University criteria for ***reappointment*** of Instructor and Senior Instructors

Academic Year 2024-25, 2025-26

Table of Contents

Preamble and Context for the Criteria

Florida Polytechnic University relies on the faculty to execute the core mission and a high-functioning faculty is necessary to insure the long-term health of the institution. Standards for faculty achievement in the reappointment and promotion process are expressed in the University Criteria and these standards underpin the "high-functioning faculty" that is necessary to achieve our mission which is: "*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 and promotion process. University wide criteria for faculty promotion are specified by this document. Each academic department will apply the criteria in their promotion process and each academic department will develop clarifications to the criteria. The purpose of the departmental clarifications is to provide departments with the opportunity to comment on how faculty in the academic disciplines within a department can demonstrate the academic excellence that is required by the University Criteria. The clarifications do not replace the University Criteria, the Clarifications help the interpretation of the university Criteria at the departmental level. Both the University Criteria and the Department Clarifications focus on how faculty demonstrate that they have, and will continue to, serve the University's mission.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA, section 6.5a) notes that instructors 6.3(a)1:

(1) Instructor

a. Initial Contract duration: two (2) years.

b. Reappointment Contract duration: two (2) years.

c. Promotion Contract duration: Faculty promoted from Instructor to Senior Instructor shall receive an initial appointment contract duration of (3) years.

(2) Senior Instructor

a. Initial contract duration: three (3) years.

b. Reappointment contract duration: three (3) years.

Criteria for reappointment for Instructor and Senior Instructor are organized to evaluate a faculty member based on their evidence of achievement in Instruction and Service.

The overall evaluation of a candidate for reappointment as an Instructor or Senior Instructor must consider the long-term impact that a faculty member has, and is expected to have, on the institution and its mission. The overall evaluation of a candidate for reappointment must consider a faculty member's efforts that contribute to the institution and determine if the individual faculty member is effective in executing the University mission. Finally, it is imperative that the contribution and effectiveness of the faculty member, both positive and negative, is fully considered. These factors are used to provide a recommendation on a continued and long-term employment obligation offered to the faculty member by the University. In all cases, the quality and quantity of the work done is an important factor in the promotion decision.

A faculty member's set of annual performance evaluations represents the outcome of an annual process primarily performed by a single individual with a focus on a single year performance period. These reviews therefore are neither determinative nor sufficient to justify (or deny) promotion. 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 two areas (instruction and service) are evaluated. Overall, the evaluation must consider the impact that the faculty member has on the university mission and community.

- 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 must also provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value, commensurate with their assigned duties. An emerging area to consider is how a faculty member supports students beyond the classroom at Florida Poly.

The following sections set institutional expectations in the areas of Teaching, and Service for faculty reappointment for another two years for the Instructor Rank and three years for the Senior Instructor Rank.

University criteria for reappointment to a two-year term as Instructor

For an Instructor, the minimum qualifications are: "Demonstrated ability to perform his or her assigned duties." Reappointment must consider the candidates record of accomplishment in two areas (**instruction and service**). These areas are listed below, along with a narrative that provides background on expectations for a faculty member seeking reappointment.

1.0 Instruction

Core Criterion: A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission and must shows signs of excellence in teaching or progression toward excellence in teaching.

Instruction Includes 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 in the listing provided below.

1.1 Criterion Minimum Requirements. The faculty member is contributing positively to the overall instructional mission of the institution as evidenced by the materials in their dossier.[1] For an instructor, there must be strong evidence of excellence in the teaching function. Key elements to be considered are instructional delivery, cooperative instructional participation in multi-section courses, leadership as appropriate in multi-section courses, instructional material development, and in most cases course development. the applicant must provide evidence of delivery of an appropriate section of the curriculum aligned with their department's needs and as appropriate evidence of both collaboration and leadership in the delivery of multi-section courses .

1.2 Overall Criterion Considerations & Requirements

1.2 (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. 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, delivers the set of subjects that comprise the student learning outcomes, holds high academic standards while facilitating student success and that they are effective in the classroom. Evidence of meaningful collaboration with other faculty is a requirement,[2] sensible syllabus construction is a requirement (including thoughtful assessment planning that appropriately measures student individual performance), and campus presence consistent with the expectations for a full-time faculty member is a requirement. 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 based upon the list provided below and

[1] Committees must consider the departmental context as they evaluate this criterion.

[2] Evidence can be participation in an active manner in departmental matters, collaboration in course delivery, participation in institutional matters, participation in joint proposals, etc.

faculty are strongly encouraged to consider these items, consistent with their work-assignment, as they prepare their reappointment dossier.

1.2 (B) Instructional effectiveness will not be judged solely by Student Assessment of Instruction results or by the "D, F, W" rate.

1.2 (C) Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient on their own (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness.

1.3 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.

1.4 Factors to consider in terms of "quality" of instruction include, but are not limited to, adhering 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.*

1.5 Further Criterion Considerations

Note that it is not a criterion for reappointment to have activity in each of the areas.

1.5 (A) Coordinated Courses: For courses that are highly coordinated, a requirement is that faculty carefully adhere to the common expectations of the course set by either the department chair or course coordinator. For faculty with the rank Instructor, faculty must appropriately execute the duties assigned to them for the course (including leadership for the course if assigned). In a 'common, multiple section course' or 'core' course, failure to deliver all materials in the syllabus is cause for concern.

1.5 (B) Repeated Delivery. For repeated deliveries, faculty should present evidence that the course is effective and where possible that the effectiveness of their instruction is improving.

1.5 (C) 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. . For coordinated courses, non-course coordinators must do their part to deliver a sufficiently complete and organized course.

1.5 (D) Effective development/application of new instructional methods that have the potential to enhance the learning outcomes. 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.

1.5 (E) 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 course materials with appropriate assessment methods demonstrates the maturity of the faculty member. However, delivering course materials consisting primarily of the publisher's resources indicates only that the faculty member can find the resources and deliver them. Further, a new course based on random inclusion of course materials not aligned with the outcomes and subject matter of the course

indicates that the faculty is not sufficiently mature**. New course development is not a requirement for reappointment.**

1.5 (F) 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.

2.0 Research N/A

3.0 Service

Core Criterion: At the Instructor level, service expectations are that a faculty member is contributing to their department and profession in a positive way.

"Service" includes supporting activities for professional societies and contributions to the University and department.

3.1 A minimum requirement is that the faculty member, consistent with their duty assignments, contributes positively to the department and the institution.

3.2 Further Criterion Considerations

3.2 (A) While there is no minimum standard, no service activity of significance overall for a multi-year period is strong cause for concern.

3.2 (B) 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.

3.2 (C) Instructor's should build a portfolio of service, appropriate to their role, that supports the department and the institution.

4.0 Overall recommendation

Core Criterion: The faculty member's overall effort demonstrates capacity for long-term, positive impact and contribution to the health of the campus and to advancing the mission of University, the department, and its programs.

4.1 Overall Criterion Considerations. Florida Poly is growing quickly and the demands placed upon faculty may include effort to build the institution. Consideration of this effort is necessary and appropriate. Such consideration should be based on the "non-traditional effort" that advances the institution and how this effort has impacted time availability for more traditional teaching, or service. 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.

4.2 Further Criterion Considerations

4.2 (A) Noting the statement above, individuals must provide evidence of proficiency, independence, collaboration, where appropriate leadership, and accomplishment in teaching in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment.

4.2 (B) The dossier must provide evidence of involvement in the university community with service or other activities that add value to the university community.

4.2 (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 Senior Instructor

Reappointment review focuses on the two areas (**instruction and service**) listed below. This listing includes a narrative that provides background on expectations for a faculty member seeking reappointment as Senior Instructor. Faculty at the Senior Instructor level should provide evidence of maturity and proficiency in instruction. In addition, the Senior Instructor should demonstrate significant leadership and contribution to the teaching mission for their department, and service that provides impact to the institution.

1.0 Instruction

Core Criterion: Senior Instructor must show proficiency and maturity in instruction by clearly contributing to the instructional mission, delivering their assigned courses, and by contributing to the departmental and university educational mission. A Senior Instructor is expected to be an expert in certain areas of the curriculum and to lead a portion of the curriculum for the department.

Instruction includes 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 in the listing provided below.

1.1 Criterion Minimum Requirements. The Faculty member is contributing positively to the overall instructional mission of the institution as evidenced by the materials in their dossier.[3] .[4] For a senior instructor, there must be demonstrated evidence of excellence in the teaching function. Key elements to be considered are instructional delivery, cooperative instructional participation in multi-section courses, leadership as appropriate in multi-section courses, instructional material development, and in most cases course development. The applicant must demonstrate ongoing delivery and development of an appropriate section of the curriculum aligned with their department's needs and as appropriate evidence of both collaboration and leadership in the delivery of multi-section courses .

1.2 Overall Criterion Considerations & Requirements

1.2(A) A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission. 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. Evidence of meaningful collaboration with other faculty is requirement,[5] sensible syllabus construction is a requirement (including thoughtful assessment planning that appropriately measures student individual performance), and campus presence consistent with the expectations for a full-time faculty member is a requirement. For

[3] Committees must consider the departmental context as they evaluate this criterion.
[4] Committees must consider the departmental context as they evaluate this criterion.
[5] Evidence can be participation in an active manner in departmental matters, collaboration in course delivery, participation in institutional matters, participation in joint proposals, etc.

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 based upon the list provided below and faculty are strongly encouraged to consider these items, consistent with their work-assignment, as they prepare their reappointment dossier.

1.2 (B) Instructional effectiveness will not be judged solely by Student Assessment of Instruction results or by the "D, F, W" rate.

1.2 (C) Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient on their own (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness.

1.3 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.

1.4 Factors to consider in terms of "quality" of instruction include, but is not limited to, adhering 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.*

1.5 Further Criterion Considerations

1.5 (A) Coordinated Courses. , a requirement is that faculty carefully adhere to the common expectations of the course set by either the department chair or course coordinator. For faculty to achieve the rank Senior Instructor, faculty must naturally execute the duties assigned to them for the course (including leadership for the course if assigned). In a 'common, multiple section course' or 'core' course, failure to deliver all materials in the syllabus is cause for concern.

1.5 (B) Similarly, in single section courses, assessment materials should demonstrate that course delivery supported student learning outcomes and subjects defined for delivery in the syllabus.

1.5 (C) Repeated Delivery. For repeated deliveries, faculty should present evidence that the course is effective and where possible that the effectiveness of their instruction is improving.

1.5 (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.

1.5 (E) Effective development/application of new instructional methods that have the potential to enhance the learning outcomes.. 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.

1.5 (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 demonstrates the maturity of the faculty member. Delivering course materials consisting primarily of the publisher's resources indicates only that the faculty member can find the resources and deliver them. Random inclusion of course materials not aligned with the outcomes and subject matter of the course indicates that the faculty is not sufficiently mature**. New course development is not a requirement for reappointment.**

1.5 (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.

2.0 Research N/A

3.0 Service

Core Criterion: At the Senior Instructor level, service expectations are that a faculty member is contributing to their department and profession in a positive way and, where appropriate, taking a leadership role.

"Service" includes supporting activities to professional societies and contributions to the University and department.

3.1 A minimum requirement is that the faculty member, consistent with their duty assignments, contributes positively to the department and the institution.

3.2 Criterion Considerations

3.2 (A) While there is no minimum standard, **no service activity of significance overall for a multi-year period is strong cause for concern**.

3.2 (B) 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.

3.2 (C) Senior Instructor's should build a portfolio of service, appropriate to their role, that supports the department and the institution. The Senior instructor is expected to play a strong service role for the department, and where appropriate, the institution.

4.0 Overall Recommendation

Core Criterion: The Senior Instructor demonstrates strong, ongoing contribution to the University and performs their full suite of duties with a high degree of quality and independence, demonstrating accomplishment in teaching, leadership in the curriculum, and service that positively advances the University, department, and program.

4.1 Criterion Consideration. Florida Poly is growing quickly and the demands placed upon faculty may include effort to build the institution. Consideration of this effort is necessary and appropriate. Such consideration should be based on the "non-traditional effort" that advances the institution and how this effort has impacted time availability for more traditional teaching, research, or service. 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 how these efforts positively or negatively impact the institution and its mission. The review committee 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 Senior Instructor 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. As noted earlier, Senior Instructors are expected to provide leadership for the curriculum.**

4.2 Further Criterion Considerations

4.2 (A) Noting the statement above, individuals must provide evidence of demonstrated proficiency independence, collaboration, where appropriate leadership and breadth in **instructional** quality and capacity in order to warrant recommendation for reappointment.[6]

4.2 (B) Finally, the dossier must provide evidence of involvement in the university community with **service** or other activities that adds value to the university community.

4.3 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.

[6] Review Committees are cautioned to consider the candidate's department as a faculty member is considered for this standard.