

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

Fall Semester, 2020

Table of Contents

Preamble and Context for the Criteria	2
University criteria for reappointment to a three-year term as Assistant Professor	4
1.0 Instruction	4
2.0 Research or Scholarly/Creative Activities.....	6
3.0 Service	8
4.0 Overall recommendation	9
University criteria for reappointment to a three-year term as Associate Professor	10
1.0 Instruction	10
2.0 Research or other Creative/Scholarly Activities.....	13
3.0 Service	15
4.0 Overall Recommendation.....	16

Preamble and Context for the Criteria

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 is 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. University-wide criteria for faculty reappointment that provide new three-year contracts to faculty members are specified by this document. Each academic department will apply the criteria in their reappointment 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 Departmental 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 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 “how” a faculty member’s efforts contribute to the institution and “how” the individual faculty member is effective in executing the University mission. This evaluation considers the contribution and effectiveness of the faculty member, both positive and negative, and provides a recommendation on a continued and long-term employment obligation on the part of the University.

- 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. An emerging area to consider is how a faculty member supports students beyond the classroom at Florida Poly.

Faculty members' FARE forms should be used to determine assigned work duties. Finally, because Florida Poly has evolved quickly, the reappointment evaluation must consider how the faculty member has participated in building the institution; in some instances, this will involve activity that is outside the typical scope of faculty responsibilities.

As noted in the collective bargaining agreement, a faculty member's demonstrated overall contribution to the institution, consistent with their rank, 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."*

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

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. 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.

1.0 Instruction

Core Criterion: A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission.

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

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.

1.2 The “Instructional Dashboard” is provided by Institutional Research for a dossier. This includes “measures” of faculty performance including courses delivered, SAI results, an appendix of student comments, and DFW rates. These measures should provide indications of faculty contribution which can be used, with appropriate judgement applied by all parts of the process, in the evaluation of a faculty member. Faculty members should review this material for accuracy.

1.3 Overall Criterion Considerations & Requirements

1.3 (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, 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 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 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.

Two important Notes:

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

1.3 (C) Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness.

1.4 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.

1.5 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.*

1.6 Further Criterion Considerations

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

1.6 (A) Coordinated Courses: 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.

1.6 (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.

1.6 (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.

1.6 (D) 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.

1.6 (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 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.

1.6 (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 or Scholarly/Creative Activities

Core Criterion: 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.

Includes scholarly publications, proposal and grant activity, support and advising of graduate students.

2.1 Criterion Minimum Requirements. Minimum requirements for ***evidence for a three-year review must include a research plan and alignment of the faculty member's activity with the plan; and, 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.

2.2 Further Criterion Considerations

2.2 (A) Directing thesis committees or project advisory groups. A successful thesis or project advisor should provide evidence that they have purposefully and deliberately guided the student through the process. The quality of a master's thesis or project 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 or project and through their efforts help students produce a greater impact in their work. 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 or project including careful feedback on the student's thesis. Participation in the graduate program, especially by being a graduate student thesis advisor or project 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).

2.2 (B) 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 (note that this includes identification of predatory journals as well as specification of journals that are of high quality).

- 2.2 (C) 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.
- 2.2 (D) Multi-author publications** are many times warranted. However, the author list should make sense and a "me too" style of publication is strongly discouraged. When individuals are listed as an author on a publication, they should be able to identify what they contributed to the publication and what fraction of the publication's content is directly from their efforts.
- 2.2 (E) 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.
- 2.2 (F) 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.
- 2.2 (G) Patents that have been granted** represent a more significant achievement and their importance may be assessed by the "use" of the patent.
- 2.2 (H) 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.

2.3 Important Note on Proposal and Grant Activity: 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.

3.0 Service

Core Criterion: At the Assistant Professor 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) 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.

4.0 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. 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.

4.2 Further Criterion Considerations

4.2 (A) 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 beginning indications of 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.

4.2 (B) 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.

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. Faculty at the Associate Professor level should provide evidence of maturity and proficiency in instruction, a growing and increasingly established research profile where their expertise and how it contributes is well defined, and service that provides impact to the institution.

1.0 Instruction

Core Criterion: Associate Professors 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.

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

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.

1.2 The” Instructional Dashboard” is provided by Institutional Research for a dossier. This includes “measures” of faculty performance including courses delivered, SAI results, an appendix of student comments, and DFW rates. These measures should provide indications of faculty contribution which can be used, with appropriate judgement applied by all parts of the process, in the evaluation of a faculty member.

1.3 Overall Criterion Considerations & Requirements

1.3(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 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 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.

Two Important Notes:

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

1.3 (C) Student assessment of instruction results are insufficient (and indeterminate) to demonstrate instructional effectiveness.

1.4 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.

1.5 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.*

1.6 Further Criterion Considerations

1.6 (A) Coordinated Courses. 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.

1.6 (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.

1.6 (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.

1.6 (D) 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.

1.6 (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 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.

1.6 (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 or other Creative/Scholarly Activities

Core Criterion: 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.

Includes activity relevant to the institutional mission, such as scholarly publications, proposal and grant activity, support and advising of graduate students.

2.1 Criterion Minimum Requirements for evidence for a three-year review must include a research plan and alignment of the faculty member's activity with the plan. This plan should address how they have demonstrated their expertise in Research as an Associate Professor and provide **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 continuing to build their own reputation in their field.

2.2 Further Criterion Considerations

2.2 (A) Directing thesis committees or project advisory groups. A successful thesis or project advisor should provide evidence that they have purposefully and deliberately guided the student through the process. The quality of a master's thesis or project 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 or project and through their efforts help students produce a greater impact in their work. 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 or project including careful feedback on the student's thesis. Participation in the graduate program, especially by being a graduate student thesis advisor or project 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 are expected to demonstrate, where appropriate, leadership in the graduate program and supporting the graduate program in producing highly qualified students.

2.2 (B) 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 (note that this includes identification of predatory journals as well as specification of journals that are of high quality).

2.2 (C) 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.

2.2 (D) Multi-author publications are many times warranted. However, the author list should make sense and a "me too" style of publication is strongly discouraged. When individuals are listed as

an author on a publication, they should be able to identify what they contributed to the publication and what fraction of the publication's content is directly from their efforts.

2.2 (E) 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.

2.2 (F) 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.

2.2 (G) Patents that have been granted represent a more significant achievement and their importance may be assessed by the "use" of the patent.

2.2 (H) 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.

2.3 Important Note on Proposal and Grant Activity: 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.

3.0 Service

Core Criterion: 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.

“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) **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.

4.0 Overall Recommendation

Core Criterion: The Associate Professor 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, appropriate reputation in research, and service that positively advances the University, department, and program.

4.1 Criterion Consideration. 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.**

4.2 Further Criterion Considerations

4.2 (A) 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.

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.

4.2 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.