

---

**Section: Survey**

Description: *For promotion only go to question 10.*

---

**Question No.: 1.**

**Question Description:** Did you go up for tenure early?

Answer Choices:

Yes, go to question 2 : 30%

No, I went up in 6-7 years, go to question 4: 70%

---

**Question No.: 2.**

**Question Description:** Did you experience any bias?

Percentage Yes : 13

Percentage No : 40

Percentage Unanswered : 47

---

**Question No.: 3.**

**Question Description:** If you answered yes to question 2 please explain.

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *I met resistance and missing support in my own department. In my opinion, this was not justified. Later, at the college level, I did not have any problems with the tenure process.*
  - *I felt that the feedback I received from the previous chair was different than the one I received from the chair who evaluated me for tenure. Being on the more applied side of the field, it seems I was perceived as not being a good fit to the department.*
  - *The college level Tenure and Promotion committee at CLAS exhibited worrisome incompetence and bias. We were never given adequate explanation of their puzzling vote.*
  - *My promotion was to Distinguished Prof. I am the only senior female faculty member in my department, thus for me to be promoted to distinguished Prof would put me above all other faculty in my department. Many of the male full profs were supportive but some were not, arguing strongly that others in the department were more deserving (not so according to my chair and dean). Thus the dept vote in my case was split (50-50) but the college P&T committee vote was unanimous, the dean was supportive and the University Personnel board was supportive so it turned out OK but this was because my chair and dean were so supportive. If I would have had a weak chair, my packet would not have gone forward.*
  - *I was encouraged not to go up early (wait a year), and then was offered another position at another university, then was encouraged to go up here.*
  - *Expectations were different for me than for others who had gone up previously.*
  - *Against teaching*
  - *Perhaps at the department level, either on the basis of gender or the fact that my spouse is in the department.*
- 

**Question No.: 4.**

**Question Description:** Did you exercise your right to stop the tenure clock?

Percentage Yes : 9  
Percentage No : 74  
Percentage Unanswered : 18

---

**Question No.:** 5.  
**Question Description:** Were you officially mentored?

Percentage Yes : 41  
Percentage No : 41  
Percentage Unanswered : 18

---

**Question No.:** 6.  
**Question Description:** Were you unofficially mentored?

Percentage Yes : 49  
Percentage No : 31  
Percentage Unanswered : 21

---

**Question No.:** 7.  
**Question Description:** When were you first aware of all the criteria necessary for tenure?

Answer Choices:  
at hiring: 54%  
mid-process, at the 3 year review: 21%  
the year before I went up: 14%  
never directly made aware : 11%

---

**Question No.:** 8.  
**Question Description:** Was the tenure process clearly explained to you when hired?

Percentage Yes : 46  
Percentage No : 34  
Percentage Unanswered : 21

---

**Question No.:** 9.  
**Question Description:** If yes, who explained the tenure process when hired?

Answer Choices:  
Dean: 14%  
Chair: 43%  
Other faculty : 43%

---

**Question No.:** 10.  
**Question Description:** Did you attend one of the University Tenure and Promotion workshops?

Percentage Yes : 76  
Percentage No : 24  
Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 11.  
**Question Description:** If there were an online training for the tenure and promotion process

would you participate?

Percentage Yes : 66

Percentage No : 31

Percentage Unanswered : 3

-----  
**Question No.:** 12.

**Question Description:** Did you submit items other than student evaluations for teaching assessment?

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *letters from students in independent research*
- *Peer evaluations*
- *Yes, I submitted course materials.*
- *NO*
- *Yes. I included peer teaching evaluation.*
- *Peer evaluations*
- *No*
- *NA*
- *no*
- *no*
- *No*
- *yes a whole portfolio*
- *Yes.*
- *No.*
- *n/a*
- *Some highlights of curriculum development, but primarily student evaluations.*
- *Yes, peer assessment from faculty from both within and outside of the department.*
- *Resident evaluations; lecture evaluations from lectures and presentations at national meetings*
- *No*
- *yes-peer evals*
- *Not applicable (non-teaching faculty)*
- *No*
- *No*
- *no*
- *Yes, I did since my student evaluations were not the best. In my opinion, student evaluations are the worst method to evaluate an instructor's teaching capabilities. In addition, I got a teaching assessment by a group of full professors of my department. This group considered my teaching skills as excellent. Further, I could present a number of letters from current and former students who expressed their high satisfaction with my teaching.*
- *Not really.*
- *Yes. My college requires documentation equivalent to a teaching portfolio.*
- *yes*
- *yes - evaluations from presentations at national meetings and evaluations from resident teaching*
- *yes, I also submitted examples of teaching materials and exams developed by me.*
- *Yes, I submitted a narrative on my teaching philosophy.*
- *Peer evaluation*
- *Faculty peer review*
- *y*
- *You need to clarify this question. Do you mean any items that were included in / appended to*

*the packet, or items specific to teaching, or any other specific item?*

- Peer evaluations
  - N/A
  - N/A
  - NO
  - No
  - No
  - resident and fellow evaluations
  - Peer evaluation.
  - No
  - N/A
  - No
  - Only the essay on teaching philosophy requested in the T and P packet.
  - Yes - peer evaluations
  - yes
  - Letters from prior fellowship trainees
  - Peer evaluation
  - No
  - No
  - Yes
  - No. My classes were never peer-reviewed.
  - Yes, peer evaluations
  - Yes, I submitted evaluations I'd developed for each class.
  - yes
  - no but some of my colleagues who attended my classes wrote reports about my teaching
  - no
  - I completed the form -- so I had all the stuff that was requested, but nothing in addition.
  - yes
- 

**Question No.:** 13.

**Question Description:** Do you believe that there is recognition of your service contributions?

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- yes, minor.
- Not applicable
- Yes.
- I do very little service because my UF appointment is only 20% that I really can't answer this.
- Yes, although sometimes I think service contributions are difficult to disentangle from other aspects of job performance.
- No enough
- Yes
- no-but there isn't for anyone
- yes
- Yes, but the recognition could be better.
- No
- Not enough recognition of service.
- In my department, perhaps, but - at least judging by the letter from the Interim Dean who devoted a half of one sentence to service- service does not seem to be recognized on the college level. Demands for service and junior faculty time still outpace its recognition in the T&P process.
- Yes.

- yes
- *The feeling changed over the years preceding the actual P/T process. Please see my comments at the last question.*
- Yes.
- yes
- *I think so -- although not sure if they were appreciated after all.*
- *No, nor do I think it should be a major part of the tenure process.*
- yes
- Yes
- yes
- Yes
- *No No No. I was told they don't count.*
- *an appropriate level*
- Yes.
- No.
- *very little*
- **DEFINITELY!!!**
- yes
- No
- Yes
- *I am not sure.*
- Yes
- Yes
- *Maybe*
- n
- *Some, but probably not enough.*
- No
- *Yes, informally within our college and the HSC, but not formally within P&T.*
- YES.
- *Not sufficient.*
- Yes
- *Not fully.*
- *Minor*
- yes
- *This was included in my tenure packet, but was not commented on by my Chairman or the Dean. I suppose the answer is no, but I was not party to departmental or committee discussions, or to the letters of evaluation.*
- *I do not know.*
- Yes
- **NOOOOOOOOOO!!!!!!!!!!**
- No
- *No, not in any significant way.*
- *Hard to say.*
- *I don't know.*
- *i would like to think so, but it is probably weighted very minimally*
- Yes
- *no idea as nobody told me explicitly*
- Yes
- *Not sure*
- *I have an extension appointment, so that is where my service goes, even though it doesn't really fit extension's "program" focus.*
- *Some, but it is not weighted enough. Service is certainly expected, but the time give is not*

*reflected/recognized in the tenure process.*

*- some*

*- not by the department but yes by the college committee and the upper administration*

---

**Question No.:** 14.

**Question Description:** Do you believe that the college-level Tenure and Promotion committee is a committee of your peers?

Percentage Yes : 72

Percentage No : 28

Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 15.

**Question Description:** Are the tenure and promotion criteria provided in writing for your unit or college?

Percentage Yes : 87

Percentage No : 12

Percentage Unanswered : 1

---

**Question No.:** 16.

**Question Description:** Did the criteria for tenure and promotion change during your period of evaluation?

Answer Choices:

Yes, go to question 17: 41%

No, go to question 18: 59%

---

**Question No.:** 17.

**Question Description:** Were you judged by the old or the new criteria?

Answer Choices:

Old criteria: 16%

New criteria: 84%

---

**Question No.:** 18.

**Question Description:** Do you feel the criteria are fair?

Percentage Yes : 81

Percentage No : 19

Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 19.

**Question Description:** Did you know you were to be notified when your packet was updated with a copy of the Dean's letter

Percentage Yes : 79

Percentage No : 21

Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 20.

**Question Description:** Did you know you were to be notified when your packet was updated

with a copy of the Department Chair's letter

Percentage Yes : 75

Percentage No : 25

Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 21.

**Question Description:** Did you receive a copy of the Dean's letter?

Percentage Yes : 94

Percentage No : 4

Percentage Unanswered : 1

---

**Question No.:** 22.

**Question Description:** Did you receive a copy of the Department Chair's letter?

Percentage Yes : 91

Percentage No : 9

Percentage Unanswered : 0

---

**Question No.:** 23.

**Question Description:** Please list your college

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- *CALS Percival*
- *COM*
- *Warrington College of Business Administration*
- *Warrington College of Business Administration*
- *CLAS*
- *Public Health and Health Promotions*
- *CLAS*
- *University Libraries*
- *IFAS*
- *Libraries*
- *IFAS*
- *IFAS*
- *Engineering*
- *College of Engineering*
- *engineering*
- *IFAS*
- *Journalism and Communication*
- *CLAS*
- *CLAS*
- *Nursing*
- *Medicine*
- *Engineering*
- *CLAS.*
- *Medicine*
- *Dentistry*
- *Engineering*
- *Eng.*
- *College of Agricultural and Life Sciences*

- IFAS
- Pharmacy
- medicine
- Nursing
- Medicine
- Public Health and Health Professions
- CLAS
- Arts and Sciences
- IFAS
- CLAS
- Medicine
- Dentistry
- Pharmacy
- medicine
- CALS
- IFAS
- University Libraries
- Medicine
- CLAS
- IFAS
- Education
- Engineering
- CLAS
- Dentistry
- CLAS
- Medicine
- Agricultural and Life Science
- CLAS
- CLAS
- College of Dentistry
- Education
- Medicine
- DCP
- CLAS
- clas
- Fine Arts
- CALS
- Engineering
- College of Medicine

-----  
**Question No.:** 24.

**Question Description:** Do you have any other comments or concerns to share with the Senate Faculty Welfare Council?

**Each item corresponds to a response by one student :**

- not at this time.
- My chair is truly outstanding. Dr. Baker made sure this was a very transparent procedure.
- Yes. It was a bit disconcerting that the call for the next years P & T candidates was announced without having heard the outcome of my application.
- I am concerned that about criteria relating to obtaining major research funding in time periods where there is severe reduction in the percentage of grant proposals that get funded. When places like NIH are only funding at 6-10%, the faculty member has important out-of-

*his/her-control limitations on his/her control to get such funding. Tenure expectations should take that into account.*

*- The third year review is supposed to be advisory in nature, and now is becoming more evaluative. This is demoralizing to the new faculty who are already suffering from self-generated pressure. The Dean's letter during a third year review could be completely unfair if viewed as a completed T&P packet.*

*- Criteria for promotion in my Department are vague.*

*- You need to have a serious investigation about what is going on with the Tenure and Promotion committee at CLAS. From my personal experience, there seem to be a troubling pattern of corruption and/or incompetence. This requires urgent attention, as it is detrimental to the proper functioning of the college and the university, and of course can have tragic consequences for faculty who get caught up in whatever is going on.*

*- too much emphasis on \$\$\$\$ and less on scholarly work*

*- The process is drawn out and archane and could be streamlined.*

*- Changes in expectations as well as the number of years in service (the latter changed twice - first the number of years was increased, then tenure-as-ready was instituted but not yet embraced) affected me profoundly. I do not regret waiting - I think the T&P process went much more smoothly thanks to my full-6 year service - but I still find such play with rules unfair. Combined with salary compression and real-wage decreases this off and on game is bound to create fear and resentment not just among junior faculty.*

*- After the Dean's Letter the process got less transparent. It would have been nice to receive a copy of the Provost's Letter as well so that there is another milestone in the process. Also, it seems our process at UF seems to last far longer than in some other peer institutions (e.g., Texas A&M and Georgia Tech). Also, the tenure and promotion seems to take effect later.*

*- The biggest concern for me was that the requirements changed midway through my cycle. Not only the requirements but the amount of time awaiting possible promotion. Although I do not disagree with the eventual requirements, per se, changes in the requirements led to several of my peer group leaving this university and seeking employment elsewhere. I was fortunate enough to have some overlap of my already ongoing activities to be able to 'stay on track.' The junior faculty member is quite exposed and vulnerable; this is a position that can be untenable unless there is adequate support and encouragement. The environment does not, as a rule, provide either support or encouragement. Hence the junior faculty member gripes and leaves out of unfounded concerns when they, in fact, may have been able to stay and progress. Finally, demanding that faculty receive national/extramural funding without the provision of adequate start-up resources is disingenuous and unrealistic - the cynic will comment that the process is skewed so that 'cheap labor' can be harvested from the junior most faculty with no hopes for progress, salary advance, or a position from which to complain. The process worked well-enough for me; but that was not universal and it was not without feelings of abandonment and isolation. Repairs are indicated.*

*- The questions on tenure are not germane to my case.*

*- The process is simply too long -- from the day one begins working on the packet and the department chair sends out requests for external letters until one gets the (positive) letter from the president it takes some 14 months. The uncertainty of such a long process could become paralyzing for many (and their families).*

*- It was my impression that activities related to diversity in the profession were devalued relative to activities directly related to my job description.*

*- N/A*

*- I was hired with T&P at 5 years, then it moved to 6 and then to 7 years. I went up at 5 years and received comments from senior faculty in my department and at the college level that I hadn't "put in my time." The University says tenure "when ready"-- somebody needs to get their stories straight. So I was held back for 2 years merely because I had to "do time." I had external funding at 5 years and the ones who wanted me to do my time wre not then and some*

*had never been externally funded. Bitter? Yes, I don't think this process works as it should.*

*- no.*

*- The evaluation of an instructor's teaching skills by student evaluations should be abolished and be replaced by another evaluation method (e.g., a committee of professors with a high reputation in teaching).*

*- No*

*- I believe the College T&P committee needs to be more diverse and all new committee members should be properly trained to assess packets. Being a full professor does not automatically qualify one to do an excellent job of T&P packet review; and the decisions of this committee can make or break careers.*

*- I withdrew upon learning that the APB was not going to recommend me for tenure and promotion, despite very strong support from the earlier stages of the process, including a unanimous college vote, strong Dean and Dept. Chair letter (and from what I understand) good external letters. I believe I was treated unfairly at the university level review. What is very troubling is that I believe the College was never consulted when the APB had reached its recommendation. I was told by the provost that this was because there weren't any questions about my packet, which I find hard to believe if everyone else along the way provided strong recommendations. I also found out about this decision the day after the budget cuts were announced. I was also initially only given 3 days until a Friday to make a decision to withdraw which my Dean was able to get extended until Monday. In all I was treated fairly by my College but let down by the university-level review process. It's a slap in the face to believe that no one from my discipline in the College or the external evaluators who are experts in the area were taken seriously.*

*- I was an atypical candidate for promotion to professor - less grant funding than most. I felt the committee gave me due credit for my service, teaching and scholarly accomplishments and did not overly penalize me for less grant funding.*

*- no*

*- I believe my college is very thorough in showing us what is required.*

*- You cannot change the criteria for P&T in the middle. You may not do so and not even tell the applicant. This is abhorrent.*

*- No.*

*- No*

*- I have a colleague in another college at UF who was supported by unanimous votes at every level and had full support for tenure from his Dean. When it went to the Academic Review Board he was denied tenure. Seems like WAY too much power given to that group, especially since at many/most institutions that group is an almost automatic approval if you have unanimous support going in...*

*- Criteria should be modified and re evaluated based on realistic academic expectations vs service productivity requirement. Currently clinical production rated more than academic + salary compression has discouraged associates to work hard to professor level. Not clear advantage on achieving a "tenured status" from academic or economical status*

*- As for P&T criteria, there are no explicit criteria communicated within our college. There was some in official communication about the number of publications etc.*

*- I think that it would have been useful to have some formal mentorship for the tenure process. I got the sense that nobody in my department really cared about the process, and thus nobody ever talked about it to me. It was a lonely and depressing process that made me realize that there was very little camaraderie in my department.*

*- No*

*- I didn't have any problems with the tenure/promotion process but some people in my department had. From what I heard those stemmed from lack of clear understanding what the T&P criteria actually are, what specific things are the people at various steps looking for.*

*- I think you should be judged on your strongest area, especially for physicians who are now*

*required to have a busy and productive clinical practice. It leaves very little or no time for research if you are a highly busy clinician. Teaching, obviously can be done in a very busy clinical setting*

*- The University and Tenure Workshop was not very helpful. Perhaps, a non-tenure research track Faculty should also be part of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.*

*- no*

*- No*

*- No*

*- My denial of promotion to Full Professor seems to be ridiculous. There were four criteria, and I did well in all four. It seems that UF just wanted to save money by denying my promotion. Because of this, I am considering leaving UF very seriously.*

*- There is a complete disconnect between the college criteria and the university. Receive no feedback from university committee!*

*- No.*

*- mentoring needs to be strengthened beyond the departmental and/or college level*

*- Very laborious, prolonged, and inefficient process*

*- At the departmental level, the process is rather transparent, and feedback is provided by colleagues about T&P cases: who meets when and where to discuss the various cases; when are ballots due; when will chair inform the candidates about the counts etc. But after that (college and university level) it feels as if files disappear "in a black hole". Perhaps the size of UF is a contributing factor, but it would be nice that candidates are being informed better. Also, timing of decisions is completely unknown, which makes the wait somewhat stressful. So, more feedback from 2nd and 3rd level, and a clear timetable (when will the decision be made, when will the candidate receive a letter etc) would be significant improvements.*

*- No.*

*- Yes. The journal impact factor is not a reasonable method for assessing quality research. Not all journals are scanned, for one thing, and not everyone is doing theoretical research. Some of us do applied research, and that is less citable. So it doesn't make any sense to use that metric.*

*- The University is behind the times in terms of recognizing the ever growing importance of business within the world of academic medicine*

*- This was an interesting process for me at this time. The Department was not very supportive even though I had exceeded all the "hoops" they had told me I needed to jump through. The Dept chair was supportive as indicated by her previous annual letters of evaluations but several of the other "full professor" faculty members had personal "issues" and wanted me to pull my packet. Nonetheless, the college committee strongly supported my promotion as did the Dean and the rest of the individuals and committees involved in the process. I have since switched departments, but remain in the same college. I was naive in thinking that these types of prejudices and "control issues" no longer occurred in the present day academia, but I have been educated. I would be happy to discuss any of this further in the hopes of not having it happen to anyone else.*

-----