



**FLORIDA POLYTECHNIC**  
UNIVERSITY

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

**Spring Semester, 2020**

**Sections:**

**Preamble**

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

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

## 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 student 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 student 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. .

- h. **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
  - 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. 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.
  - e. 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.
  - c. 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.

