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AGENDA

I. Call to Order
Don Wilson, Board Chair

II. Roll Call
Zaira Medina

III. Public Comment
Don Wilson, Board Chair

IV. Approval of the September 11, 2019 Minutes
*Action Required*
Don Wilson, Board Chair

V. 2018-2020 Academic & Student Affairs Committee Work Plan Review
Dr. Terry Parker, EVP and Provost

VI. Provost Report and Discussion
Dr. Terry Parker, EVP and Provost

VII. Closing Remarks and Adjournment
Don Wilson, Board Chair
I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Hallion called the Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting to order at 9:23 a.m.

II. Roll Call

Amy Devera called the roll: Committee Chair Richard Hallion, Committee Vice Chair Adrienne Perry, Trustee Victoria Astley, Trustee Ryan Perez, Trustee Mark Bostick and Trustee Philip Dur were present (Quorum).

Other trustees present: Board Chair Don Wilson, Trustee Frank Martin, Trustee Cliff Otto, Trustee Gary Wendt and Trustee Bob Stork.

Staff present: President Randy Avent, Provost Terry Parker, Ms. Gina DeIulio, Mr. Mark Mroczkowski, Mrs. Kathy Bowman, Dr. Kathryn Miller, Dr. Tom Dvorske, Mrs. Kris Wharton, Mrs. Kim Abels and Ms. Amy Devera were present.

III. Public Comment

There were no requests received for public comment.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Trustee Adrienne Perry made a motion to approve the Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting minutes of March 22, 2019. Trustee Victoria Astley seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

V. 2018-20 Strategic Planning Committee Work Plan Review

The 2018-2020 Work plan remains unchanged and no discussion occurred.

VI. Provost Report

Provost Terry Parker reviewed activity aligned with the Work Plan, which included Admissions and
Financial Aid, Student Affairs, four-year graduation improvement plan, degree program additions, faculty hiring status, student and faculty diversity, Graduate programs, and Technology and Pedagogy.

Admissions and Financial Aid

Provost Parker reported on the current Admissions status. Currently, the entering student headcount for first day of classes was 401 students; the targeted headcount was 400 students. Provost Parker quickly recognized the staff of the Admissions department for their recruitment efforts. He then briefed the committee on the First Time in College and diversity statistics and reported the Graduate program is continuing to grow with 25 new students enrolled for fall 2019. When reviewing the FTIC chart, Trustee Gary Wendt asked what the difference was on the 279 enrolled number and the previous enrolled number that was provided. Provost Parker stated that the 279 was the FTIC enrollment number and the 401 enrolled number included FTIC, transfer and graduate students. Trustee Wendt asked where transfer students come from and Ms. Michelle Powell stated that transfer students can from a variety of other different institutions. She also stated that the University receives a good amount of transfers from Polk State College and Hillsborough Community College where students have either decided not to finish an Associate’s degree or transferred after.

Degree Program Additions and Faculty Hiring Status

Provost Parker reviewed how the faculty were distributed in each department. The total number of full-time faculty that the University currently employees is 74, with the Computer Science department currently having the most faculty. Trustee Victoria Astley stated that according to a previous report, it seemed the University was behind on hiring Mechanical Engineering faculty. Provost Parker said that he would have to go back and look at the numbers, but ensured the committee that Mechanical Engineering is where it should be in terms of faculty recruitment. Hiring priorities are for Computer Science and Environmental Engineering. Trustee Frank Martin asked what the faculty hiring goal was for this academic year. President Randy Avent stated the goals may have been higher, but this was the result. Trustee Martin stated he would like to see the faculty hiring budget for academic year 2019-2020. President Avent stated if the budget is not used for faculty hiring, it is moved to carry forward. Trustee Martin also stated his concern about diversity, to which Provost Parker stated in terms of women in a STEM institution, Florida Poly’s numbers are very good. There were no African American hires this year. Trustee Martin stated that he would like to see some type of effort to increase diversity. Trustee Philip Dur asked what size faculty will the Environmental Engineering program need and when. Provost Parker stated that the department will need at least need two new faculty next year and approximately four the year after. The rest would depend on the demand of the degree.

Student Affairs

Provost Parker stated Dr. Kathryn Miller and her team began to establish values and traditions for University students over the summer. A wide range of community outreach was recently completed, including summer camps led by various Florida Poly staff and faculty. Dr. Miller also piloted an advising program over the summer which had an 89 percent success rate.

Degree Program Additions

The committee was briefed by Provost Parker on the degrees the University currently offers. Trustee Otto asked if receiving the accreditation for Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering accelerated the pace to get accreditation for the other degrees. Provost Parker stated that Data Science and Business Analytics does not fall under the ABET umbrella, therefore the University will not seek accreditation for those degrees. Environmental Engineering, Engineering
Mathematics and Engineering Physics do fall under the ABET umbrella, however there are still rules that need to be followed, including having a graduate from one of those programs. Provost Parker informed the committee that there are two new National Science Foundation (NSF) awards being granted to two faculty, Professor Grisselle Centeno in the amount of $600,000 and Professor Arman Sargolzaei in the amount of $200,000. Professor Sargolzaei’s award has not yet been awarded, but all signs state that it will be.

Accountability Plan

Provost Parker presented selected slides from the Accountability Plan that was recently presented to and approved by the Board of Governors (BOG). He addressed performance-based funding (PBF) and metrics, noting difficulties common to all universities as well as those unique to Florida Poly. He also reviewed how the plan was revised and listed key take-aways from this experience. Trustee Astley asked Provost Parker to elaborate on the movement of budget funds. Provost Parker stated he moved funding from certain buckets to Admissions to assist with enrollment growth and offered to meet with Trustee Astley separately if she wanted to review this more in-depth.

For each area of concern with the Accountability Plan, the University identified opportunities for improvement. Trustee Dur would like to note for the record that he thinks the critical variable is the quality of the applicant and the person that is admitted. He also recommended sending faculty into the schools to recruit. Mrs. Powell stated Admissions does target specific high schools and students who have what the University is looking for in an applicant. Admissions recruiters speak directly to high school students in STEM-based classes that align with Florida Poly’s degrees. Trustee Dur asked for more granularity on what Admissions is doing to recruit new students. Both Trustee Dur and Committee Chair Richard Hallion stated the University needs to better target underrepresented counties around Florida Poly and increase the outreach efforts.

The committee briefly conversed about faculty research and space needs. Provost Parker reviewed the University’s five-year goals which include increasing campus enrollment to 2,000 students. Trustee Ryan Perez expressed his concern for housing needs if enrollment grows to 2,000. President Avent stated that beds in the dorms may have to be doubled up, but there will also be an increase of new apartments in the area. He also stated that as the University grows, more investors will see more opportunities. Forty-six percent of students currently live on campus.

Approval of Additional Space in the Applied Research Center (ARC)

Provost Parker stated in order to move forward with adding additional space to the ARC, Board approval is needed. The additional 8,000 square feet will support labs for a prototype shop, vehicle bays, student project space, and research space for FIPR Institute. Formal approval for funding is within the Finance Committee Meeting.

Trustee Mark Bostick made a motion to approve the support of the addition of approximately 8,000 square feet in support of labs for a prototype shop, vehicle bays, student project space, and research space for FIPR Institute. Trustee Adrienne Perry seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

BOT Choice Metric

The committee discussed the funding given to universities based on metrics. President Avent stated the University needs to choose a metric that highlights the University’s uniqueness. Trustees engaged in discussion on what their choice metric might be; they focused discussion on undergraduate selectivity.
Approval of Textbook Accountability Plan

Forty-five days before the start of the fall and spring semester, the campus must show that 95 percent of course sections have adopted textbooks. The intent is to provide suitable notice to students so that they can minimize their textbook cost. The University is compliant.

Trustee Mark Bostick made a motion to approve the Textbook Accountability Plan. Trustee Ryan Perez seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Policy Revision: English Proficiency Requirement

Provost Parker reviewed a change in this policy that simply aligns the University with standard practice across the SUS. All background information on the policy was included in the materials provided to the committee.

Trustee Adrienne Perry made a motion to approve the revised policy FPU-2.005 Admissions of International Students. Trustee Mark Bostick seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the Academic and Student Affairs Committee Meeting adjourned at 10:46 a.m.
Work Plan Review

Adrienne Perry
Academic and Student Affairs Committee Chair
December 10, 2019
Reporting and actions for the committee are organized in the following categories:

- Admissions and Financial Aid
- Student Services
- Four year graduation improvement plan
- Degree Program Additions and Faculty Hiring
- Student and Faculty Diversity
- Graduate programs
- Technology and Pedagogy
- Items requested by the Chair, the Committee or provided by the institution
Today’s Discussion is a Review of Activity Aligned with the Work Plan

- Admissions and Financial Aid
- Student Affairs
- Four year graduation improvement plan
- Degree Program Additions and Faculty Hiring Status
- Student and Faculty Diversity
- Graduate Programs
- Technology and Pedagogy
  - No report this meeting
- Other items
  - A quick note on the bookstore
Our quality measures for the FTIC students are similar to those for Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Time Freshman</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Fall 2019*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ACT</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HS GPA</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Quartile HS Class</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of Census Date, Test Scores as of Drop Date

Entering student headcount
396

FTIC – First Time in College

Graduate Enrollment
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The entering class is more diverse than in prior years

- New students enrolled (FTIC, TR, GR)
  - 21.2% Latino compared to 16.3% last year
  - 8.3% Black/African American compared to 4.6% last year
  - 19.1% Women compared to 14% last year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTIC</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APP STARTED</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIT</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOSIT</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLL</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APP STARTED</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOSIT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FTIC – First Time in College, TR – Transfer, GR - Graduate*
Florida Poly App and CommonApp Volume

- Applicant = a completely filled out application, but no board scores or transcripts received yet

- **Student Behavior** Favors the Common App
- **Number of Applicants** is up
- **There will be a decline in yield**

![Graph showing Applicant Filled out, no scores submitted]

- **Fall 2017**
- **Fall 2018**
- **Fall 2019**
- **Fall 2020**

**Legend**
- Native
- Common App
Admitted Freshmen: up ~90%
As of Nov 26th

Yield 51%  45%   45%   ?? %
FL Admit Geography
as of Nov 26th
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Trained staff to identify and engage hand-raising digital prospects

Added recruitment vehicles: text messaging, personalized letters, direct mail, evening calls, student calls, student post cards, calls to parents and an email drip campaign.

Built focused change to embrace a human connection grounded in a personal level of engagement – which is expected from top, highly competitive students as they consider small, selective universities.

Launched STEM-Tech Days (30-40 this year). Chartered buses to bring pre-calc, calculus and physics classes to campus for tours within state-of-the-art labs, immersive TED-like talk and presentation on the critical relevancy of math and technology and impact on markets, the economy, health, space exploration, and all industries and everyday living. Students receive lunch, some light Florida Poly swag and information about Florida Poly majors and concentrations.

YouTube and Instagram campaigns; Third-Party web promotion; deployment of automated software that identifies and tracks high school student digital behavior and digital visits to the Florida Poly web site. This empowers Admissions Counselors to contact the most interested students, economizing their time to the hottest prospects.

Develop new publications and material with fresh, modern and engaging photography, a focused marketing message and new branding that positions Florida Poly as Highly Selective, Deliberately Small and STEM focused in a pool of wildly expensive private STEM universities.

Re-packaged academic products (scholars programs) for selective scholarship leveraging. Faculty chairs wrote personalized nomination letters, followed by admissions counselor calls and personalized letter to parents from campus executive based on math board scores and interest in our majors.

Point. Click. Send. Deployed a dramatic change in application process by allowing students to use their mobile phones to submit pics of HS transcripts and board scores.
Florida Poly has Moved to a “Class Shaping” Model

- Inputs are not limited to GPA and Board Scores
- Other factors that are considered:
  - Math acumen as demonstrated in the HS curriculum
  - STEM leadership, initiative, drive, demonstrated interest in Florida Poly, overall engagement and aspirations
  - Student’s high school and region, high school rigor, desired major and concentration
  - Predictive model and competitive analysis of student’s university options and projected awards
  - Letters of Recommendation
  - Admission Essay
  - AP Exams
  - Co-curricular and non-classroom activities
  - Differentiating Major Activities
  - Positions of Significant Responsibility
  - Sustained Participation
For Fall 2019, We Piloted the First Year STEM Program

• Intent: provide access to a small number of students that are below incoming class average board scores but that show “promise” in Math curriculum
  – Typically students are economically disadvantaged
  – Focus on Central Florida

• The program provides:
  – Conditional admittance to the University in the Fall
  – Fall enrollment in three credit-bearing courses

• Academic immersion:
  – Academic coaching (Assigned Success Coach)
  – Tutoring
  – Campus engagement programing

• Outcomes
  – Fall 2019, 24 students
  – One withdrawal to date, Performance “appears” similar to overall student body
Residence Halls are owned by Vestcor, managed by a third party.

Fall change in management partner included a shift in responsibilities:
- Florida Poly now directly manages students and programming within the dorms.
- Coastal Ridge manages maintenance and leasing.

The agreement includes an onsite residence director that is a Florida Poly employee:
- Paul Carey, Assistant Director of Residential Life.
- Resident Assistant Role changed to be more student focused.

This change provides two critical improvements:
- A stronger “Campus Safety Net” for our students.
- Capability to build the “student experience.”
The Academic Success Center Provides Student Advising and Support

- **Co-located with Math and Science Tutoring in the IST**
  - Setup for Drop in Advising
  - Intent is to provide “high access” advising especially for Freshman
- **Retention Initiatives:**
  - All first year students assigned to a Success Coach
  - Collaborative advising with faculty for Spring 2020 Registration
    - 83% of undergraduate students registered for Spring 2020 (compared to 79% last year)
- **Spring 2020 Initiative—Degree Declaration Day**
This effort has evolved into a broad effort to improve key metrics

Initiatives from last spring were:

- **Admissions**: a top to bottom reconsideration of our admission operation
  - *Status: underway, Champion: Ben Matthew Corpus,*

- **Retention**: a broad effort that aligns academic and student affairs touchpoints, policies, and activities to improve retention
  - *Status: Underway, Champion Kathryn Miller*

- **Academics and Instructional Quality**: a focused effort to improve instruction and outcomes on the campus
  - *Status: Underway, Champion Tom Dvorske*
Performance Metrics take Multiple Years to Improve but Require Constant Attention

- **Progression Rate**
  - Influenced by incoming student quality, student experience, instructional quality and consistency

- **Graduation Rate**
  - Influenced by Progression Rate, quality of advising, student experience, instructional quality and consistency

- **Enrollment Projections**
  - Influenced by Admissions operation, website, brand recognition, financial aid

- **Time to Degree**
  - Influenced by quality of advising, instructional quality and consistency

- **Research Volume**
  - Influenced by faculty activity and FIPR

- **Number of Graduates**
  - Influenced by enrollment and graduation rate
The status for “activities” behind each forecast for improvement

- **Academic Progression Rate**
  - **Financial Aid Policy change**, Pre-calculus and calculus support, Freshman Advising, Campus Housing Support, Student Life improvements
- **Graduation Rates**
  - **Course Withdrawal Policy**, Course availability, Improved advising, Course support
- **Time to Degree**
  - 15 to degree campaign, active advising, term by term road maps, strategic use of summer
- **15+ Credit Hours**
  - 15 to degree campaign, term-by-term roadmaps, strategic use of summer, pre-calc and calculus support, Freshman advising
- **Research Volume**
  - Emphasized proposal production, low overhead to help cost competitive profile, faculty hiring
- **Key**, Green is in Place, Black is underway, Red is starting
Early data for Fall 2019 shows a drop in number of withdrawals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>FA 2018</th>
<th>FA 2019</th>
<th>Mid-Term Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Withdrawals</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC 1147 (Pre-Calc)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC 2311 (Calc 1)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM 2045 (Chemistry)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS 1106 (APS)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS 1380 (Intro to STEM)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 2048 (Physics 1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Hiring Targets for the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>B.S. Degrees</th>
<th>M.S. Degrees</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Student percentage in undergraduate degrees</th>
<th>Replace</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Target Fall 2020</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.70%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Build strength in core degree, recruit new chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Science and Business Analytics</td>
<td>Business Analytics, Data Science</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Improve Data Science strength, add capacity due to FIPR loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Let Program and Faculty Mature, Broaden research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Build environmental, one mechanical to lower teaching load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Arts, and Mathematics Division</td>
<td>Engineering Physics</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Build program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Engineering Mathematics</td>
<td>Engineering Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Build Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>Engineering Mathematics</td>
<td>Engineering Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity in STEM fields continues to NOT mirror the general population.
Faculty recruiting encourages diversity through advertising and process

- **Advertising**
  - Diversity and Inclusion Email
  - Diversity.com
  - DiversityandCareer.com
  - Diversityjobs.com
  - Women in Higher Ed
  - Diversejobs.net
  - AABHE (American Association of Blacks in Higher Education)
  - JBHE (Journal of Blacks in Higher Education)

- **Results for last season**
  - 35% Female
  - 12% Hispanic

- **Process**
  - Requires diversity element on committees
Our Current Focus in the Graduate Program is on Consistent Quality and Efficiency

- **Consistent Quality**
  - Degree standards set globally by Graduate committee (controls broad requirements)
  - Thesis and Thesis Proposal set by Graduate Committee
  - Common track courses set by Department
  - Allowed electives set by Department
  - Thesis committee approved by Chair and Graduate Director

- **Efficiency**
  - Degree name common courses
  - Track common courses
  - Maximum of two upper division under graduate courses

- Degrees include thesis or project
- Each degree includes two common courses
- New Tracks configured to include two common courses and then four electives
- Engineering Management targeted at working professionals

We currently have ~50 graduate students and will add ~5 students next semester
Key Messages for Today

• Admissions and Financial Aid
  – Early positive Indicators, lots of work for 2020
• Student Affairs
  – Very good result with change in Housing
• Four year graduation improvement plan
  – Lots of activity
• Degree Program Additions and Faculty Hiring Status
  – Hiring adds placed
• Student and Faculty Diversity
  – Results somewhat positive, one area of concern
• Graduate Programs
  – Emphasis on quality and Efficiency
• Technology and Pedagogy
  – No report
December 8, 2019

To: Florida Poly Board of Trustees

From: Terry Parker

Re: Understanding Reappointment and Promotion of Faculty

Faculty are not traditional, year round employees that have an “at will” employment relationship with Florida Poly. Each full time faculty member that holds Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor rank holds a nine-month appointment with a fixed duration employment contract. The process used to put in place a new contract is termed “reappointment” and the change in rank is termed “promotion.” Typically, promotion also includes a new contract with a new duration so that reappointment is included in the promotion process.

Florida Poly is a non-tenure granting institution but we have constructed the reappointment and promotion process to replicate many of the employment elements that come with tenure. Tenure based institutions typically have an initial review after three years of employment and then an “up or out” decision at the end of the sixth year. We have an initial review after three years of employment (noting that for faculty that started before June 1, 2017 we have provided an extended timeline) and then for Assistant Professors, an “up or out” promotion decision at the end of the sixth year. The appointment duration for an individual that is promoted is six years. Tenure based institutions typically do not require individuals to achieve promotion to Professor and we do not either. Tenure based institutions increasingly are moving to in-depth post tenure reviews; our reappointment/promotion process is based on an in-depth careful review.

A primary difference between at-will employment and the faculty employment model that we use is the review process for reappointment and/or promotion. Annual evaluations for faculty are performed by their Division Director or Chair and are similar to annual evaluations for staff. Reappointment and/or promotion decisions are based on a lengthy process that includes input from a range of faculty, and in the case of what is termed a “full” review, input from external experts in the individual’s field. Since the result of the reappointment/promotion review is a long term employment commitment to a faculty member, the process is much more thorough and involves multiple individuals.

In the spring of 2019, ten faculty members chose to seek reappointment on the basis of a “shortened” review. Eight of these individuals were successfully reappointed and two individuals were provided with a one-year notice that their employment at Florida Poly would come to an end. In the spring of 2020, at minimum eighteen faculty will be required to seek reappointment via a “shortened” review and two individuals are seeking promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.
The processes used for reappointment are rigidly specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and are very detailed in what “must” be done. In order to provide information to the Board on these processes, the following pages of this memo include: a set of Diagrams that illustrate the process used for faculty evaluation and reappointment and/or promotion, a written summary that provides highlights of Reappointment and/or Promotion, and a set if important dates for this year.
Faculty Evaluation

Development of Evaluation Guidelines to be used for the Evaluation cycle that begins in the following spring.

Evaluation Guideline Changes proposed by Provost office by Sept. 15

Departments provide comments on guidelines by November 1

Review Evaluation Panel provides recommendations on guidelines to Provost by Jan. 15

Guidelines used in development of faculty evaluations at the end of the review period

Evaluation guidelines communicated to faculty before the start of the review period: February 1

Provost provides finalized guidelines to faculty before February 1

Annual Evaluation Review Process

Annual Review Period ends (Jan. 31)

Employee submits Faculty Activity Report by Feb. 15

Division Director or Chair develops Preliminary Evaluation (with help of Evaluation Guideline for the performance period)

Evaluation added to employee file May 15

Division Director or Chair distributes and discusses Evaluation with faculty member by May 1

Evaluation Review Panel considers all faculty reviews, provides inputs to Division Director and Chairs
Establishing University Criteria, Candidate Prepared Dossier Format, and Departmental Clarifications

- University "establishes" criteria and the Candidate Prepared Dossier Format on an annual basis
- Faculty Representative Council formally comments on University Criteria and Dossier Format
- Provost modifies University Criteria and dossier, provides report on modifications to FRC
- Department Committee reviews University Criteria and Creates Department Clarifications
- If clarifications are sent back to department, Committee reconsiders clarifications and resubmits to the Provost
- Provost reviews clarifications and accepts or sends back to Department Committee
- Department Faculty consider clarifications and if approved send to Provost for approval
- Provost issues final revisions and/or approvals

The Shortened Review Process

- Faculty eligible for shortened review notified in the fall semester, Notice provides deadline for submission of materials
- Candidate submits dossier to Provost Office
- University provides PAEP* with candidate Dossier. PAEP reviews candidate dossier and submits recommendation to Provost
- Positive recommendations considered by President. President makes final decision.
- Provost considers PAEP report and makes a positive or negative recommendation. Negative recommendations appealable to President.

- PAEP – Program Area Evaluation Panel, composed of department members with higher rank than the candidate, minimum of three members, chaired by Division Director or Chair if no Director present, further clarification in section 6.8 (e).
The Full Review Process

- **PAEP** – Program Area Evaluation Panel, composed of department members with higher rank than the candidate, minimum of three members, chaired by Division Director or Chair if no Director present, further clarification in section 6.8 (e).
- **UEC** – University Evaluation Committee composed of faculty with rank “Professor,” appointment described in section 6.8 (f).
Summary of Processes for Reappointment and/or Promotion

Definition of Documents used in Faculty Evaluation and Faculty reappointment and/or Promotion

- **Evaluation Guidelines:** these are overall guidelines used by the chairs to produce “fairness” in the faculty evaluation process across the university. These are reviewed in the fall of each year and then provided to the faculty before the start of the next years evaluation cycle (Feb. 1). The document that was reviewed this fall will be finalized and distributed to faculty for use before Feb 1, 2020 and will be used for the 2020-2021 evaluation cycle. The spring 2020 evaluation will use the guideline that was in place for the 2019-20 evaluation cycle.

- **Faculty Activity Report:** defined in section 8.7 of the CBA. This is the annual evaluation document provided by the faculty member that is the primary basis for his or her evaluation. It is defined in Appendix B of the CBA and the FRC may recommend changes to the Faculty Activity Report each year before December 1.

- **University Criteria:** Defined in section 6.5 (a). These are the broad criteria that are used as a “benchmark” for reappointment and/or promotion recommendations.

- **Department Clarifications:** Defined in section 6.5 (b). These are “clarifications” that allow a department to provide guidance on how the university criteria apply to the field(s) included in each department.

- **Dossier** (formally labeled in the CBA as the “Candidate Prepared Dossier”). The document that a faculty member submits for consideration of reappointment or promotion. This document format is generated by the Provost office, reviewed by the FRC, and then finalized by the provost office. Current interpretation is that this is done annually in the fall. Please note that the Dossier and the Faculty Activity Report are not the same document in spite of some lack of precision in the language used in the CBA.

---

**Appointment Terms:**

- Instructor – two years, renewed annually
- Assistant and Associate Professor – initial three years, reappointed to three years, Assistant may only be reappointed once without change in rank
- Associate Professor – six years after promotion
- Promotion – six years unless initially defined to be a shorter term
- Exception – faculty hired before June 1, 2017 must have shortened review by end of spring 2021

**Faculty Dossier**

- Formal format used to consider reappointment (similar to annual evaluation)
- Prepared by Candidate
- Format provided annually by Provost to FRC for review
- This has been done for 2019-20 year
University Criteria and Department Clarifications:

Criteria for reappointment or promotion established annually (reviewed by FRC, not mandatory). Review has been done for 2019-20 AY.

Department clarifications developed by Department Committee (clarifications offer refinement to university criteria to accommodate differences in disciplines)

Department committee is Vice Provost Academic Affairs, Division Director (or chair if there is no Division Director), two faculty members. Clarifications reviewed by department faculty.

Timeline is very formal, see section 6.5c of CBA, timeline for 2019-20 provided below.

Timeline for department clarifications:

Provost “provide a framework and formally charge” committee …… Formally charge effort NOW, noting complications of finals and winter break, committees to provide results to departments on or before January 8

Department faculty vote by Jan 18, if accepted, forwarded to Provost for review. If rejected, committee reconsider clarifications by Jan 23, second vote in department by Jan 28.

Provost Review: either accept or return to committee within ten days of receipt, if return, committee has 10 days to resubmit, subsequently, Provost has 7 days to finalize based on inputs.

Shortened Review

Review by Department committee with no external letters that is required to produce a 3 year reappointment

Program Area Evaluation Panel (PAEP) consists of all division faculty of appropriate rank (or department if not in SAM). Minimum committee size is three. See section 6.8(e) of CBA.

PAEP provides formal recommendation to Provost.

Provost creates positive or negative recommendation. Positive recommendations forwarded to President for decision.

Full Review

Shortened review with the addition of external letters and University committee review

Minimum of 4 external letters, 2 letters from individuals nominated by candidate

University Evaluation Committee (UEC) – three individuals holding full rank

UEC considers candidate dossier AND PAEP report. Provides recommendation to Provost.

Provost creates positive or negative recommendation. Positive recommendations forwarded to President for decision.
Important Dates for Reappointment and/or Promotion Review

Reappointment For Faculty Employed before June 1, 2017 (see section 6.2 (b))

- Notice of reappointment process for the spring 2020 sent to faculty by Provost – December 5, 2019.
- Faculty request shortened review by January 15, 2020 (email to Provost, copy to director or chair if no director is present).
- Faculty list of individuals to be reviewed determined and faculty that will be reviewed informed by January 20, 2020. Provost office sends out notification.
- PAEP committees formalized February 15, 2020 (committees defined in section 6.8 (e)).
- PAEP reports due to Provost April 15, 2020.

Reappointment For Faculty Employed after June 1, 2017 with a contract end date in 2020

- Notice of upcoming reappointment review sent to faculty by Provost– December 5, 2019.
- Reappointment Dossiers due in Provost’s office February 26, 2020
- PAEP committees formalized February 15, 2020 (committees defined in section 6.8 (e)).
- PAEP reports due to Provost April 15, 2020

For Faculty Undergoing Promotion review

- Final Promotion Dossier and suggested names of external reviewers provided to Provost office by Dec 2, 2019.
- External reviewers determined and requests for letters in place by December 10, 2019.
- PAEP report provided to UEC due March 1, 2020
- UEC report due April 15, 2020 (UEC defined in section 6.8 (f)).