



Table of Contents: Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences Reappointment

Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor..... **2**

University reappointment criteria..... **8**

Acceptance memo from Provost..... **19**

Transmittal memo from Vice Provost and clarifications AHSS**21**

University criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Spring Semester, 2020

Table of Contents

Preamble:	2
University criteria for promotion to Associate Professor:	3
1. Instruction	3
2. Research or other creative activities relevant to the institutional mission	4
3. Service to external professional societies and contributions to the University and department.	6
4. Overall recommendation	6

Preamble:

Universities rely on the faculty to execute their core mission and each university takes particular pride in the quality of its faculty. At Florida Poly, we take great pride in our faculty. Setting high standards for faculty achievement as an important part of building and sustaining the institution to enable us to achieve our mission to “*Serve students and industry through excellence in education, discovery, and application of applied sciences and engineering.*”

A core component in developing a great faculty body is the faculty promotion process. General criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are set forth herein. Each academic department will provide clarifications to the criteria tailored to their discipline and the ways they can best serve the University’s mission.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA, section 6.5a) notes that Assistant Professors:

May only be reappointed once and must apply for promotion no later than at the completion of six, fall to spring, academic years. However, if hired prior to June 1, 2017, such faculty must apply for promotion to Associate Professor no later than the last year of their three-year reappointment term.

Promotion to Associate Professor considers the faculty member’s contributions to the university and if sufficient evidence is present to demonstrate that an individual has achieved the rank Associate Professor.

The faculty handbook (section 4.2.2) sets minimum criteria for the faculty ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor). These criteria are organized to evaluate a faculty member based on his/her evidence of achievement in Instruction, Research or Scholarship, and Service. The faculty handbook sets minimum qualifications by rank and notes:

The evaluation of teaching may include coursework and curriculum development; research may include traditional publication but may also include tech transfer and tech development activities, and/or leading edge practice in industrial or business organization; service should consider effort in support of both the institution and their respective field.

The overall evaluation must consider the long-term impact of all of a faculty member’s efforts on the ability of the institution to execute its mission.

The faculty handbook specifies that an Associate Professor must achieve: “*a demonstrated record of scholarly activity, teaching, and, as appropriate, course and/or curriculum development commensurate with the university’s mission and relevant academic discipline(s); evidence of a positive and growing reputation in his/ her chosen field; and promise of continued successful performance.*”

Given the importance of excellence in education to the mission, faculty must provide evidence of accomplishment in teaching in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment. Faculty members must demonstrate achievement in research and scholarship consistent with their assigned duties. Faculty must also provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value, commensurate with their assigned duties. Faculty members’ FARE forms should be used to determine assigned work duties. Finally, because Florida Poly has grown quickly, the evaluation will consider efforts to build the institution that are outside the typical scope of faculty responsibilities.

The following sections set institutional expectations in the areas of Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service for faculty promotion to Associate Professor.

University criteria for promotion to Associate Professor:

As noted in the collective bargaining agreement, a faculty member's demonstrated contribution to the institution is the basis for the recommendation to reappoint a faculty member. In all cases, the quality of the work done, and the faculty member's impact, is an important factor in the reappointment decision. A faculty member's annual performance evaluation represents the outcome of a process that is not longitudinal in considering a faculty member's contribution to the institution and is therefore not sufficient to justify reappointment. The evaluation of a candidate must consider the assigned workload for the faculty member, including periods of the summer that are compensated, as the contributions to the three areas (instruction, scholarship or research, and service) are evaluated. Overall, the evaluation must consider the impact of the faculty member on the university community.

The faculty handbook notes: *"The evaluation of teaching may include coursework and curriculum development; research may include traditional publication but may also include tech transfer and tech development activities, and/or leading edge practice in industrial or business organization; service should consider effort in support of both the institution and their respective field."* For an Associate Professor the minimum qualifications are: *"a demonstrated record of scholarly activity, teaching, and, as appropriate, course and/or curriculum development commensurate with the university's mission and relevant academic discipline(s)."* The three areas (**instruction, scholarship or research, and service**) are listed below, along with a narrative that provides background on expectations for a faculty member seeking reappointment.

1. **Instruction**, including *regular classroom and laboratory teaching, laboratory / project based learning instruction, effective development/application of new instructional methods, new course development, directing thesis committees, and other instructional activities*. Each of these is discussed below after paragraphs a and b that provide a framework for consideration. Overall promotion requires proficiency and breadth in instructional capacity considering instructional delivery, instructional material development, and in most cases course development. **Note that it is not a criterion for reappointment to have activity in each of the areas.**
 - a. **A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission**, by delivering their assigned courses, and also by contributing to the departmental and university educational mission. Instructional effectiveness will not be judged solely by Student Assessment of Instruction results or by the "D,F, W" rate. To demonstrate instructional effectiveness, faculty at the time of reappointment must show evidence that their teaching proficiency is sufficient that they can independently deliver their courses in a manner that is consistent, meets student learning outcomes, holds high academic standards while facilitating student success and that they are effective in the classroom. Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness. Evidence of meaningful collaboration with other faculty is an important factor to consider as well as sensible syllabus construction and campus presence consistent with the expectations for a full time faculty member. For multi-section courses, a requirement is positive and appropriate collaboration with other faculty to provide a consistent and high quality instructional experience for students. New course development must show not only that the course was developed but that the course was appropriate and executed effective learning outcomes consistent with the degree(s) supported by the course. Instruction is further considered following the standards presented in sections b-h and faculty are strongly encouraged to consider these items as they prepare their reappointment dossier.
 - b. **The assigned instruction credit hours** are captured by FARE forms. Factors to consider in terms of "effort" are how many times the faculty member has delivered the class, the "efficiency" of the schedule

- for the faculty member in terms of how many course preparations are present in a semester, the amount of support provided for the delivery by student assistants (graduate or undergraduate) or technicians.
- c. **Regular classroom and laboratory teaching** – this includes, but is not limited to, teaching ‘core’ curriculum courses to standards established by the departments (includes courses with common exams or in ‘core’ of degree program) – a minimum requirement is: *Appropriately professional cooperation with co-instructors to deliver ALL materials in the syllabus and complete delivery of the course in a satisfactory manner.* For courses that are highly coordinated, faculty must carefully adhere to the common expectations of the course. The expectation is that all assessments required for that course (not just one of multiple sections) is present. Individual sections may vary in assessment outcome due to time offered, particular students population, or hurricane delays, however, instructors must cover ‘common’ material and explain raw assessment data from their section in a narrative. In a ‘common, multiple section course’ or ‘core’ course, failure to deliver all materials in the syllabus is cause for concern. Similarly, in single section courses, assessment materials should demonstrate that course delivery supported student learning outcomes and subjects defined for delivery in the syllabus.
 - d. **Laboratory / project based learning instruction** and other instructional activities. Evidence must demonstrate that the instructional activity is well planned and the learning outcomes are achieved. A minimum requirement is that instructional materials are sufficiently complete and organized so that students can use them to achieve the learning outcomes for the activity.
 - e. **Effective development/application of new instructional methods.** New pedagogical interventions should be supported by the literature and aligned with a reasonable rationale that justify the exploration/adoption of such technique. The university encourages new instructional methods, but not at the expense of learning outcomes; hence experimentation with new instructional techniques must be well coordinated with a chair and care taken to deliver all course topics. If an instructor chooses to implement a new teaching technique, they must be sure the course materials /topics in the syllabus are not compromised.
 - f. **New course development.** This activity ranges from development of a new course for Florida Poly to significant redesign of an existing course where the instructor develops a substantial amount of material for the delivery of the course. Creating a significant volume of high quality new courses materials with appropriate assessment methods show exemplary effort on the part of the faculty. Delivering course materials consisting primarily of the publisher’s resources is deemed satisfactory. Random inclusion of course materials not aligned with the outcomes and subject matter of the course is deemed as unsatisfactory.
 - g. **Other instructional activities.** These activities typically include, but are not limited to, course coordinator delivery of courses across multiple sections, preparation of ABET materials. Course coordinators for multi-section courses (lecture/lab) have the lead role in developing course materials, maintaining Canvas shell to share course materials (lectures, assignments, rubrics, etc.) with others, conducting weekly/bi-weekly course coordination meetings, coordinating availability of supplies , and collecting formal and informal feedback for instructors (who would be fulfilling roles as described in ‘part c’ of this item.) A minimum standard is to meet with faculty regularly to create an appropriate outcome and to provide an organizational framework for success of the multi-section course. Preparation of ABET materials is similarly a significant responsibility; a minimum contribution is to provide timely delivery of materials in association with the schedule that has been agreed upon.
2. **Research or other creative activities relevant to the institutional mission**, including scholarly publications, proposal and grant activity, support and advising of graduate students.
 - a. Promotion to Associate Professor requires a **a faculty member to demonstrate a unique and scholarly expertise in their field**, and have activity that aligns with this professional direction. Evidence

- presented for promotion must include a research plan and alignment of the faculty member's activity with the plan.
- b. **A minimum requirement is evidence that the faculty member is establishing a reputation in their field;** the faculty member's portfolio should provide evidence that their research trajectory is building their own reputation in their field.
 - c. **Directing thesis committees.** A successful thesis advisor should provide evidence that they have purposefully and deliberately guided the student through the process. The quality of a master's thesis may vary due to circumstances beyond an advisor's (committee chair's) control, so documentation of the process is paramount to demonstrating success by the faculty member. Simply participating as an advisor is not sufficient; the advisor should play an active role in a student's research and through their efforts help students produce a greater impact in their research. Faculty advisors are responsible for providing guidance in an advisory role to identify a viable and suitable project, that resources are available to complete the project, and to provide timely feedback during all stages of the thesis including careful feedback on the student's thesis. Participation in the graduate program, especially by being a graduate student thesis advisor is strongly encouraged (departmental clarifications should comment on the graduate program and how faculty in the department can appropriately participate in the graduate program).
 - d. **Publications and patents** must be evaluated for their quality and impact; to inform this statement, departments as a part of refining the university criteria must provide recommendations for publication venues (journals and conferences) that are considered high value for the fields represented by the department. As a part of a review, department committees are expected to provide input on the quality of the journals and/or conferences present in a faculty member's reappointment package.
 - i. Mainstream journal articles or conference presentations are easier to assess since departments have the opportunity to provide input regarding conference quality and journal quality. More specialized outlets may be appropriate depending on the faculty member's area of expertise. In all cases, faculty should be able to defend the appropriateness and quality of the venues in which they publish. *Faculty for all publications must indicate their contribution to the publication and the types of collaboration with co-authors.* A faculty member's presentation at conferences should build their reputation and that of the university.
 - ii. Articles that are simply the result of student work in a class, with little faculty involvement by themselves do not indicate scholarly achievement; similarly, publications in low quality conferences are appropriate stepping stones to more prestigious publications recognized by their respective professional societies but are not significant in their own right. Articles where a faculty member provided critical and ongoing guidance to students are encouraged.
 - iii. Provisional patents are difficult to assess because they are not reviewed and may or may not indicate scholarly achievement. Individuals must provide sufficient information for reviewers to assess the importance of the provisional filing and the faculty member's contribution to the work.
 - iv. Patents that have been granted represent a more significant achievement and their importance may be assessed by the "use" of the patent.
 - v. Activity with industrial partners documented by how the activity has advanced the state of the art of the partner and/or how the activity has brought value to Florida Poly.
 - e. Proposal and grant application activity should be documented in a way that shows the contribution of the faculty member to the overall grant effort. Proposals should align with the department and/or institution research directions and be submitted according to standard and appropriate procedures. Collaborations both within Florida Poly and external to the university are strongly encouraged. **While there is no minimum standard for grant activity, for most of the fields represented at Florida Poly, strong participation and/or authorship in proposals is a requirement for promotion.** If the candidate belongs to a discipline where there is no funding opportunity, evidence of critical peer review must be

included in the candidate's publication record. Internally and externally funded grants, contracts, and awards are required to advance research agendas, and in all disciplines funding typically provides evidence of critical peer review. Therefore, candidates are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of applications to appropriate external funding opportunities. Funding history, prestige of the funding source(s), strenuousness of the peer review, oversubscription rate of the funding opportunity, size of the award, and impact on the productivity and quality of scholarship will be considered in the evaluation. On grants where multiple authors contribute, the candidate must provide an explanation of their technical contribution to the effort.

3. Service to external professional societies and contributions to the University and department.

- a. To achieve promotion, a faculty member must demonstrate that they are a contributing member of the university.
- b. Promotion to Associate Professor requires that a faculty member is contributing to their department and profession in a positive way.
- c. Simply being a member of a committee is not an indication of service contribution; a faculty member must provide evidence of how their effort provided value to the university. The service contribution must be appropriate to the co- or extra-curricular activity that the faculty member is an active advisor or participant.
- d. Service to one's professional society should be present and demonstrated in order to achieve promotion. For all faculty, using professional society service to build one's own reputation can be effective.

4. Overall recommendation

- a. Because Florida Poly has grown quickly and the demands placed upon faculty have included effort to build the institution, consideration of this effort is appropriate. Such consideration should be based on demonstrable evidence of contribution to advance teaching, research, or other significant institutional effort as it impacts time taken away from other areas. It is incumbent on the faculty member under review to provide a clear and honest presentation of the nature and impact of their contribution and how it is impactful for the institution. The overall evaluation of a faculty member must consider the long-term impact of a faculty member's efforts on the health of the institution and review committees must exercise judgement regarding this impact. In addition, consideration of the evidence provided in an individual's application should carefully consider the effect of the course load assigned to the faculty member, resource availability, faculty rank, and any other assigned university duties, when comparing faculty achievement for Florida Poly faculty to those at other institutions.
- b. Noting the statement above, individuals **must provide evidence of proficiency and accomplishment in teaching** in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment. Similarly, a faculty member **must provide a measure of effort and achievement in research** consistent with their assigned duties. Finally, the dossier must provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value to the university community.
- c. Review committees must work carefully and confidentially, as they consider the reviews for faculty members and the committees must set aside personal relationships and consider the accomplishments of the faculty member being reviewed.

University criteria for three-year reappointment of Assistant and Associate Professors

Spring Semester, 2020

Table of Contents

Preamble:	2
University criteria for reappointment to a three-year term as Assistant Professor:	3
1. Instruction	3
2. Research or other creative activities relevant to the institutional mission	5
3. Service to professional societies and contributions to the University and department.	6
4. Overall recommendation	6
University criteria for reappointment to a three year term as Associate Professor:	7
1. Instruction	7
2. Research or other creative activities relevant to the institutional mission	9
3. Service to external professional societies and contributions to the University and department.	10
4. Overall recommendation	10

Preamble:

Universities rely on the faculty to execute their core mission and each university takes particular pride in the quality of its faculty. At Florida Poly, we take great pride in our faculty. Setting high standards for faculty achievement as an important part of building and sustaining the institution to enable us to achieve our mission to “*Serve students and industry through excellence in education, discovery, and application of applied sciences and engineering.*”

A core component in developing a great faculty body is the faculty reappointment process. General criteria for reappointment that provides a three-year contract are set forth herein. Each academic department will provide clarifications to the criteria tailored to their discipline and the ways they can best serve the University’s mission.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA, section 6.5a) notes that Assistant Professors:

May only be reappointed once and must apply for promotion no later than at the completion of six, fall to spring, academic years. However, if hired prior to June 1, 2017, such faculty must apply for promotion to Associate Professor no later than the last year of their three-year reappointment term.

The reappointment review thus considers an Assistant Professor’s trajectory towards promotion; for Associate Professors the review does not have to consider the trajectory toward promotion but must consider the faculty member’s contributions based on the expectation of accomplishment for an Associate Professor.

The faculty handbook (section 4.2.2) sets minimum criteria for the faculty ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor). These criteria are organized to evaluate a faculty member based on his/her evidence of achievement in Instruction, Research or Scholarship, and Service. The faculty handbook sets minimum qualifications by rank and notes:

The evaluation of teaching may include coursework and curriculum development; research may include traditional publication but may also include tech transfer and tech development activities, and/or leading edge practice in industrial or business organization; service should consider effort in support of both the institution and their respective field.

The overall evaluation must consider the long-term impact of a faculty member’s efforts on the ability of the institution to execute its mission. Given the importance of excellence in education to the mission, faculty must provide evidence of accomplishment in teaching in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment. Faculty members must demonstrate achievement in research and scholarship consistent with their assigned duties. Faculty must also provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value, commensurate with their assigned duties. Faculty members’ FARE forms should be used to determine assigned work duties. Finally, because Florida Poly has grown quickly, the evaluation will consider efforts to build the institution that are outside the typical scope of faculty responsibilities.

The following sections set institutional expectations in the areas of Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service for faculty reappointment for another three years for the Assistant and Associate ranks.

University criteria for reappointment to a three-year term as Assistant Professor:

As noted in the collective bargaining agreement, a faculty member's demonstrated contribution to the institution is the basis for the recommendation to reappoint a faculty member. In all cases, the quality of the work done is an important factor in the reappointment decision. A faculty member's annual performance evaluation represents the outcome of a process that is not longitudinal in considering a faculty member's contribution to the institution and is therefore not sufficient to justify reappointment. The evaluation of a candidate must consider the assigned workload for the faculty member, including periods of the summer that are compensated, as the contributions to the three areas (instruction, scholarship or research, and service) are evaluated. Overall, the evaluation must consider the impact of the faculty member on the university community.

The faculty handbook notes: *"The evaluation of teaching may include coursework and curriculum development; research may include traditional publication but may also include tech transfer and tech development activities, and/or leading edge practice in industrial or business organization; service should consider effort in support of both the institution and their respective field."* For an Assistant Professor, the minimum qualifications are: *"Combination of appropriate scholarship and teaching ability commensurate with the university's mission and relevant academic discipline(s)."* The reappointment review must consider an Assistant Professor's trajectory towards promotion which must be achieved at the end of the three year appointment under consideration. For an Associate Professor the minimum qualifications are: *"a demonstrated record of scholarly activity, teaching, and, as appropriate, course and/or curriculum development commensurate with the university's mission and relevant academic discipline(s)."* The three areas (**instruction, scholarship or research, and service**) are listed below, along with a narrative that provides background on expectations for a faculty member seeking reappointment.

1. **Instruction**, including *regular classroom and laboratory teaching, laboratory / project based learning instruction, effective development/application of new instructional methods, new course development, directing thesis committees, and other instructional activities*. Each of these is discussed below after paragraphs a and b that provide a framework for consideration. **Note that it is not a criterion for reappointment to have activity in each of the areas.**
 - a. **A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission**, by delivering their assigned courses, and also by contributing to the departmental and university educational mission. Instructional effectiveness will not be judged solely by Student Assessment of Instruction results or by the "D,F,W" rate. To demonstrate instructional effectiveness, faculty at the time of reappointment must show evidence that their teaching proficiency is sufficient that they can independently deliver their courses in a manner that is consistent, meets student learning outcomes, holds high academic standards while facilitating student success and that they are effective in the classroom. Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness. Evidence of meaningful collaboration with other faculty is an important factor to consider as well as sensible syllabus construction and campus presence consistent with the expectations for a full time faculty member. For multi-section courses, a requirement is positive and appropriate collaboration with other faculty to provide a consistent and high quality instructional experience for students. New course development must show not only that the course was developed but that the course was appropriate and executed effective learning outcomes consistent with the degree(s) supported by the course. Instruction is further considered following the standards presented in sections b-h and faculty are strongly encouraged to consider these items as they prepare their reappointment dossier.

- b. **The assigned instruction credit hours** are captured by FARE forms. Factors to consider in terms of “effort” are how many times the faculty member has delivered the class, the “efficiency” of the schedule for the faculty member in terms of how many course preparations are present in a semester, the amount of support provided for the delivery by student assistants (graduate or undergraduate) or technicians.
- c. **Regular classroom and laboratory teaching** – this includes, but is not limited to, teaching ‘core’ curriculum courses to standards established by the departments (includes courses with common exams or in ‘core’ of degree program) – a minimum requirement is: Appropriately professional *cooperation with co-instructors to deliver ALL materials in the syllabus and complete delivery of the course in a satisfactory manner.* For courses that are highly coordinated, faculty must carefully adhere to the common expectations of the course. The expectation is that all assessments required for that course (not just one of multiple sections) is present. Individual sections may vary in assessment outcome due to time offered, particular students population, or hurricane delays, however, instructors must cover ‘common’ material and explain raw assessment data from their section in a narrative. In a ‘common, multiple section course’ or ‘core’ course, failure to deliver all materials in the syllabus is cause for concern. Similarly, in single section courses, assessment materials should demonstrate that course delivery supported student learning outcomes and subjects defined for delivery in the syllabus.
- d. **Laboratory / project based learning instruction** and other instructional activities. Evidence must demonstrate that the instructional activity is well planned and the learning outcomes are achieved. A minimum requirement is that instructional materials are sufficiently complete and organized so that students can use them to achieve the learning outcomes for the activity.
- e. **Effective development/application of new instructional methods.** New pedagogical interventions should be supported by the literature and aligned with a reasonable rationale that justify the exploration/adoption of such technique. The university encourages new instructional methods, but not at the expense of learning outcomes; hence experimentation with new instructional techniques must be well coordinated with a chair and care taken to deliver all course topics. If an instructor chooses to implement a new teaching technique, they must be sure the course materials /topics in the syllabus are not compromised.
- f. **New course development.** This activity ranges from development of a new course for Florida Poly to significant redesign of an existing course where the instructor develops a substantial amount of material for the delivery of the course. Creating a significant volume of high quality new courses materials with appropriate assessment methods show exemplary effort on the part of the faculty. Delivering course materials consisting primarily of the publisher’s resources is deemed satisfactory. Random inclusion of course materials not aligned with the outcomes and subject matter of the course is deemed as unsatisfactory.
- g. **Other instructional activities.** These activities typically include, but are not limited to, course coordinator delivery of courses across multiple sections, preparation of ABET materials. Course coordinators for multi-section courses (lecture/lab) have the lead role in developing course materials, maintaining Canvas shell to share course materials (lectures, assignments, rubrics, etc.) with others, conducting weekly/bi-weekly course coordination meetings, coordinating availability of supplies , and collecting formal and informal feedback for instructors (who would be fulfilling roles as described in ‘part c’ of this item.) A minimum standard is to meet with faculty regularly to create an appropriate outcome and to provide an organizational framework for success of the multi-section course. Preparation of ABET materials is similarly a significant responsibility; a minimum contribution is to provide timely delivery of materials in association with the schedule that has been agreed upon.

2. **Research or other creative activities relevant to the institutional mission**, including scholarly publications, proposal and grant activity, support and advising of graduate students.
 - a. At the Assistant Professor level, **a faculty member should demonstrate that they are pursuing a research direction that has the potential to develop an expertise in their field**, and have activity that aligns with this professional direction. Evidence presented for a three-year review must include a research plan and alignment of the faculty member's activity with the plan.
 - b. **A minimum requirement is evidence of activity that will enhance the faculty member's reputation in their field**; the faculty member's portfolio should provide evidence that their research trajectory is building their own reputation in their field. In addition, the evidence should indicate that the faculty member is on a path to promotion in three years.
 - c. **Directing thesis committees.** A successful thesis advisor should provide evidence that they have purposefully and deliberately guided the student through the process. The quality of a master's thesis may vary due to circumstances beyond an advisor's (committee chair's) control, so documentation of the process is paramount to demonstrating success by the faculty member. Simply participating as an advisor is not sufficient; the advisor should play an active role in a student's research and through their efforts help students produce a greater impact in their research. Faculty advisors are responsible for providing guidance in an advisory role to identify a viable and suitable project, that resources are available to complete the project, and to provide timely feedback during all stages of the thesis including careful feedback on the student's thesis. Participation in the graduate program, especially by being a graduate student thesis advisor is strongly encouraged (departmental clarifications should comment on the graduate program and how faculty in the department can appropriately participate in the graduate program).
 - d. **Publications and patents** must be evaluated for their quality and impact; to inform this statement, departments as a part of refining the university criteria must provide recommendations for publication venues (journals and conferences) that are considered high value for the fields represented by the department. As a part of a review, department committees are expected to provide input on the quality of the journals and/or conferences present in a faculty member's reappointment package.
 - i. Mainstream journal articles or conference presentations are easier to assess since departments have the opportunity to provide input regarding conference quality and journal quality. More specialized outlets may be appropriate depending on the faculty member's area of expertise. In all cases, faculty should be able to defend the appropriateness and quality of the venues in which they publish. ***Faculty for all publications must indicate their contribution to the publication and the types of collaboration with co-authors.*** A faculty member's presentation at conferences should build their reputation and that of the university.
 - ii. Articles that are simply the result of student work in a class, with little faculty involvement by themselves do not indicate scholarly achievement; similarly, publications in low quality conferences are appropriate stepping stones to more prestigious publications recognized by their respective professional societies but are not significant in their own right. Articles where a faculty member provided critical and ongoing guidance to students are encouraged.
 - iii. Provisional patents are difficult to assess because they are not reviewed and may or may not indicate scholarly achievement. Individuals must provide sufficient information for reviewers to assess the importance of the provisional filing and the faculty member's contribution to the work.
 - iv. Patents that have been granted represent a more significant achievement and their importance may be assessed by the "use" of the patent.
 - v. Activity with industrial partners documented by how the activity has advanced the state of the art of the partner and/or how the activity has brought value to Florida Poly.

- vi. Proposal and grant application activity should be documented in a way that shows the contribution of the faculty member to the overall grant effort. Proposals should align with the department and/or institution research directions and be submitted according to standard and appropriate procedures. Collaborations both within Florida Poly and external to the university are strongly encouraged. **While there is no minimum standard for grant activity, no grant activity over a multi-year period is likely cause for concern.** Internally and externally funded grants, contracts, and awards are required to advance research agendas, and in all disciplines funding typically provides evidence of critical peer review. If the candidate belongs to a discipline where there is no funding opportunity, evidence of critical peer review must be included in the candidate's publication record. Therefore, candidates are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of applications to appropriate external funding opportunities. Funding history, prestige of the funding source(s), strenuousness of the peer review, oversubscription rate of the funding opportunity, size of the award, and impact on the productivity and quality of scholarship will be considered in the evaluation. On grants where multiple authors contribute, the candidate must provide an explanation of their technical contribution to the effort.
3. **Service to professional societies and contributions to the University and department.**
 - a. While there is no minimum standard, **no service activity of significance overall for a multi-year period is strong cause for concern.**
 - b. At the assistant professor level, service expectations are that a faculty member is contributing to their department and profession in a positive way.
 - c. Simply being a member of a committee is not an indication of service contribution; a faculty member must provide evidence of how their effort provided value to the university. The service contribution must be appropriate to the co- or extra-curricular activity that the faculty member is an active advisor or participant.
 - d. Service to one's professional society should start to be present at the three-year review level. For all faculty, using professional society service to build one's own reputation can be effective.
 4. **Overall recommendation**
 - a. Because Florida Poly has grown quickly and the demands placed upon faculty have included effort to build the institution, consideration of this effort is appropriate. Such consideration should be based on demonstrable evidence of contribution to advance teaching, research, or other significant institutional effort as it impacts time taken away from other areas. It is incumbent on the faculty member under review to provide a clear and honest presentation of the nature and impact of their contribution and how it is impactful for the institution. The overall evaluation of a faculty member must consider the long-term impact of a faculty member's efforts on the health of the institution and review committees must exercise judgement regarding this impact. In addition, consideration of the evidence provided in an individual's application should carefully consider the effect of the course load assigned to the faculty member, resource availability, faculty rank, and any other assigned university duties, when comparing faculty achievement for Florida Poly faculty to those at other institutions.
 - b. Noting the statement above, individuals **must provide evidence of proficiency and accomplishment in teaching** in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment. Similarly, a faculty member **must provide a measure of effort and achievement in research** consistent with their assigned duties. Finally, the dossier must provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value to the university community.
 - c. Review committees must work carefully and confidentially, as they consider the reviews for faculty members and the committees must set aside personal relationships and consider the accomplishments of the faculty member being reviewed.

University criteria for reappointment to a three year term as Associate Professor:

A “shortened” review is required for appointment renewal of Associate Professors with an appointment that is less than six years in length.

As noted in the collective bargaining agreement, a faculty member’s demonstrated contribution to the institution is the basis for the recommendation to reappoint a faculty member. In all cases, the quality of the work done is an important factor in the reappointment decision. A faculty member’s annual performance evaluation represents the outcome of a process that is not longitudinal in considering a faculty member’s contribution to the institution and is therefore not sufficient to justify reappointment. The evaluation of a candidate must consider the assigned workload for the faculty member, including periods of the summer that are compensated, as the contributions to the three areas (instruction, scholarship or research, and service) are evaluated. Overall, the evaluation must consider the impact of the faculty member on the campus.

The faculty handbook notes: *“The evaluation of teaching may include coursework and curriculum development; research may include traditional publication but may also include tech transfer and tech development activities, and/or leading edge practice in industrial or business organization; service should consider effort in support of both the institution and their respective field.”* For an Associate Professor the minimum qualifications are: *“a **demonstrated** record of scholarly activity, teaching, and, as appropriate, course and/or curriculum development commensurate with the university’s mission and relevant academic discipline(s).”* The three areas (**instruction, scholarship or research, and service**) are listed below, along with a narrative that provides background on expectations for a faculty member seeking reappointment.

1. **Instruction**, including *regular classroom and laboratory teaching, laboratory / project based learning instruction, effective development/application of new instructional methods, new course development, directing thesis committees, and other instructional activities*. Each of these is discussed below followed by paragraphs a and b that provide a framework for consideration. **Note that it is not a criterion for reappointment to have activity in each of the areas.**
 - a. **A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission**, not only by delivering their assigned courses, but also by providing evidence that their contribution is greater than simple delivery of assigned courses. Instructional effectiveness will not be judged solely by Student Assessment of Instruction results or by the “D,F,W” rate. To demonstrate instructional effectiveness, faculty at the time of reappointment must show evidence that their teaching proficiency is sufficient that they can independently deliver their courses in a manner that is consistent, meets student learning outcomes, holds high academic standards while facilitating student success and that they are effective in the classroom. Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness. Evidence of meaningful collaboration with other faculty is an important factor to consider as well as sensible syllabus construction and campus presence consistent with the expectations for a full time faculty member. For multi-section courses, a requirement is positive and appropriate collaboration with other faculty to provide a consistent and high quality instructional experience for students. New course development must show not only that the course was developed but that the course was appropriate and executed effective learning outcomes consistent with the degree(s) supported by the course. Instruction is further considered following the standards presented in sections b-h and faculty are strongly encouraged to consider these items as they prepare their reappointment dossier.

- b. **The assigned instruction credit hours** are captured by FARE forms. Factors to consider in terms of “effort” are how many times the faculty member has delivered the class, the “efficiency” of the schedule for the faculty member in terms of how many course preparations are present in a semester, the amount of support provided for the delivery by student assistants (graduate or undergraduate) or technicians.
- c. **Regular classroom and laboratory teaching** – this includes, but is not limited to, teaching ‘core’ curriculum courses to standards established by the departments (includes courses with common exams or in ‘core’ of degree program) – a minimum requirement is: *Appropriately professional cooperation with co-instructors to deliver ALL materials in the syllabus and complete delivery of the course in a satisfactory manner; Associate Professors should naturally lead and must be strong team members in the delivery of multi section courses.* For courses that are highly coordinated, faculty must carefully adhere to the common expectations of the course and an Associate Professor’s experience should significantly benefit the delivery of the course. The expectation is that all assessments required for that course (not just one of multiple sections) are present. Individual sections may vary in assessment outcome due to time offered, particular students population, or hurricane delays, however, instructors must cover ‘common’ material and explain raw assessment data from their section in a narrative. In a ‘common, multiple section course’ or ‘core’ course, consistent failure to deliver all materials in the syllabus is an unacceptable result. Similarly, in single section courses, assessment materials should demonstrate that course delivery supported student learning outcomes and subjects defined for delivery in the syllabus. Associate professors are expected to operate independently and achieve high quality results.
- d. **Laboratory / project based learning instruction** and other instructional activities –Evidence must demonstrate that the instructional activity is well planned and the learning outcomes are achieved. A minimum requirement is that instructional materials are sufficiently complete and organized that students can use them to achieve the learning outcomes for the activity. Associate Professors should be capable of these types of activity with a high degree of independence.
- e. **Effective development/application of new instructional methods.** New pedagogical interventions should be supported by the literature and aligned with a reasonable rationale that justify the exploration/adoption of such technique. The university wants to encourage new instructional methods, but not at the expense of learning outcomes; hence experimentation with new instructional techniques must be well coordinated with a chair and care taken to deliver all course topics. Associate Professors should be capable of these types of activity with a high degree of independence. Note, if an instructor chooses to implement a new teaching technique, they must be sure the course materials /topics in the syllabus are not compromised.
- f. **New course development.** This activity ranges from development of a new course for Florida Poly to significant redesign of an existing course where the instructor develops a substantial amount of material for the delivery of the course. Creating a significant volume of high quality new courses materials with appropriate assessment methods show exemplary effort on the part of the faculty. Delivering course materials consisting primarily of the publisher’s resources is deemed satisfactory. Random inclusion of course materials not aligned with the outcomes and subject matter of the course is deemed as unsatisfactory. Associate Professors should be capable of these types of activity with a high degree of effectiveness and independence.
- g. **Other instructional activities.** **These activities typically include,** but are not limited to, course coordinator delivery of courses across multiple sections, preparation of ABET materials. Course coordinators for multi-section courses (lecture/lab) have the lead role in developing course materials, maintaining Canvas shell to share course materials (lectures, assignments, rubrics, etc.) with others, conducting weekly/bi-weekly course coordination meetings, coordinating availability of supplies , and

collecting formal and informal feedback for instructors (who would be fulfilling roles as described in 'part a' of this item.) A minimum standard is to meet with faculty regularly to create an appropriate outcome and to provide an organizational framework for success of the multi-section course. Preparation of ABET materials is similarly a significant responsibility; a minimum contribution is to provide timely delivery of materials in association with the schedule that has been agreed upon. An expectation for Associate Professors is that they provide appropriate leadership in course coordinator or ABET preparation roles.

2. **Research or other creative activities relevant to the institutional mission**, including scholarly publications, proposal and grant activity, support and advising of graduate students;
 - a. At the Associate Professor level, **a faculty member should provide evidence of an established and growing focused research presence** and have activity and results that aligns with this requirement.
 - b. Evidence presented for a three-year review must include a research plan and alignment of the faculty member's activity and accomplishments with the plan. When a faculty member applies for reappointment as an Associate Professor, they should provide evidence of activity and results consistent with building a reputation in their field. Associate Professor's must provide evidence that this activity has been established.
 - c. **Directing thesis committees.** A successful thesis advisor should provide evidence that they have purposefully and deliberately guided the student through the process. The quality of a master's thesis may vary due to circumstances beyond an advisor's (committee chair's) control, so documentation of the process is paramount. Simply participating as an advisor is not sufficient; the advisor should play an active role in a student's research and through their efforts help students produce a greater impact in their research. Faculty advisors are responsible for providing guidance in an advisory role to identify a viable and suitable project, that resources are available to complete the project, and to provide timely feedback during all stages of the thesis including careful feedback on the student's thesis. Participation in the graduate program, especially by being a graduate student thesis advisor is strongly encouraged (departmental clarifications should comment on the graduate program and how faculty in the department can appropriately participate in the graduate program). Associate Professors should be capable of these types of activity with a high degree of independence
 - e. **Publications and patents** must be evaluated for their quality and impact; to inform this statement, departments as a part of refining the university criteria must provide recommendations for publication venues (journals and conferences) that are considered high value for the fields represented by the department. As a part of a review, department committees are expected to provide input on the quality of the journals and/or conferences present in a faculty member's reappointment package. Articles where a faculty member provided critical and ongoing guidance to students are encouraged. An Associate Professor should contribute to research in a unique way where the value that they bring to individual or collaborative projects is easily identified.
 - i. Mainstream journal articles or conference presentations are easier to assess since departments have the opportunity to provide input regarding conference quality and journal quality. More specialized outlets may be appropriate depending on the faculty member's area of expertise. In all cases, faculty should be able to defend the appropriateness and quality of the venues in which they publish. Faculty for all publications must indicate their contribution to the publication and the types of collaborations with co-authors. A faculty member's presentation at conferences should build their reputation and that of the university.
 - ii. Articles that are simply the result of student work in a class, with little faculty involvement by themselves do not indicate scholarly achievement; similarly, publications in low quality local conferences are appropriate stepping stones to more prestigious publications recognized by their respective professional societies but are not significant in their own right.

- iii. Provisional patents are difficult to assess because they are not reviewed and may or may not indicate scholarly achievement. Individuals must provide sufficient information for reviewers to assess the importance of the provisional filing and the faculty member's contribution to the work.
- iv. Patents that have been granted represent a more significant achievement and their importance may be assessed by the "use" of the patent.
- v. Activity with industrial partners documented by how the activity has advanced the state of the art of the partner and/or how the activity has brought value to Florida Poly.
- vi. Proposal and grant application activity should be documented in a way that shows the contribution of the faculty member to the overall grant effort. Proposals should align with the department and/or institution research directions and be submitted according to standard and appropriate procedures. Collaborations both within Florida Poly and external to the university are strongly encouraged. **While there is no minimum standard for grant activity, no grant activity over a multi-year period is likely cause for concern.** Internally and externally funded grants, contracts, and awards are required to advance research agendas, and in all disciplines funding typically provides evidence of critical peer review. If the candidate belongs to a discipline where there is no funding opportunity, evidence of critical peer review must be included in the candidate's publication record. Therefore, candidates are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of applications to appropriate external funding opportunities. Funding history, prestige of the funding source(s), strenuousness of the peer review, oversubscription rate of the funding opportunity, size of the award, and impact on the productivity and quality of scholarship will be considered in the evaluation. On grants where multiple authors contribute, the candidate must provide an explanation of their technical contribution to the effort. Associate professors should provide leadership on some grant activity.

3. Service to external professional societies and contributions to the University and department.

- a. While there is no minimum standard, **no service activity of significance overall for a multi-year period is strong cause for concern.**
- b. At the associate professor level, service expectations are that a faculty member is contributing to their department and profession in a positive way and, where appropriate, takes a leadership role.
- c. Simply being a member of a committee is not an indication of service contribution; a faculty member must provide evidence of how their effort provided value to the university. The service contribution must be appropriate to the co- or extra-curricular activity that the faculty member is an active advisor or participant.
- d. Service to one's professional society should be easily identified for Associate Professors. For all faculty, using professional society service to build one's own reputation can be effective.

4. Overall recommendation

- a. Because Florida Poly has grown quickly and the demands placed upon faculty have included effort to build the institution, consideration of this effort is appropriate. Such consideration should be based on demonstrable evidence of contribution to advance teaching, research, or other significant institutional effort as it impacts time taken away from other areas. It is incumbent on the faculty member under review to provide a clear and honest presentation of the nature and impact of their contribution and how it is impactful for the institution. The overall evaluation of a faculty member must consider the long term impact of a faculty member's efforts on the health of the institution and review committees must exercise judgement regarding this impact. In addition, consideration of the evidence provided in an individual's application should carefully consider the effect of the course load assigned to the faculty member, resource availability, faculty rank, and any other assigned university duties, when comparing faculty achievement for Florida Poly faculty to those at other institutions. **At the Associate Professor**

level, the expectation is that the faculty member is a strong contributor to the university and can perform their duties with a high degree of independence and quality.

- b. Noting the statement above, individuals **must provide evidence of accomplishment in teaching in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment.** Similarly, a faculty member must provide a **measure of achievement in research that demonstrates reputation in their field consistent with their assigned duties.** Finally, the dossier must provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value to the university community.
- c. Review committees must work carefully and confidentially, as they consider the reviews for faculty members and the committees must set aside personal relationships and consider the accomplishments of the faculty member being reviewed.



January 26, 2020

To: AHSS Committee for Departmental Clarifications of University Reappointment and Promotion Criteria (Dvorske, Hickman, Luck, Bruce)

From: Terry Parker, Provost

Re: AHSS Reappointment and Promotion Clarifications.

I have received the clarifications from your committee and this memo formalizes my acceptance of these clarifications. Within this acceptance, I would like to note three elements of concern. These are:

- 1) The preamble appropriately describes the unique role of AHSS but in some cases “strays” into elements that are university based (for instance teaching load concerns). My sense is that the department is better served with a preamble that focuses on elements unique to the department. In addition, the preamble can be read as a statement that multi-year efforts are unique to AHSS (which they are not) and that difficulties in identifying the quality of journals are unique to AHSS (again this is a problem in many fields). The notation on difficulties with impact factor alone being a determining factor is valid. When clarifications are developed next year, I strongly suggest that the preamble be reconsidered by the department.
- 2) The overall recommendation section restates what is present in the university criteria. As a point of emphasis, the department clarifications are to be used as “clarifications” to the university criteria. Hence, duplication of material that is present in the criteria is not necessary. When clarifications are developed next year, I strongly suggest that the overall recommendation section not duplicate items that are present in the university criteria.
- 3) The clarifications include, as part of “primary factors” under the heading of “instruction”, peer teaching evaluations. This is problematic since we do not have an institutionally accepted or validated methodology for peer teaching evaluation. I caution the department that using an “unspecified” peer teaching evaluation as part of the reappointment or promotion process creates difficulty because it has neither been broadly discussed or accepted. If the department wants to include peer teaching evaluations, it will need to work with the administration to develop this methodology.

I have reviewed these clarifications carefully to ensure that the clarifications offered are indeed “clarifications” of the criteria set by the university. Within the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), section 6.5(b) defines the clarifications.

Section 6.5(b)

“Department Clarifications of University Criteria. The department clarifications shall flexibly define department criteria based upon the broader University criteria and:

- 1. Be consistent with university requirements and faculty duty assignments;*
- 2. Be detailed enough that a reasonable professor should be informed about the performance or accomplishment expectations necessary to earn reappointment or promotion, assuming that the accomplishments are of sufficient quality, quantity, and consistency; and*



FLORIDA POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY

3. Identify some representative examples of the achievements or performance characteristics which, if the requirement or distinction were met, are appropriate comparisons for reappointment or promotion.”

To ensure that the clarifications for all departments are used in a manner that consistent with the contract, i.e. as clarifications to university criteria, I will add the following Header at the start of each department's clarification document:

University criteria set an overall set of guidelines for all faculty at Florida Poly for reappointment and promotion.

Department clarifications are used to “define department criteria based upon the broader University criteria.”

Reappointment and/or promotion consideration must therefore rely on both documents, noting that department clarifications must be “consistent with university requirements,” where the requirements are laid out in the university criteria.

Thank you for the effort in putting together the departmental clarifications.



TO: Dr. Terry Parker, Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR: Dr. Tom Dvorske, Vice Provost Academic Affairs

DT: January 10, 2020

RE: Department Clarifications to University Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

This memo formally transmits the results of the Department's vote on its clarifications to University Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion for 2019-2020.

Department of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences: Approved: 4 – 0.

Approved Clarifications are included below.

Cc:
Drs. Hickman, Lenz, Bruce

Addendum, Jan 31, 2020

University criteria set an overall set of guidelines for all faculty at Florida Poly for reappointment and promotion.

Department clarifications are used to “define department criteria based upon the broader University criteria.”

Reappointment and/or promotion consideration must therefore rely on both documents, noting that department clarifications must be “consistent with university requirements,” where the requirements are laid out in the university criteria.

(See CBA 6.5(b))

Clarifications to University Criteria for
Reappointment & Promotion – All Ranks, Proposed for Spring Semester 2020
Draft Date(s): 12/13/2019, 1/6/2020

Committee Members

Committee Chair	Tom Dvorske
Department Chair/Division Director	Nicoleta Hickman
Department Faculty, or Chair	Wylie Lenz
Department Faculty	Amanda Bruce

Clarifications for Reappointment for Assistant Professor

The following guidelines identify those elements that will be considered with regard to teaching, scholarship, and service during the reappointment review process; these elements are further categorized as being of primary or secondary significance. These guidelines are intended to serve as a general overview of the types of activity a faculty member should prioritize; however, in the case of any particular faculty member, reappointment does not depend on demonstrated activity with respect to all elements. Consideration of the evidence provided in an individual’s application for reappointment should account for the effect of the course load assigned to the faculty member (including the number of different and new courses assigned), faculty rank, and any other assigned university duties; for example, in evaluation of a faculty member with a heavy teaching load, teaching should be given proportionally greater consideration. Faculty members’ FARE forms should be used to determine a faculty member’s assigned work duties. Department guidelines are reviewed annually. Consideration should be given to the mix of factors and the quality exhibited with respect to each as the judgment at reappointment, in part, is a measure on the candidate’s capacity to build a successful case for promotion in the time remaining.

It is important to situate the Department’s instructional within the larger mission of the University. The courses taught in Florida Poly’s Department of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, empower our students with a deep understanding of the human complexities—cultural, historical, and economic. Our students learn both processes and collaborative skills in writing, communication, and developing ideas using creative and critical thinking and have the opportunity to pursue wide-ranging interests in the arts, social sciences, and the humanities, both on and off campus. However, AHSS is not a degree granting department, so it necessarily has a restricted teaching mission at a 100% STEM institution, serving primarily to deliver lower division core general education courses for STEM majors.

As well, it is important to recognize essential distinctions between humanities research and STEM research. Scholarship in AHSS disciplines tends to emphasize single-author articles and monographs that typically developed via multi-year projects. Moreover, there are far more high-quality venues for publication in these disciplines than in STEM, such that relative ranking of such venues becomes difficult, if not impossible. Most mechanisms for strictly numerical or quantitative ranking of academic journals are applicable to science and engineering publication, whereas “Statistical information about which humanities journals are considered better than other journals is not easy to find and is not especially trustworthy,” according to Princeton University’s guide to journal rankings. (For example, no journal in history or literature has a “high impact factor” compared to engineering journals. Compare the impact factor of a well-regarded mechanical engineering journal [e.g.,

Advanced Materials, SJR=10.108] to that of the more prestigious journals in American history [*American Historical Review*, SJR=0.768] or general literary studies [*South Atlantic Review*, SJR=0.789]; moreover, contributors even to these journals are rarely faculty from regional 100% STEM institutions with extremely limited research tools in these fields.) Also, large external grants play a limited role in the research agenda of a humanities/social sciences faculty member.

1. Instruction

a. Contribution to Instructional Mission

• Primary Factors

- Evidence of clear, coherent course delivery; relevant documentation includes course syllabi and samples of instructional materials, such as assignment instructions, tests, lecture notes, Canvas materials, and so on.
- Student evaluation of instruction, with an emphasis on thoughtful reflection of strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement. Particularly notable is how identified issues are addressed over time.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Sufficient breadth and depth of knowledge to offer the scope of curriculum and expand in areas of needs, demand, and opportunity

b. Assigned Instruction Credit Hours (Effort)

c. Regular Classroom and Laboratory Teaching (includes Coordination)

• Primary Factors

- Evidence of meaningful contribution to student learning outcome assessment and evidence of its impact on student learning.
- For multi-section courses, evidence of collaboration with course coordinators and other faculty to deliver all topics identified in the syllabus and complete delivery of the course so as to support all student learning outcomes
 - Common Course coordinator: manages canvas course shell; should set agenda for term meeting (including biweekly meetings), timelines for completion of instructional and exam materials, assignments to other instructors as appropriate to rank/role (i.e., adjunct, assistant, associate, full) taking care not to assign all work to other instructors, but taking primary responsibility for course content and appropriately calibrated work distribution;
 - Common Course contributor: strives to attend all meetings, abides by agreed upon elements of course, completes work assignments in a timely fashion in order to share with group for feedback and decisions; work delivered is useable in the course; delivers test and test prep in accordance with common sections ensuring no section attains an advantage over another.
 - Whether coordinator or contributor, all faculty demonstrate availability and alignment on delivery of content, exams, standards, and grading as appropriate

d. ~~Laboratory~~/Project-Based Learning/Instructional Activities (Planning)

e. Development/Application of New Methods

• Primary Factors

- Evidence of innovative teaching methods and active learning methods, and evidence of such methods' impact on student learning

- Rationale for materials selected and used and explanation of how these materials contribute to student learning outcomes

f. **New Course Development**

- **Primary Factors**

- Course, program, seminar and colloquia series development
 - Development of new or interdisciplinary degrees or certificate programs
 - Generate an entire curriculum, plan course syllabi, and produce teaching materials
 - Development of knowledge to cover an area of instruction that the individual is not currently prepared to teach and for which the department needs new expertise
 - Leadership in improving current offerings and in establishing new directions for the department's instructional programs

g. **Other Instructional Activities**

- **Primary Factors**

- Academic Advising
 - Serving as faculty advisor to student professional clubs, groups, and honor societies
 - Adherence to department's academic standards for advising
 - Mentoring students who are preparing for academic competitions
 - Availability of faculty member to students
- Proposal development to support teaching—to be considered:
 - Relevance of proposals to department's teaching goals
 - Funding agency reviews
 - Peer reviews of proposal's pedagogic merit

- **Secondary Factors**

- Instructional activities in support of the outside departments
 - Development of interdisciplinary and non-major instruction and programs
 - Development and/or delivery of workshops to industry, government, schools, and universities
 - Undergraduate student educational assistant supervision and other forms of advising and mentoring
- Conferences and workshops
 - Attendance at conferences, courses, workshops and seminars with themes relevant to the teaching mission of department
- Teaching contribution prizes and awards by professional, university, and civic organizations

2. Research & Scholarship

a. Pursuing a direction with potential for developing expertise

b. Evidence of activity that will enhance reputation in field

~~c. Directing Thesis Committees~~

d. Publications and Patents

i. Articles, Conferences

- **Primary Factors**

- Authorship of refereed books, articles, book contributions; it is incumbent on the candidate to define significance of journal and/or publisher with respect to his/her field of expertise
 - Publication of articles in high quality academic journals
 - Publication of peer-reviewed monographs

- Publication of edited collections
 - Publication in high standards proceedings
 - Publication of book chapters that deal with advanced topics in the field
 - Publication of textbooks in discipline
 - Evidence of significant progress on a multi-year project (e.g., book manuscript)
 - Editing of academic journals
- Research presentation
 - Invited talks
- Other scholarly and creative activity
 - Publication of encyclopedia articles
 - Publication of review articles and reviews in academic journals
 - Publication of creative work (e.g., fiction, poetry, narrative essays)
 - Publication of non-fiction non-peer-reviewed books
 - Editorships, assistant editorships, and advisory positions on the boards of nationally distributed journals.
- Secondary Factors
 - Authorship of unrefereed work; the candidate is responsible for providing appropriate descriptive and evaluative documentation pertaining to the publication outlets
 - Publication of articles and papers in unrefereed journals and proceedings
 - Publication of review articles and reviews in newspapers, magazines, and unrefereed journals
 - Presentation of unpublished research papers and posters at conferences and colloquia series
 - Readings or performances of creative work
 - Contribution to cross-disciplinary and/or community-engaged scholarship, such as reports, presentations, museum exhibits, films, public events, and websites
 - Other research activity; the candidate is responsible for providing appropriate descriptive and evaluative documentation
 - Participating in and directing innovative research programs that cross department and discipline lines
 - Using expertise in the research field to support the research activities of other departments
 - Active participation in professional organizations and conferences as related to scholarship and creative work
 - Consulting on professional matters related to scholarly expertise
 - Scholarly and creative work in electronic media
 - Contribution to databases as related to scholarship
 - Blogs as related to scholarship
 - Patents and copyrights
 - Reviews, citations, reprints, and translations of one's own work
 - Recognitions
 - Research contribution prizes and awards by professional, university and national organizations

- ii. Student collaborations
- iii. ~~Provisional Patents~~
- iv. ~~Use of Patent~~
- v. ~~Industrial Partner Activity~~
- vi. Proposal/Grant Activity
 - Primary Factors
 - Grants and fellowships received in support of scholarship and other creative activity
 - Funding agency reviews and other peer reviews of proposal's research merit
 - Competitiveness of funding agency

3. Service

- a. Service activity
- b. Departmental service
 - Primary Factors
 - Service to Department
 - Mentoring GTAs, adjuncts, visiting professors, and/or junior faculty in teaching, research, and service
 - Leadership and contributions in departmental committees
 - Development of knowledge to cover an area of instruction in which the department lacks expertise, and in which it wishes to provide instruction and research
 - Demonstrated service to the department's needs as indicated by department chair and other faculty, including department governance, registration, orientation, student recruiting, faculty recruiting, colloquia development, class scheduling, and the development of accountability and assessment reports such as those needed during the accreditation reviews.
 - Service to Division
 - Leadership and contributions in division committees
 - Demonstrated service, especially in the time-demanding assignments such as membership on personnel and search committees, and participation in advisory councils to the director's office
 - Service to University
 - Leadership and contributions in university committees
 - Demonstrated service, especially in the time-demanding assignments such as membership in the faculty representative council or equivalent, on personnel and search committees, and major steering committees such as strategic planning, policy boards and commencement exercises
 - Secondary Factors
 - Service to other disciplines and departments
 - Service on committees in other departments as a representative of the department, division or university.
 - Service on organizing committees for professional activities in other disciplines
- c. Evidence of contribution
- d. Professional society service
 - Primary Factors
 - Selection as chair or committee member for professional organizations

- Selection as chair, organizer or committee member for professional meetings
- Service as reviewer for a research journal, monograph, conference proceedings or other scholarly publications
- Refereeing contributions to journals, books, and professional conferences
- Organizing research conferences and special sessions within conferences
- Secondary Factors
 - Service to community
 - Invited speaker at civic events or industry in role as a university professor or based on academic expertise
 - Member of community group or advisory board performing an activity which is based on academic position or expertise
 - Activities in the community which have a direct benefit to the university (e.g., in student recruiting, the acquisition of gifts and grants, or public relations)
 - Service to elementary and secondary schools
 - Invited speaker at schools based on academic position or expertise
 - Performing any activity in schools which has a direct benefit to the university (e.g., in student recruiting, public relations, the improvement of pre-college instruction or the judging of science, math and other relevant fairs)
 - Professional development
 - Attendance at conferences, courses, workshops and seminars with themes applicable to the research mission of the department
 - Membership in professional organizations

4. Overall Recommendation

- a. Because Florida Poly has grown quickly and the demands placed upon faculty have included effort to build the institution, consideration of this effort is appropriate. Such consideration should be based on demonstrable evidence of contribution to advance teaching, research, or other significant institutional effort as it impacts time taken away from other areas. It is incumbent on the faculty member under review to provide a clear and honest presentation of the nature and impact of their contribution and how it is impactful for the institution. The overall evaluation of a faculty member must consider the long-term impact of a faculty member's efforts on the health of the institution and review committees must exercise judgement regarding this impact. In addition, consideration of the evidence provided in an individual's application should carefully consider the effect of the course load assigned to the faculty member, resource availability, faculty rank, and any other assigned university duties, when comparing faculty achievement for Florida Poly faculty to those at other institutions.
- b. Candidates must provide: evidence of proficiency and accomplishment in teaching; a measure of effort and achievement in research consistent with their assigned duties; and evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value to the university community.
- c. Review committees must work carefully and confidentially, as they consider the reviews for faculty members and the committees must set aside personal relationships and consider the accomplishments of the faculty member being reviewed.

Clarifications for *Promotion* to Associate Professor

Candidate applications for promotion to Associate Professor should document substantial and increasing activity in the areas of primary factors. While secondary factors may still help to round out a full picture of the candidate, they will not constitute justification for promotion.

1. Instruction

- a. Contribution to Instructional Mission
- b. Assigned Instruction Credit Hours (Effort)
- c. Regular Classroom and ~~Laboratory~~ Teaching (includes Coordination)
- d. ~~Laboratory~~/Project-Based Learning/Instructional Activities (Well-planned)
- e. Development/Application of New Methods
- f. New Course Development
- g. Other Instructional Activities

2. Research & Scholarship

- a. Pursuing a direction with potential for developing expertise
- b. Evidence of activity that will enhance reputation in field
- c. Directing Thesis Committees
- d. Publications and Patents
 - i. Articles, Conferences
 - ii. Student collaborations
 - iii. ~~Provisional Patents~~
 - iv. ~~Use of Patent~~
 - v. ~~Industrial Partner Activity~~
 - vi. Proposal/Grant Activity

3. Service

- a. Service activity
- b. Departmental service
- c. Evidence of contribution
- d. Professional society service

4. Overall Recommendation

- a. Institutional (startup) adjustment
- b. Must provide evidence of proficiency and accomplishment in teaching / measure of effort and achievement in research / evidence of involvement in service.
- c. Committee must set aside relationships and consider accomplishments.

Clarification for Reappointment for Associate Professor

Candidate applications for reappointment to Associate Professor must show continued activity in the areas of primary factors consistent with the expectations at the time of promotion, continued achievement toward departmental, division, and university goals, and appropriate leadership and self-direction befitting the rank of Associate Professor.

1. Instruction

- a. Contribution to Instructional Mission
- b. Assigned Instruction Credit Hours (Effort)
- c. Regular Classroom and Laboratory Teaching (includes Coordination)
- d. Laboratory/Project-Based Learning/Instructional Activities (Well-planned)
- e. Development/Application of New Methods
- f. New Course Development:
- g. Other Instructional Activities

2. Research & Scholarship

- a. Pursuing a direction with potential for developing expertise
- b. Evidence of activity that will enhance reputation in field
- c. Directing Thesis Committees
- d. Publications and Patents
 - i. Articles, Conferences
 - ii. Student collaborations
 - iii. Provisional Patents
 - iv. Use of Patent
 - v. Industrial Partner Activity
 - vi. Proposal/Grant Activity

3. Service

- a. Service activity
- b. Departmental service
- c. Evidence of contribution
- d. Professional society service

4. Overall Recommendation

- a. Institutional (startup) adjustment
- b. Must provide evidence of proficiency and accomplishment in teaching / measure of effort and achievement in research / evidence of involvement in service.
- c. Committee must set aside relationships and consider accomplishments.

Clarifications for Promotion to Full Professor

Clarifications Reappointment for Full Professor