide guidance and target deadlines for packet preparation and letter solicitation.
 6. Department and college level reviews normally are completed by late December. Packets go to the university level in January of the following year. Typically, decisions on promotion and tenure are made by mid-June.
 7. Tenure and promotion decision dates:
 - a. Tenure awarded to a candidate in this cycle will be effective July 1, 2026, for 12-month faculty and at the beginning of the 2025-26 academic year for 9-month faculty.
 - b. Permanent status awarded to a candidate in IFAS will be effective July 1, 2026.
 - c. Promotions will be effective at the beginning of the 2026-27 academic year for 9- and 10-month faculty and on July 1, 2026, for 12-month faculty.

II. ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE AND PERMANENT STATUS

1. Only those employees who are classified as instructional and research faculty with the rank of assistant professor, assistant curator, assistant librarian, or above and who are employed in a tenure-accruing position are eligible for nomination for tenure. Tenure is normally held in an academic department. With the written consent of the Provost, the tenure of a faculty member may reside in a center or institute when the teaching, research, and other duties of the faculty member necessitate such a designation.

2. Only those employees who are classified as faculty with the rank of Extension Agent I or above and who are employed in a permanent-status-accruing position under the provisions of University regulations are eligible for nomination for permanent status.
3. Tenure or permanent status may be granted in the faculty ranks, but not in administrative positions.
4. For purposes of calculating the tenure or permanent status probationary period, one year of academic service means employment during at least 39 weeks of any 12-month period beginning with the fall term. Employment for one semester (or its equivalent) constitutes one-half year of academic service. A 12-month faculty member should have been employed by November 7th for the first academic year of employment to count as one year of eligibility.
5. No tenure or permanent-status earning time shall be accrued during a semester leave of absence without pay or a reduced FTE appointment, unless the faculty member is on a joint appointment or exchange or a special assignment for the benefit of UF, or the primary purpose of the leave is to conduct research, or there is an agreement to the contrary in writing between the faculty member and the appropriate senior vice president entered into prior to the commencement of the leave. Such requests should be included in the request for leave of absence or reduced FTE and processed through appropriate administrative offices.
6. A one-year extension of the tenure probationary period may be requested if the faculty member becomes a parent or develops significant care responsibilities for a spouse or domestic partner, great-grandparent, grandparent, parent, brother, sister, child, grandchild, or great-grandchild of the faculty member, their spouse or domestic partner, or the spouse or domestic partner of any of these. Provisions for extension of the probationary period articulated in Article 19.4 of the Collective Bargaining agreement apply to In-unit faculty. Any faculty member requesting an extension of the probationary period must make the request in writing, with documentation, to the Department Chair. The Chair must forward the request to the Dean with a recommendation that it be approved or disapproved; the Dean will then forward to the Provost with a recommendation. The Provost has final authority to approve the request. In-unit faculty must make a request no later than March 1st prior to the final year of the probationary period. Out-of-unit faculty must make the request within 3 months of the event and no later than 15 months prior to the end of the probationary period. A form is available at <https://aa.ufl.edu/policies--guidelines/tenure-and-promotion-information/>.

III. PROCEDURES

1. If the candidate holds a tenure-accruing position in a department or center, then they should request that the Chair or Director initiate the promotion and tenure process. In those colleges in which there are no departments or in which the departments are so small that the college has chosen to forego the departmental review, the Dean shall initiate the process. In such colleges, a secret ballot of the eligible faculty members of the college shall be taken in lieu of the secret ballot of the department or unit eligible faculty. The Chair, Director, or Dean will initiate the process upon the request of an eligible faculty member, regardless of the time the faculty member has spent in rank. Faculty members

are advised to consult with senior faculty and the Chair, Director, or Dean before making this request.

2. Letters of evaluation must be available to the candidate for review unless they waive their right to view the solicited letters of evaluation; **candidates must execute the waiver statement in the F.E.A. system before letters of evaluation are solicited.** Evaluators must be notified in the solicitation letter whether the candidate chose to execute or decline the waiver.
3. The candidate dossier must be completed by the faculty member prior to the department or center review, and **it is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that the dossier is complete.** This means that the candidate must (a) review the dossier to determine that the dossier contains all the information the faculty member believes is pertinent to their nomination and is accurate; and (b) certify in the F.E.A. system that the dossier is ready to be reviewed. The candidate may make copies of the dossier from the F.E.A. system (except for any evaluation letters, if the faculty member has waived their right to see them). The candidate is not required to provide any additional materials beyond those listed in the template referenced in Section VIII below.
4. After the candidate has certified their packet, no materials can be added to, deleted from, or changed in it without the candidate's consent except inadvertent omissions, assessments by committees or administrators charged with review, or clarifications and documentation of assertions made by the candidate when requested in writing by official reviewing bodies.
5. The candidate may add information or provide revisions to the candidate dossier. These additions may occur prior to the College Review, prior to the entering of the University review, and again during the university review. FEA will notify the candidate when they have the opportunity to update their candidate dossier.
6. If a department/center uses a committee to provide a written assessment of the packet (note that written committee assessments are not required), the committee will submit the committee assessment to the Department Chair or center Director, who will share it with the faculty member. The candidate shall have 7 days from receipt of the written assessment to append a written response. The Department Chair or center Director, shall share the written assessment and the candidate's written response with the eligible department/center faculty before they meet to discuss and make their individual assessments. This exchange will not occur inside the F.E.A program.
7. Eligible department/center faculty shall review the packet and should normally meet to discuss the nomination before a secret ballot is taken. Such discussions and the materials reviewed must be confidential, and hence reviewers cannot attend via telephone, video conferencing, etc. Violation of confidentiality will be considered a breach of the integrity of the process and will be treated as misconduct. **A secret ballot of the department/center faculty eligible to vote shall be taken no earlier than one day following the meeting.** If unit policy provides for input from another unit in which the nominee holds an appointment, whether it is in the form of written comments or a vote by the secondary unit, that input shall be advisory only.

(Note that the voting process is not part of the F.E.A. system.) However, departments that wish to use a secure online voting system should review the UF Voting application at <https://it.ufl.edu/services/for-faculty/uf-voting-application/>). The Department P&T Administrator will enter the results of the secret ballot in the F.E.A. system.

8. Faculty who are in phased retirement are not eligible to vote on tenure nominations. However, they may vote on promotion nominations in accordance with university procedures. Faculty participating in the Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP) may vote on both tenure and promotion nominations in accordance with university procedures. Chairs, Unit heads, Deans or Associate Deans who participate in the formal tenure or promotion evaluation process in the Health Sciences, IFAS, or the College of Law may not participate in the secret ballot process in their home department or unit. In all other units, Chairs may participate in the secret ballot if their tenure status and rank allow for it.

Note that relatives of the candidate, including those who live in the same household, may not be involved in evaluating one another and a plan mitigating the conflict of interest must be in place. The missing assessment should be registered as “abstain” and an explanation for the abstention provided in the Chair’s letter.

9. Once the department/center faculty have registered their assessments of the candidates, their role in the process is complete and they will no longer have access to review materials within the F.E.A. system. The promotion and tenure process is a personnel evaluation, and as such Chairs should not communicate any results of assessments, other documentation such as Chairs’ letters, or final decisions about individual faculty with others in the unit.
10. The nomination must go to the college level for consideration unless the candidate chooses to withdraw their nomination. Before being opened to college review, the Chair’s or Director’s letter and the faculty individual assessments must be included in the packet. The number of individual faculty assessments must equal the total number of voting-eligible unit faculty. The Chair must indicate in the packet their endorsement or lack of endorsement of the nomination and explain any assessment voting results that total more than 20% negative, absent, or abstain.
11. At the college level, the Dean or Director and a college-level fact-finding committee review the nominations. The college tenure and promotion committee will be composed of tenured faculty members of the college holding faculty titles at the associate rank and above. For colleges that are out of the bargaining unit, committees that evaluate promotion in the non-tenure accruing faculty titles may include faculty at the associate rank (and equivalent) and above. (For evaluation ranks, see attached Appendix A.)
12. The eligible members of the college committee shall provide recorded individual assessments to the Dean or Director as part of its fact-finding and consultative role. An individual assessment shall consist of a committee member’s indication whether or not the candidate meets the criteria for tenure, permanent status, and/or promotion within that college. The individual faculty members making the assessment shall not be identified. The College P&T Administrator will enter the committee member’s individual

assessments in the F.E.A. system. The assessments will be communicated to the candidate via the F.E.A. system.

13. The Dean/Director must indicate in the F.E.A. system their endorsement or lack of endorsement for the nomination before it can be opened to University-level review.
14. The candidate will be informed of the recommendations at the department and college levels and allowed to respond, within 10 days. See sections IV and V below for specific information.
15. At the university level, the Academic Personnel Board (APB) serves in a fact-finding and consultative role to the President (or designee) on all nominations received from the Deans and Directors. The Academic Personnel Board will review the candidates' nomination packets and report to the Provost on the strengths and weaknesses of the records.
16. The Provost makes the final decision concerning promotion and permanent status nominations. The Provost makes a recommendation concerning tenure nominations to the Board of Trustees. Tenure decisions are made by the Board of Trustees, typically in June.
17. Faculty members being considered for tenure prior to the last year of their tenure probationary period or faculty being considered for promotion may withdraw, without prejudice, at any stage of the review process if no official action in the form of written communication regarding denial has been taken on the nomination. In those cases where the decision of the Provost does not support tenure or promotion, the Provost's Office will notify the relevant Dean prior to taking official action. The Dean will notify the Department Chair and candidate at least 10 days prior to the official decision in order to allow the candidate to withdraw if they so choose. If the candidate is in the last year of the probationary period, the Dean will notify the Department Chair and candidate at least 10 days prior to the official decision to allow the candidate to withdraw and resign if they so choose. All cases of withdrawal and resignation prior to an official decision require written mutual agreement between the faculty member and the appropriate Chair or Director.
18. In the case of a denial, the nominee shall be notified in writing by the Provost of the denial and reason(s) for denial. Copies of the notice of denial will also be sent to all pertinent administrators. If the denial was for the award of tenure or permanent status at the end of the probationary period, the academic unit responsible for the nomination must send a separate notice of non-renewal to the faculty member unless the department concurs in a withdrawal and resignation by the faculty member. Units should contact Human Resources Employee Relations office for the format for letters of non-renewal.

NOTE: Notice of denial and any follow-up will occur outside of the F.E.A. system.

IV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR CHAIRS AND DIRECTORS

1. The Department Chair should inform the nominated faculty member well in advance about deadlines in the evaluation process.

2. Regarding dossier Section Teaching Evaluations: Course evaluation summaries from <https://gatorevals.aa.ufl.edu/> will auto-populate in the F.E.A. system candidate dossier. Peer evaluations should be inserted as instructed in the F.E.A. workflow. Peer evaluations may include, but are not limited to, the Faculty Senate Peer Evaluation of Teaching Rubric, Formative Assessment Rubric for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (FARPET), your college's designated Peer Teaching Evaluation Assessment, and the UF Pathways to Online Teaching Excellence Course Reviews or Quality Matters Course Reviews for online teaching. Peer evaluation is highly desirable but not required. If the nominee is assigned teaching but teaching evaluations are not available, an explanation should be provided regarding their absence. This may occur for those faculty receiving low FTE teaching assignments to supervise graduate committees or to do guest lecturing for courses. If the nominee is a guest lecturer, please indicate the number of lectures given for each course. Do not include written comments from students obtained as part of the course evaluation procedure. Chairs and Directors should address, within their letter, any variance between course evaluations and peer evaluations.
3. Regarding dossier Section Educational Portfolio. This section is for those units where faculty are expected to develop portfolios in which they document performance in educational scholarship, leadership and service. Include the recommended portfolio from the candidate's college, if available. Candidates may elect to include additional markers of distinction to the portfolio. Examples include but are not limited to: Passport to Great Teaching certificates of completion, UF+ Quality Matters course review designations, and Quality Matters online course design review certifications.

Faculty whose **primary** assignment is in teaching and service may also use this section to include **illustrative examples** of materials that document the instructional accomplishments described in the Teaching, Advising, and Instructional Accomplishments narrative section. Select sample materials carefully: the quality of the materials is much more important than their quantity. Candidates should specify how the included material provides evidence of impact or distinction.

4. Chair's/Director's (or Appropriate Administrator's) Letter: **The Chair's/Director's (or appropriate administrator's) letter should be no more than three pages, single-spaced.** The letter should be written and submitted only after the review and assessment by department/center faculty, but before the candidate's packet is sent to the next level. This letter should provide an explanation of the quality of the candidate's work in all areas with reference to the department's written discipline-specific clarifications of the University's tenure and/or promotion criteria. For example, the Chair/Director may describe the quality of the journals or other venues in which the candidate has published, assess creative works, and provide additional insight into the nomination for the benefit of the committees that will be reviewing the packet. In addition, the administrator should specifically address the strengths and weaknesses of a candidate's case, as appropriate.

Since many reviewers within the university may not be experts in the nominee's field, information should be given regarding the review process for publications, the significance of any awards, the quality of the candidate's service contribution, and any other clarifications which will assist the reviewers in evaluating the materials, including an explanation of how a senior author is determined. The letter should also explain the role of graduate assistants, post-docs, residents, fellows and/or interns in publication(s),

and in research. The Chair's or Director's letter may explain unusual assignments or unique contributions, **and must address negative, abstaining or absent votes when they are 20% or more of the total.**

The letter also should describe the process of departmental review and selection of outside evaluators. Any actual or perceived conflicts of interest should be addressed.

The University recognizes that teams of investigators are responsible for many new discoveries, creative works, and advancement of knowledge. Collaborative scholarship is highly valued. Authorship other than listed as first or senior author can be recognized as significant as long as a faculty member's unique contribution can be discerned. Therefore, the Chair/Director letter should address the candidate's significant contribution to distinctive collaborative scholarship.

Community-engaged scholarship aims to achieve both public and scholarly impact, aligning with the University's mission and values through its commitment to community engagement and knowledge sharing. The outcomes of this scholarly approach are rigorously produced and disseminated in formats that are accessible and relevant to diverse audiences, extending the impact of academic research beyond the traditional boundaries of the academy. Therefore, the candidate and the Chair/Director should address the candidate's significant contribution to distinctive community-engaged scholarship.

If the candidate includes inventions, software, videos, or other scholarly products in their nomination packet, the Chair/Director should include an evaluation of the product and note the candidate's contribution to its development and the product's contribution to the field. Solicited letters of evaluation may also be used to obtain peer review of such products.

When the Chair/Director addresses the candidate's accomplishment in the instructional area, they should also include information on the quality of advising, including dissertation advising.

Some research center faculty also may have letters from center Directors.

5. Submission of the Chair's/Director's Letter. The Chair/Director provides candidates with a copy of their letter by uploading the letter into the F.E.A. system. The candidate will be notified by the F.E.A. system when the letter is available. The candidate has 10 days thereafter to submit an official written response if they choose to do so by uploading the response in the F.E.A. system. The packet will not advance to the next step until the candidate either submits an official response, indicates that they will not be submitting a response, or 10 days have passed, whichever is first. Note that adding an official response should be reserved for addressing differences with the Chair's findings; faculty should not upload letters agreeing with or thanking the Chair for support.

Before the F.E.A. system transmits the packet to the college level review, the Chair's or Director's letter and the unit individual assessments must be included. The number of individual faculty assessments must equal the total number of unit faculty eligible to vote.

The Chair must indicate their endorsement or lack of endorsement of the nomination in the F.E.A. system.

6. Regarding Bio-Sketches & Letters of Evaluation:

For the appropriate process to use when soliciting external letters of evaluation for faculty in the bargaining unit, see Article 19, Collective Bargaining Agreement. For faculty not in the bargaining unit, the Chair should work with the candidate to generate a list of potential evaluators. The chair shall be responsible for choosing the individuals who will be requested to submit letters of evaluation, provided that at least one-half of the evaluators who agree to write letters come from the candidate's list. If an insufficient number of individuals agree to serve as evaluators, the candidate shall submit additional names, as necessary. A sufficient number of external evaluations should be sought so the packet includes at least five letters from outside the university. A College could elect to require a different number of outside letters.

Letters of evaluation from qualified reviewers external to the University should be solicited by Department Chairs or center Directors as early as possible to enable nomination packets to move through department/center review in a timely fashion. Those from whom letters of evaluation are solicited must be notified of the possibility that a copy of the letter will be sent to the nominee, unless the nominee has executed a written waiver.

Letters of evaluation should not be solicited from individuals currently employed by the University of Florida or persons previously employed in the past 10 years whose term at UF overlapped that of the candidate.

A copy of a typical letter requesting the letters of evaluation should appear in the F.E.A. system workflow.

All solicited letters received must be included in the F.E.A. packet. External letters of evaluation received in hard copy or by fax should be scanned into PDF form and uploaded in F.E.A. The department/center P&T administrator will upload the external letters of evaluation to the F.E.A. system.

The focus of the letters of evaluation by qualified external reviewers should be to present evidence of recognized contributions and not simply to support or recommend. Letters should evaluate the candidate's record holistically to determine if it supports the claim that the candidate's work has made a significant contribution to the field, as well as being nationally and/or internationally recognized. All letters of evaluation completed by external reviewers must be in English in the original version.

Letters of evaluation should normally be written by faculty of higher rank than the candidate is seeking. Letters from faculty who are at the top of the candidate's field and at the very best institutions are particularly valued.

Only faculty in non-tenure-accruing or non-permanent status titles whose assignments have been solely in teaching and service or whose promotion will be decided based

almost solely on their performance in teaching and service may substitute some or all of the letters of evaluation from within the University for the outside evaluations.

University reviewers consider conflict of interest when assessing the weight given to a letter of evaluation. It is therefore important that the candidate and department/center administrators realize that the quality and independence of the letters and their writers play an important role in tenure and promotion decisions. Letters from individuals who have or have had a personal, professional, or mentoring relationship with the candidate could create a conflict of interest. Similarly, internal letters for candidates in non-tenure-accruing or non-permanent status titles (as described above) that come solely from within the unit may create a perception of conflict of interest. The guiding principle is whether the individual stands to benefit from the success of the candidate, either professionally or personally. In general, for example, this includes those who have shared a common grant or coauthored a publication within the previous 5 years, or those who served as dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor or were close collaborators. Exceptions can be made in the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research or service panels. This is not meant to exclude individuals who have a familiarity with the candidate because of professional contact in a community of scholars.

A biographical sketch of each reviewer will be included in the nominee's packet. To aid in the preparation of the bio-sketches, the department/center may wish to ask for copies of the evaluator's *curriculum vitae* when soliciting the external letter of evaluation. The bio-sketch must indicate whether the reviewer came from the Chair's or the candidate's list.

Note: It is not appropriate to argue that a discipline or field is so small that everyone in that community presents a demonstrable conflict of interest and, would, therefore, be excluded by this approach. Scholarship of the quality that is commensurate with success in the promotion and tenure process should have a substantial impact, beyond any small community of scholars.

If a reviewer has a potential conflict of interest, the Chair must explain the rationale for using that reviewer.

V. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR COLLEGE COMMITTEES AND DEANS

1. College criteria should be written to clarify the expectations for promotion, permanent status, and tenure. A definition of distinction should be included. The documents should state clearly that they are intended to clarify the department's/center's and/or college's application of the University criteria and not to change or modify the University criteria. The Provost's Office and college faculty should have access to the document.
2. **Promotions for those holding faculty positions as Assistant In or Associate In should be decided by the college Dean or unit chief administrative officer and do not need to be forwarded to the Provost.** Evaluations of faculty in this title series should otherwise follow the same promotion procedures as for other faculty, and be based on evidence of merit in the performance of assigned duties and responsibilities since hire or

last promotion, and not on time in rank. Distinction should be clearly defined within College documents.

3. The F.E.A. system will notify the candidate and Chair/Director automatically when the college committee assessments have been entered in the system.
4. Regarding the Dean's Letter: **The Dean's (letter should be no more than three pages, single-spaced.** The letter from the Dean should be written only after the results of the nomination review at the college/unit level, but before the packet moves to the university level.

After reviewing the nominee's packet, including assessments by the department/center and college level review committees, and evaluations completed by external reviewers and the Department Chair/Director, the Dean prepares a letter conveying his or her evaluation of the case as well as a recommendation to the Provost. The Dean's letter serves as an evaluation of the nomination, and must convey the Dean's endorsement or lack of endorsement of the nomination, and explain/clarify exceptional assignments, unique contributions, **or negative, abstaining or absent assessments if these are more than 20% of the total.**

The Dean provides this letter to the candidate by uploading it into the F.E.A. system. The F.E.A. system will generate an email notification. The candidate has 10 days thereafter to request a meeting with the Dean or to submit an official written response by uploading the response into the F.E.A. system. Any such response shall become part of the packet. The packet will not move to the next step until the candidate either submits an official response to the Dean's letter, indicates that they will not be submitting a response, or 10 days have passed, whichever is first. Note that requesting a meeting with the Dean or adding an official response should be reserved for addressing differences with the Dean's findings; faculty should not upload letters agreeing with or thanking the Dean for support.

5. The Dean/Director indicates endorsement or lack of endorsement in the F.E.A. system.

VI. TENURE UPON APPOINTMENT

1. Under exceptional circumstances, an award of tenure may be recommended to the Board of Trustees at the time of initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or above.
2. Requests for tenure upon appointment must be submitted to the Provost **before** the candidate's appointment commences. The form for submitting requests for tenure on hire can be found at <https://aa.ufl.edu/policies--guidelines/tenure-and-promotion-information/>.
3. Requests for tenure upon appointment should be accompanied by a statement of reasons for the request and supporting documentation, including a statement justifying the special circumstances that warrant granting tenure as a condition of employment, the candidate's complete *curriculum vitae*, letters of reference if available, and the vote on tenure of the appropriate department/unit faculty. Recent teaching evaluations should be included, if appropriate and available.

4. Approved requests for tenure on appointment normally will be submitted for final decision to the first Board of Trustees meeting following the acceptance of employment.

VII. ANNUAL EVALUATION AND PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE, PERMANENT STATUS, AND/OR PROMOTION

1. Each faculty member shall be evaluated in writing at least once annually on the basis of an assessment of the individual's total performance in fulfilling their assigned duties and responsibilities to the University. The evaluation shall precede and be considered in making recommendations and final decisions on tenure, permanent status, or promotion.
2. In addition, each college and equivalent academic unit shall establish a mentoring program for faculty in the tenure probationary period. Individual development and mentoring plans are both encouraged. Consultation assessing the faculty member's progress toward tenure is a required component of the mentoring program. No college or equivalent academic unit mentoring program shall require any written assessments by the mentor.
3. Depending on the length of the probationary period, a mid-term review should be conducted for any faculty member in the tenure probationary period during spring of the third or fourth year of academic service. Each college must establish procedures for conducting the pre-tenure review. Such procedures must require that each candidate prepare a tenure packet (without external letters). A departmental/center committee of tenured faculty, the Department Chair/Director, and the Dean or designee must provide an evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure. The outcome of the review shall be shared with the faculty member evaluated. These results shall include any recommendations about how the faculty member might improve their performance and tenure dossier and what assistance might be available in the department, college, and University to address candidate needs and improve performance. The mid-term review is separate and distinct from the annual review process. The appraisal shall not be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file and shall not be included in the faculty member's subsequent tenure dossier. A separate letter of annual evaluation addresses annual performance.
4. While there is no probationary period for promotion within the non-tenure accruing ranks, **progress through the ranks for non-tenure track faculty should generally follows the same period of academic service in a position at the University of Florida as for tenure-track faculty.** Each college and equivalent academic unit should establish a mentoring program for non-tenure track faculty.

All departments that employ non-tenure track faculty must develop a progress-to-promotion review process. The purpose of this appraisal shall be to assess the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion and to provide assessments, suggestions, and guidance to assist the faculty member in fulfilling the University's, College's, and Department's criteria. Such procedures must require that each candidate prepare a promotion packet (without external letters). Faculty members senior in rank (including both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty) and eligible to vote on promotion within the appropriate department, the Department Chair/Director, and the

Dean or designee must provide an evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion. The appraisal shall not be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file and shall not be included in the faculty member's subsequent promotion dossier. A separate letter of annual evaluation addresses annual performance.

VIII. DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR/CURATOR AWARD

The award of Distinguished Professor/Curator follows the same calendar cycle as that for tenure and promotion. Please refer to separate guidelines issued each year by the Provost for the Distinguished Professor/Curator award. Criteria for the award are available at <https://fora.aa.ufl.edu/provost/Committees/Distinguished-Professors>

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Eligibility for Voting on Promotional Rank

University of Florida – As Revised February 27, 2019

Equivalent faculty titles are listed across at each of the 4 levels below. Titles may vote for promotion for those titles in the series below each numbered section. I.e., Professor, Clinical Professor, or Curator may vote on all other faculty titles; Assistant Professor or equivalent is eligible to vote on all Specialty titles, PKY or Extension titles, and General titles, regardless of their rank; Master Lecturer may vote on Lecturer or Associate In, etc. Units may not have faculty in all title series, or may only have faculty in specific title series (such as the PKY Developmental Research School). Promotion is open only to regularly-appointed faculty.²

1. Professorial Ranks: Faculty in these titles must hold terminal or highest degree in field, or have equivalent professional qualifications.

Professor ¹	Clinical Professor ²	Curator ³
Associate Professor	Clin Assoc Prof	Assoc Curator
^a Assistant Professor	^b Clin Asst Prof	^c Asst Curator

2. Specialty Faculty Ranks: Faculty in these titles may hold terminal or highest degree in field, and/or have professional qualifications, and focus on specific academic functions.

^d Master Lecturer	^e Scientist/Scholar/Engineer	^f Librarian	^g Professor of Practice
^b Senior Lecturer	ⁱ Associate Scientist/Scholar/Engineer	^j Assoc Librarian	
^k Lecturer	^l Assistant Scientist/Scholar/Engineer	^m Asst Librarian	

3. PKY Faculty Ranks and Extension Faculty Ranks: Faculty in these titles may hold terminal or highest degree in field, and specialize in academic functions; no equivalent.

ⁿ PKY Prof	^o County Extension Agent IV
^p PKY Assoc Prof	^q County Extension Agent III
^r PKY Asst Prof	^s County Extension Agent II
^t PKY Instructor	^u County Extension Agent I

4. General Faculty Ranks: Faculty in these titles have academic or professional qualifications and perform generalized faculty functions.

^vSenior Associate In
^wAssociate In
^xAssistant In

Voting Abilities

Professor, Clinical Professor, Curator: Promotion all Faculty titles

Associate Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Associate Curator: Promotion of faculty titles a-x

Assistant Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Assistant Curator: Promotion of faculty titles d-x

Master Lecturer; Scientist/Scholar/Engineer; Librarian; Professor of Practice: Promotion of faculty titles h-x

Senior Lecturer, Associate Scientist/Scholar/Engineer; Associate Librarian: Promotion of faculty titles k-x

Lecturer, Assistant Scientist/Scholar/Engineer; Assistant Librarian: Promotion of faculty titles n-x

PKY Professor/ County Extension Agent IV: Promotion of a faculty titles: p-x

¹ Those holding tenure vote on tenure and those holding permanent status vote on permanent status regardless of rank. Promotion and tenure are separate assessments.

² Faculty titles with the following modifiers are not eligible for the University's promotion process: Acting, Adjunct, Affiliate, Joint, Emeritus, Provisional, Visiting, Courtesy, Honorary, Affiliated Clinical, Industry, of Practice, Multi-Year, or Term.

³ Includes award titles such as Distinguished Professor, Graduate Research Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, Eminent Scholar, etc.

⁴ Includes Clinical Eminent Scholar

⁵ Includes Distinguished Curator

Voting Abilities cont.

PKY Associate Professor/ County Extension Agent III: Promotion of a faculty titles: r-x

PKY Assistant Professor/ County Extension Agent II: Promotion of a faculty titles: t-x

PKY Instructor/ County Extension Agent I: Promotion of a faculty titles: v-x

Senior Associate In: Promotion of faculty titles w-x

Associate In: Promotion of Faculty title x