Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
Clarifications unanimously approved on: 5/13/2026

**Overarching Consideration for all activity and all ranks:**

- Due to the size, growth, and operational demands of the Mechanical Engineering program, faculty across all ranks, but especially at the ranks of Associate Professor and Full Professor, have frequently been called upon to take significant roles in administrative leadership, accreditation, curriculum development, assessment, hiring, laboratory development, and other institutional initiatives, often requiring a substantial reallocation of professional effort away from traditional scholarly activities during the period. Reviewers should consider the impact of these responsibilities on scholarly trajectory, research continuity, and allocation of professional effort during the review period, while remaining within the framework of the published university criteria.

**1.0 – Instruction Core Criterion: A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission.**

- Demonstrated Excellence in Teaching. A faculty member may be asked to routinely deliver courses that are not their preference or within their technical area of expertise; these courses must be delivered with "excellence" to meet established learning outcomes. Reviewers may see faculty across the department where opportunities to deliver courses in the upper division or in their area of expertise may be limited. Reviewers are encouraged to consider that course assignment may be outside a faculty member's control. Committees should carefully weigh the opportunities provided to faculty as they consider instructional performance and note that there are many ways a faculty member can contribute to the instructional mission.
- Due to the size and enrollment of the ME department relative to other departments Florida Poly, we see a diverse array of enrolled students, including those from outside the major taking ME courses as electives. Course assignment and student population can vary in ME when considering demonstrated excellence in teaching. This includes a diversity of courses from multi-section freshman courses, courses with a strong mix of student level (freshman to senior) and traditional junior and senior level courses.

1.1 Minimum Requirements.

- Department context for the minimum requirements is expressed in the formal course assignment provided for each faculty member, noting that all faculty members may not have the same opportunity to demonstrate the "proficiency and breadth in instructional quality and capacity" highlighted in the overall university criteria. Faculty with limiting course assignments make valuable contributions to the instruction mission of the university.

**1.2 – Overall Criterion Considerations & Requirements**

(A) A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission

- "Evidence of meaningful collaboration with other faculty" includes faculty delivering a multi-section course in an independent fashion and demonstrating "collaboration" as noted in the criteria by meeting the student learning outcomes defined by the department for the course. In addition, committee

members should consider the effect of course assignment which may limit autonomy for a faculty member, especially where material in non-traditional courses is mandated by the department. Faculty should explain the impact of course assignments on their career.

- New programs demand significant time and resources for course development in addition to the regular curriculum revision that is an ongoing contribution to the instructional mission.

(B) Instructional effectiveness

- As noted in the criteria, the DFW rate as an assessment may not be considered in a singular manner. Faculty in the ME&IE department are encouraged to provide companion information that contextualizes student population within the course.
- Courses in the ME and IE curriculum include prerequisite structures that require students to pass certain courses in order to progress towards their degree. Summer courses may include many students that are struggling within the degree; faculty may provide context for student performance in these sections.
- In many cases poor student performance or withdrawal correlates with chronic student absence from scheduled class meetings. Faculty may provide evidence regarding this performance such as correlations between student absence and their final grade. Faculty recourse for chronically absent students is to utilize early alerts, and in such cases follow through on the alert is beyond Faculty control.

(C) Student assessment of instruction

**1.3 – Factors to consider in terms of "effort"**

- Consideration should be given to the effort required to develop new laboratories, significant project-based-learning activities, and experimental setups to support related fieldwork, laboratories, or workspaces. Laboratory set-up, execution, logistics, facilities, and assessment of student work in a laboratory or design sequence courses often require a heavy lift of effort, especially for the individual space and resource usage for a multi-section lab. AE and IE as new programs are currently setting up labs.
- The ME department has recently started offering online courses, and many faculty are taking on significant effort setting up a new course delivery modality.
- The IE and AE programs demand significant faculty time for course development, as new offerings for students at Florida Poly.
- Consideration should be given to the time commitment required for "first-time" course deliveries for all faculty members. Non-traditional courses that do not have established course materials, such as a textbook or laboratory manual, are also time intensive to develop and deliver for the first time.
- Increased enrollment demanding an increase in course sections is likely to result in significant instruction overload within the ME/IE department, which is likely to impact service and research capacity for faculty.
- Increased enrollment, of which ME/IE is outpacing University average, is leading to section size growth.
- The ME/IE department coordinates several multi-section courses which include faculty and student populations from a variety of majors within the university, effort to coordinate should be considered along with faculty teaching load.

**1.4 – Factors to consider in terms of "quality"**

**1.5 – Further Criterion Considerations**

- The IE program will be going through initial ABET accreditation July of 2027, requiring significant effort from all IE faculty.
- The AE program in development within the ME department is currently a major effort by a subset of ME faculty.
- The ME department is currently implementing a significant curriculum redesign as we have dropped concentrations.

**2.0 – Scholarly Activities Core Criterion: a faculty member has a unique and scholarly expertise in their field and has activity that aligns with this professional direction.**

- Computing, lab equipment, funds for student labor, and a small (but maturing) population of graduate students limits access to graduate research assistance for faculty in the department.
- Department-based assignments (courses) and research resources provided should be considered when considering scholarly activity.

**2.2 – Further Criterion Considerations**

(A) Directing thesis committees or project advisory groups

- Participation in thesis committee is a part of scholarship, and this can occur for faculty that contribute to thesis committees (or formal thesis evaluations) in other institutions or countries.

(B) Publications and patents

- As part of the Research section in the Dossier, all faculty are encouraged to include an explanation of the publications venues that they have chosen. This explanation should provide reviewers with the initial context for consideration of publications. In all cases reviewers should consider the differences in disciplines within this context.

(C) Articles published… (more specialized venues of publication)

- Faculty are encouraged to specify the publication timelines within their different disciplines for committee consideration.

(D) Multi-author publications

- Publications requiring partnerships with other organizations, such as industry case studies, typically result in multi-author work.

(E) Articles that are simply the result of student work

(F) Provisional patents

(G) Patents that have been granted

(H) Activity with industrial partners

- Industry partnerships are highly valued by IE, case study research generated out of an industry partnership is considered highly impactful publication in the field.
- Collaborative applied research projects involving industry partners are highly valued by the institution.

(I) Research, creative and scholarly activity

- Mechanical Engineering research can be heavily based on use of laboratory equipment and procedures, processes, and repeated testing. Sustained effort toward defined research goal(s) must be demonstrated by documented evidence that shows coherence or thoughtful progression toward meaningful achievement, which traditionally is seen as resulting in publications, grants, external collaborations, and funding.
- The "weight" applied to this activity is not exactly specified due to the diversity of activity, subfields, and recognition of achievement for various fields and subfields that are present in the department. Departmental committee evaluation of a dossier is expected to include consideration of the quality of publication venues (noting the value of high-profile journals), valuing achievement in applied research via awarding of a patent, and also valuing highly selective conference publications. Other scholarly activity is also valued, and committees are encouraged to consider the various evidence of achievement in a careful manner and specifically to avoid simple numeric counts as a means of evaluation. The department committee letter should include comment on the quality of publication for consideration of promotion cases.
- The university plans on using local industry to increase research expenditures, which may produce different research artifacts. Local industry partnerships present a significant funding opportunity for IE research with the benefit of strengthening relationships in addition to publication. Research artifacts generated from industry partnerships should be considered from the context of originality, scope, and impact of the work (just as it is for published traditional scholarship).

**2.3 – Proposal and grant application**

- Traditional grant-funded research depends on federal funding availability. Evidence of proposal activity is a positive indicator of research effort.
- Institutional support gaps may have impacted faculty in pursuit of funding and research progression; in these cases faculty are encouraged to clarify the impact within their dossier.

**3.0 – Service Core Criterion: a faculty member is contributing to their department and profession in a positive way.**

- Contribution is influenced by duty assignments. Faculty may comment in their dossier on the service and the opportunities provided for service to the institution. Within IE and ME department size and rank impact service assignment. For example, IE faculty and faculty at the rank of Instructor may be disproportionately assigned committee membership, due to institutional requirements. Simultaneously, less University committee opportunities may exist for ME faculty.

**3.2 – Further Criterion Considerations**

- As viewed by the Departments of Mechanical Engineering and Industrial Engineering, involvement in, and service to, a professional society is a worthwhile endeavor which occurs in many venues with a range of activities, roles, and invested time. A narrative providing insight and elaborating on how one's service role enhances their professional goals, as well as advancing the position of the university is highly recommended. It is noted that service to the profession may be at the local, regional and/or national level, and the narrative will document the details and impact of these activities.
- Consideration should be given for faculty heavily involved in the ABET review process, particularly within departments programs that are seeking their initial accreditation.

(A) no service activity of significance overall for a multi-year period is strong cause for concern

(B) Simply being a member of a committee is not an indication of service contribution

- A faculty member's dossier should indicate the faculty member's role on the committee.

(C) Service to one's professional society

- Reviewing articles for conferences and journals, regardless of the professional society affiliation is a highly valued activity for faculty and should be considered positively by reviewers.

(D) Service can include hosting a conference, outreach to the community that is coordinated with the university, judging internal and external competitions, community service that is coordinated with the university

**3.3(A) Departmental Clarifying Comment on Special Consideration of Administration Contribution**

- When considering this element, the Departments of Mechanical Engineering and Industrial Engineering looks at a candidate's contribution over the multi-year period that benefits both the department/program, and the University in tangible ways. Strong emphasis is placed upon that individual's ability to show leadership, mentorship, and extra-departmental relationships that support the department's faculty and reputation over the long-term.

**4.0 – Overall Core Criterion: criteria notes, appropriate to rank and reappointment and/or reappointment: strong, ongoing contribution to the University, ability to perform their full suite of duties with a high degree of quality and independence by demonstrating accomplishment in teaching, appropriate trajectory in research, and service that positively advances the University, department, and program**

- The overarching consideration of an individual's contribution to the university mission should be considered in the context of rank, and the reasonable expectation for performance based upon the opportunities for performance provided. Faculty may comment on these factors in their dossier.
- The ME/IE Department takes pride in the quality and preparedness of its graduates. The department notes that, as a fraction of graduates, the percentage of students receiving highest academic honors (e.g., *summa cum laude*) may be lower than in some other departments. This may reflect the department's commitment to maintaining rigor within the curriculum to ensure that graduates demonstrate the competencies expected of engineering professionals. As a result, faculty may at times encounter lower student satisfaction related to grading rigor and expectations. Faculty members may address these contextual factors within their dossiers, where appropriate.
- Due to major modifications in curriculum, as well as first time delivery for AE and IE curriculum(s), it is anticipated that significant effort will be made to modify and adjust moving forward based on outcomes of new curriculum delivery.