Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines (2026)

Performance Period: **Jan. 1 – Dec. 31, 2026** (including compensated activities in Summer 2026)

Guidance from Article 8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement:

Your evaluation **must**:

- fully consider your FAR to evaluate how well you fulfilled assigned work duties
- consider quality of performance, as well as the proportions and nature of your assignments

Your evaluation **may**:

- consider work beyond assigned duties if it remains within the professional responsibilities of faculty
- be organized into the areas of *teaching*, *research*, and/or *service* with a separate rating for each area

Your evaluation **must not**

- consider work performed when you are not a member of the unit
- penalize you for having <12 credit hours of work assigned or for performance on unassigned work

Evaluations consider Faculty Handbook expectations for teaching, research, and service for each rank:

Instructor	Demonstrated ability to perform his or her assigned duties. Education and/or experience in compliance with the University's Policy on Faculty Credentials that is appropriate for his/her assigned duties
Senior Instructor	In addition to meeting the minimum qualifications for Instructor: Demonstrated excellence in delivery of courses and demonstrated ability to independently develop courses and improve pedagogy for the institution. The senior instructor should be appropriately credentialed to teach courses through the senior year of the undergraduate degree that they support
Distinguished Instructor	In addition to meeting the minimum qualifications for Senior Instructor, the Distinguished Instructor must have demonstrated sustained excellence in teaching and curriculum development as well as demonstrating strong contributions to the institution via service
Professor of Practice	Demonstrated ability to perform his or her assigned duties. This rank is positioned to rely on individuals with strong industrial experience; said experience must be at least five years in duration and with appropriate technical depth. Expectations of the rank are at minimum both teaching and service; in some instances, research may be included in job duties also
Assistant Professor	Combination of appropriate scholarship and teaching ability commensurate with the university's mission and relevant academic discipline(s).
Associate Professor	In addition to meeting minimum qualifications for *Assistant Professor*, a demonstrated record of scholarly activity, teaching, and, as appropriate, course and/or curriculum development commensurate with the university's mission and relevant academic discipline(s); evidence of a positive & growing reputation in the chosen field; & promise of continued successful performance
Professor	In addition to meeting minimum qualifications for both *Assistant Professor* and *Associate Professor*, scholarly contribution, such that the professor is recognized for sustained & significant contributions in the relevant discipline and/or interdisciplinary area by experts in the field

Evaluation Key:

Rating	Description of Area Rating	Description of Overall Rating
Needs Improvement	The employee did not successfully execute their assigned duties in this area of responsibility.	The employee did not successfully execute their assigned duties. This rating will typically require a supervisor and employee to develop a performance improvement plan.
Successful	The employee successfully executed their assigned duties in this area of responsibility.	Overall, the employee successfully executed their assigned duties.
Highly Successful	The employee significantly outperformed in this area of responsibility.	The employee successfully executed their assigned duties and demonstrated exceptional performance aligned to the mission of the University and relative to the criteria or relative to peer faculty at Florida Poly.

Note: **Each evaluator completing a performance evaluation must articulate sufficient and specific grounds or reasons to substantiate any rating other than "Successful"** (CBA 8.1(b)(4)).

Teaching

Summary:
Teaching effectiveness = Impact on student learning + Evidence of innovation + Continuous improvement.

Evaluators should triangulate evidence from multiple sources and recognize contexts and workload assignments. Faculty should curate clear, concise documentation that demonstrates how their work contributes to student success and the University's mission.

Principles:

1. Teaching effectiveness is ultimately about student learning and achievement of course objectives.
2. Teaching effectiveness should be evaluated primarily through artifacts and outcomes that may be complemented with anecdotal feedback
3. Teaching effectiveness should be evaluated using multiple convergent sources of evidence – not relying solely on student evaluations and/or grade distributions – and interpreted in the context of the types of courses taught, class sizes, and instructional modality.
4. Teaching effectiveness involves more than performance in the classroom, such as keeping up with the field (both technical and changes in pedagogy), planning instructional activities, creating instructional materials, effectively utilizing Canvas, assessing student learning, mentoring/interacting with students, conducting office hours, and participating in professional development opportunities
5. Faculty are encouraged to be innovative in their teaching and assessment of student learning, employing evidence-based methods or seeking department chair approval for testing new methods

Institutional expectations for successful faculty:

Faculty achieving a rating of **SUCCESSFUL**:

1. Meet the following institutional expectations:
    a. Exhibit appropriate interactions, communication, and professional behavior with students
    b. Submit attendance reports, midterm, and final grades consistently and on-time, as required
    c. Participate and cooperate appropriately in multi-section courses
    d. Execute teaching duties with honesty and integrity
    e. Be available to, and engage with, students during posted office hours
2. Provide evidence for the following components that apply to their teaching assignments:

Component	Definition	Example indicators
Instructional Design	Course organization, clarity of learning outcomes, and use of effective pedagogy	Up-to-date syllabus; alignment between outcomes, activities, and assessments; course design
Delivery and Engagement	Clarity, accessibility, and active student engagement	Student feedback, classroom observation notes, use of active learning or technology
Assessment & Feedback	Fair, timely, and constructive evaluation of student work	Transparent grading rubrics, prompt feedback cycles, evidence of student learning gains
Course Management	Use of LMS (e.g., Canvas), responsiveness, organization	Consistent updates, accessibility compliance, communication logs
Mentorship	Support for students outside class (projects, theses, advising)	Evidence of student research supervision, mentoring outcomes
Professional Growth	Continuous improvement through development activities	Participation in pedagogy workshops, teaching certifications, presentations or papers about teaching, curriculum innovation grants

Sample sources of evidence

(1) Instructional Design
   a. Course syllabi with learning outcomes mapped to or aligned with assessments.
   b. Review of course materials by peers (or other content experts) to assess rigor and alignment
   c. Sample activities, assignments, or assessments showing alignment with course learning outcomes

(2) Delivery and Engagement
   a. Canvas screenshots or analytics showing student engagement.
   b. Classroom or online course observation reports focused on engagement and clarity
   c. Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) data, including response rates and narrative comments

(3) Assessment & Feedback
   a. Samples of assignments/exams and rubrics demonstrating rigor and fairness.
   b. Evidence of learning improvement – pre/post test data, student work samples (with identifying information removed) showing learning outcomes achieved.
   c. Evidence of timely, meaningful, and appropriate feedback to students (including grading of assignments and exams)

(4) Course Management
   a. Course syllabi are submitted in a timely manner and comply with institutional and state requirements.
   b. Evidence of maintenance of an up-to-date Canvas page (and student grades within Canvas)
   c. Evidence of efforts towards accessibility compliance

(5) Mentorship
   a. Evidence of student research supervision, mentoring outcomes
   b. Evidence of successful graduate theses or student projects

(6) Professional Growth
   a. Evidence of active participation in pedagogy workshops and professional development opportunities
   b. Evidence of teaching improvement (improved SAI scores, classroom observation feedback, or student achievement).
   c. Teaching certifications or curriculum innovation grants
   d. Documentation of curricular innovation (new course design/delivery, industry integration)
   e. Reflective teaching statement discussing improvements made in response to feedback

Institutional expectations for highly successful faculty:

> Faculty achieving a rating of **HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL** clearly demonstrate effectiveness across relevant components and present distinct evidence that demonstrates outperformance. This evidence could include:
>
> - Substantial and successful course delivery that enhances student learning and achievement
> - Documented curricular innovation adopted by others
> - Highly effective course coordination of multi-section/multi-instructor courses.
> - Exceptional teaching performance that has attracted interest from external audiences
> - Exceptional mentorship leading to student awards, publications, or placements

Research
Research effectiveness: evidence of scholarly activity that advances knowledge, applies innovation, and/or contributes positively to Florida Poly's reputation and mission.

Evaluators should reward impact, integration, & progress, not just publication counts / journal quality indices. Faculty should document how their work strengthens the University's reputation as a hub for applied STEM innovation and supports student engagement.

Principles:

1. Research should be evaluated through a mission-driven, context-aware lens that recognizes innovation, application, and industry collaboration are central to the University's distinct value proposition.
2. The quality, significance, & application of research should matter more than sheer output quantity. The impact of research should be interpreted contextually within the field, not by journal impact factor alone.
3. Expectations scale with workload assignments and vary across disciplines. In other words, expectations for research are commensurate with the time allocated, resources available, and disciplinary context. When no time for research is assigned, the rating for Research should be N/A.
4. Scholarly work that bridges academic inquiry and practical application (such as industry-embedded projects or patents,) – and work that attracts broad interest, receives significant external recognition, and enhances the reputation of the University – should be recognized as high impact
5. All research must adhere to institutional, ethical, and legal standards for intellectual property, safety, and reporting

Institutional expectations for successful faculty:

Faculty achieving a rating of **SUCCESSFUL**:

1. Meet the following institutional expectations:
    a. Progress on a well-defined research plan, with outputs produced commensurate with workload assignment and disciplinary expectations
    b. Research activities are impactful and relevant to the University and its academic programs
    c. Integrity & Compliance (meeting ethical research standards and complying with institutional, state, and federal requirements, including protocols for engagement with external partners).
2. Provide evidence for the following components that apply to their research assignments:

Components:

Component	Definition	Example indicators
Scholarly Productivity	Producing original, peer-reviewed or otherwise validated work that advances knowledge	Refereed journal publications, conference proceedings, book chapters, or patents
Applied & Industry-Integrated Research	Translating knowledge into practice, often in collaboration with industry or government	Industry-sponsored projects, prototypes, software tools, consulting agreements, licensing, or commercialization outcomes
Funding & Resource Development	Securing external support for research or infrastructure	Grant proposals submitted/awarded (federal, state, industry, foundation), internal mini-grants, or equipment donations
Student Research Engagement	Involving students in meaningful research experiences	Supervision of UG/GR research assistants, student co-authorship, mentoring applied projects
Research Visibility & Dissemination	Sharing and communicating research outcomes to relevant audiences	Invited talks, conference presentations, exhibitions, media features, or policy influence
Collaboration & Leadership	Building interdisciplinary or industry partnerships	Participation in joint research centers, consortia, or leading cross-sector projects

Sample sources of evidence

(1) Scholarly Productivity (to include collaborative work)
   a. Peer-reviewed publications and conference proceedings (with attention to journal/conference quality)
   b. Non-refereed publications and technical reports
   c. Books or Chapters: Technical contributions or edited volumes
   d. Active Research Agenda: A clearly defined multi-year plan with milestones and deliverables
   e. Documentation of Ongoing Work: Draft manuscripts, experimental data, software code, prototypes

(2) Applied & Industry-Integrated Research
   a. Patents, Invention Disclosures, or Prototype development: Filed or issued IP demonstrating innovation
   b. Technical Reports or White Papers: Especially for sponsored projects with measurable outcomes
   c. Industry Partnerships: Documented collaborations, MOUs, or NDAs with companies or agencies
   d. Properly approved, mission-aligned consulting or technical assistance projects
   e. Commercialization Activity: Licensing, spinouts, or startup engagement

(3) Funding and Resource Development
   a. Grants or Contracts: Evidence of funded applied work or externships linked to research
   b. Proposals submitted, with feedback from reviewers.

(4) Student Research Engagement
   a. Undergraduate or Graduate Research Supervision: Students working on funded or applied projects
   b. Co-Authorship: Students listed on papers, posters, or patents
   c. Capstone or Thesis Mentorship: Applied research linked to real-world outcomes

(5) Research Visibility & Dissemination
   a. Citations and Scholarly Influence: Citation indices or invited keynote talks
   b. Awards or Honors: From professional organizations or funding agencies
   c. Visibility: Press coverage, media mentions, or institutional highlights

(6) Collaboration & Leadership
   a. Evidence of participation in joint research centers, consortia, or leading cross-sector projects
   b. Editorial position in a national level journal
   c. Refereeing or reviewing of scholarly articles that requires subject matter expertise

Institutional expectations for highly successful faculty:

> Faculty achieving a rating of **HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL** provide additional evidence to demonstrate outperformance. This evidence could include:
>
> - Securing significant competitive external funding
> - Leading significant grant-funded or industry-partnered project that yields a working prototype/product
> - Publishing applied research recognized for innovation or commercialization potential
> - Demonstrating technology transfer, such as patent licensing or startup formation
> - Achieving regional or national recognition for research (awards, invited talks, consortium leadership) or leadership in advancing the discipline
> - Significant research award or industry-sponsored project
> - Publication activity that is high quality, above the norm for the department, and mission-aligned

Service

Service effectiveness = evidence of meaningful engagement, measurable outcomes, and leadership that advances institutional and disciplinary goals.

Evaluation should reward impact, initiative, and reliability, not just presence.
Faculty should provide documentation of results, while evaluators recognize both visible and behind-the-scenes contributions that make Florida Poly thrive as an applied STEM institution.

Principles:

1. Service effectiveness should be assessed not merely by participation, but by the quality, scope, and impact of active contributions to the department, University, and discipline.
2. Service should advance Florida Poly's mission – strengthening STEM education, innovation, and industry integration – and advance the strategic goals of the University and academic department.
3. Serving on multiple committees does not automatically indicate high performance; measurable outcomes and leadership matter more.
4. Expectations scale with faculty rank and appointment type. Senior faculty are expected to take on leadership roles, while early-career faculty focus on departmental and developmental service.
5. Expectations also scale directly with workload assignment and opportunity. If no time for service is assigned, the rating for Service should be N/A.

Institutional expectations for successful faculty:

Faculty achieving a rating of **SUCCESSFUL**:

1. Meet the following institutional expectations for collegiality and citizenship:
    a. Professional behavior and constructive participation that enhance the campus community
    b. Reliability, collaboration, mentoring peers, and contributing positively to institutional culture
    c. Supportive participation in University culture
2. Provide evidence of active engagement and measurable impact in the following components that apply to their service assignments and opportunities:

Components:

Component	Definition	Example indicators
Departmental Service	Contributions that support the department's academic and operational effectiveness	Curriculum committee participation, course coordination, student recruitment events, lab supervision, mentoring junior faculty, accreditation preparation; academic advising
University Service	Engagement in governance, campus initiatives, and strategic efforts beyond the department	Active participation on FRC or university committees, leading student organizations, organizing campus events, or supporting student success initiatives
Service to the Discipline or Profession	External engagement that advances the faculty member's field	Journal or conference reviewing, conference organization, leadership in professional societies, grant review panels, serving on accreditation teams
Community and Industry Engagement	Applied service linking the University to external stakeholders	Partnership development, advisory boards, outreach to K–12, community STEM programs, or technical consultation for government or industry

Sample sources of evidence

(1) Departmental Service
   a. Record of outcomes achieved from departmental committee participation (e.g., curriculum redesign, lab improvements)
   b. Coordination of courses or labs (documentation of organization and leadership)
   c. Advising or mentoring records (e.g., number of advisees, advising hours, feedback from students)
   d. Contributions to departmental recruitment, outreach, or accreditation efforts (including programmatic assessment efforts)
   e. Internal leadership (e.g., serving as program coordinator, search committee chair)
   f. Curricular innovation: new course development and active participation in program curriculum development

(2) University Service
   a. Active engagement and contribution on University-wide committees or task forces
   b. Evidence of leadership in initiatives that advance institutional strategic goals
   c. Documentation of student organization advisement, including club activities, competitions, or student achievements
   d. Coordination or organization of University events, speaker series, or competitions
   e. Recognition or awards for service contributions

(3) Service to the Discipline or Profession
   a. Grant panel or accreditation site team participation
   b. Leadership in professional societies (e.g., officer, conference chair)
   c. Organization of professional workshops, symposia, or technical sessions
   d. Awards, invitations, or other recognition by disciplinary organizations

(4) Community and Industry Engagement
   a. Documented partnership or advisory role with industry, nonprofits, or government agencies
   b. Participation in community STEM outreach (e.g., competitions, K–12 events, mentorship programs)
   c. Facilitation of student-industry collaborations or internships
   d. Applied consulting or technical assistance that benefits the region

Institutional expectations for highly successful faculty:

> Faculty achieving a rating of **HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL** provide additional evidence to demonstrate outperformance. This evidence could include:
> - Chairing a University-wide task force that leads to a new academic policy or student success initiative
> - Securing a grant to fund service activities
> - Contributions in a leadership role for a national organization in one's field
> - Recognition through a service or leadership award from the University or professional organization
> - Organizing a major campus event or research symposium to enhance Florida Poly's visibility
> - Leading a student competition team that performs well at a state or national level