

University criteria for *promotion* from Instructor to Senior Instructor

Approved March 2026

Table of Contents

Preamble and Context for the Criteria	2
University criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor	4
1.0 Instruction.....	4
2.0 Research N/A	7
3.0 Service to external professional societies and contributions to the University and department.	7
4.0 Overall recommendation	8

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 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.

Promotion to Senior Instructor considers the faculty member’s contributions to the university and requires that an individual through demonstrated activity and contribution to Florida Poly has met the University Criteria and achieved the rank Senior Instructor. Promotion is based on demonstrated accomplishments, requires a demonstration of accomplishment at Florida Poly, and very importantly considers the individuals ongoing trajectory at Florida Poly. Promotion to Senior Instructor also requires indications that a faculty will continue to perform at a level worthy of the rank Senior Instructor.

From the Faculty Handbook:

“In addition to meeting the minimum qualifications for Instructor, a minimum of a master’s degree in the field for courses to be delivered by the individual is required. Demonstrated excellence in delivery of courses and demonstrated ability to independently develop courses and improve pedagogy for the institution is essential. The senior instructor should be appropriately credentialed to teach courses through the the senior year of the undergraduate degree or degrees that they support.”

The Faculty Handbook also notes regarding teaching and service:

“The evaluation of teaching may include coursework and curriculum development; service should consider effort in support of both the institution and their respective field. ”

The overall evaluation of a candidate for promotion to Senior Instructor must consider the long-term impact that a faculty member has, and is expected to have, on the institution and its mission. This evaluation 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. To achieve the rank Senior Instructor, individuals must have demonstrated sustained accomplishment in their assigned roles for multiple years.

- Given the importance of excellence in education to the mission, faculty must provide evidence of accomplishment in teaching in order to warrant recommendation for promotion.
- Faculty members must demonstrate achievement in leadership and contribution to the curriculum to achieve Senior Instructor rank.
- 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 promotion to Senior Instructor. Committees are reminded that a positive recommendation for promotion, if accepted, will result in a three-year contract for the individual under review.

University criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor

1.0 Instruction

Core Criterion: A faculty member must clearly be contributing to the instructional mission by demonstrating proficiency and breadth in instructional quality and capacity. The faculty must demonstrate excellence and leadership in the curriculum for a portion of the department's courses. This leadership must have significant and positive impact on the university.

Instruction, including regular classroom and laboratory teaching, laboratory / project-based learning instruction, effective development/application of new instructional methods, new course development, and other instructional activities. Each of these is discussed in the listing provided below.

1.1 Criterion Minimum Requirements. Overall promotion requires demonstrated proficiency and breadth in instructional quality and capacity.¹ 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. Promotion to Senior Instructor requires a demonstration of instructional maturity; the applicant must provide evidence that they are capable of independent deliver 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. For departments where there is appropriate opportunity, Senior Instructors must contribute across a range of courses that target Freshman through Seniors.

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

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.

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 (and indeterminate) on their own 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 “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.*

1.4 (A) Factors to consider in curriculum impact include, but is not limited to, managing a significant portion (as defined by either number of courses or fraction of student credit hours delivered) of the curriculum for the department, ongoing development and course level improvement that is impactful for the university.

1.5 Further Criterion Considerations

1.5 (A) 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 to achieve the rank Senior 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) 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) 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. For coordinated courses, non-course coordinators must do their part to deliver a sufficiently complete and organized course.

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 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 materials not aligned with the outcomes and subject matter of the course indicates that the faculty is not sufficiently mature to merit promotion. **New course development is not a requirement for promotion.**

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 to external professional societies and contributions to the University and department.

Core Criterion: Promotion to Senior Instructor requires that a faculty member is contributing to their department and the university in a positive way and has demonstrated capacity to assume a leadership role.

“Service” includes supporting activities for external 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) 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) An applicant for senior instructor must have demonstrated a significant service contribution to the department or institution.

4.0 Overall recommendation

Core Criterion: For Promotion to Senior Instructor, the candidate must demonstrate 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 and service that positively advances the University, department, and program. The individual must have a significant, positive impact on the delivery of a department's courses.

4.1 Minimum Criterion:

4.2 Overall Considerations: Florida Poly is growing quickly and the demands placed upon faculty have included 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 and how these efforts positively or negatively impact the institution and its mission. 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 (A)** Noting the statement above, individuals must provide evidence of "demonstrated proficiency independence, collaboration, where appropriate leadership and breadth in **instructional** quality and capacity." For senior instructors there is an expectation that this extends to courses beyond the freshman year and sophomore year.
- 4.2 (B)** Similarly, a faculty member must provide evidence of leadership and/or strong positive impact on the curriculum for a department.
- 4.2 (C)** Finally, the dossier must provide evidence of involvement in the university community with **service** or other activities that add value to the university community.

4.3 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.