Reviewers
Tenure and/or Promotion Applications
Procedural and Formatting Guidelines

1. View the training videos/transcripts in the Canvas site – Faculty Information System (FIS) Training (https://usflearn.instructure.com/enroll/GGFXK4) – before you begin.

2. Review the relevant tenure and/or promotion guidelines before beginning your review.

3. When opening a candidate's application for the first time, remember to complete the Agree to Integrity step (top right button). It may appear that you do not have access but look for the Agree to Integrity button as that is often the hold up.

4. Please note that tables in Archivum sometimes only show the first 5 (or so) items in a list. Be attentive to the arrows that allow navigation to subsequent pages of the table.

5. Articles in press should not be included in the counting of publications but should be separately stated as" in press," e.g., Dr. Smith published 35 articles and has 5 additional articles in press. At each review level, the counts described in the narratives should be consistent.

6. Articles submitted, under review, or in preparation should not be included in the counting of publications at all.

7. Published abstracts should not be considered peer-reviewed referred articles. In Archivum, these should be listed in the "other publications" section.

8. A journal article published online in advance of print publication is considered "published".

9. In general, the timeframe for each section (research, teaching, service, etc.) is the past five years or years since last promotion, whichever is more recent. This timeframe should be the primary focus; however, it may be described in the context of the entire career to show trajectory and overall impact.

10. At each stage of the review, the reviewers must ensure that the count of publications/grants/etc. is consistent in faculty narrative, department chair narrative, and committee narratives. Each review team should check the counts of prior reviewers to ensure consistency. If a prior reviewer incorrectly stated the number of publications, the next review team should consult with the reviewer, clarify the number, and make a brief statement noting the correction (if needed) in their review.

11. All reviews should list the name(s) of the reviewers at the bottom so that it is clear who wrote the review. For committee reviews (department/school level or college level), the names of each of the committee members should be listed at the end of the review narrative, with the chair of the committee indicated.

12. After you submit your review, you will also get a notification to DocuSign your review. Please watch for that.

13. Following your review, the application will route to back to the candidate for response. If you are wondering why the application has not moved to the next stage of review, it may be in the candidate's queue.

14. Please note, for faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Pete campuses, an extra step of review is included, that of Regional Chancellor.