

[This handbook has bookmarks for ease in navigation.](#)

Faculty Handbook

Florida Institute of Technology

August 2024

Introduction

The Florida Tech Faculty Handbook is a core governance document of the Florida Tech academic community. The Faculty Handbook establishes university governance, faculty rights, faculty responsibilities, and academic policies. Among the most important academic policies defined by the Faculty Handbook are those related to teaching, scholarship, advising, appointment, tenure, and promotion. Policies and guidelines of the Faculty Handbook apply to the Florida Tech faculty as defined in FH 1.4, Article I, Section 1. Other documents maintained by administrative offices, such as Human Resources and the Office of Sponsored Programs, apply to all Florida Tech employees, including faculty. Faculty are expected to follow all university-wide policies and procedures. Colleges and other academic units may establish internal academic policies that supplement the Faculty Handbook but they may not supersede or replace those found in the Faculty Handbook.

The Faculty Handbook includes the academic faculty and Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws, sections describing faculty guidelines, policies, procedures, and standards, and a brief history and mission of the university.

Revisions to the Faculty Handbook are made annually and require approval by a simple majority vote of the Faculty Senate and approval by the university president (excluding FH 1.4). Changes to the Faculty Handbook take effect at the beginning of the academic year following their approval. This process is described in FH 1.6. Each updated edition of the Faculty Handbook has a unique revision date and summary of substantive changes from the prior version. The handbook is accessed from the university website.

Policies

FH 1.4 Constitution And Bylaws Of The Academic Faculty And Faculty Senate

Effective Date 12/08/2021

Preamble

No less than its predecessors, the modern institution of higher learning is a guardian and interpreter of intellectual tradition. It is on the competence, integrity and devotion of its faculty to professional ideals that the university must depend for success.

In order for the academic faculty to carry out the ideals and responsibilities set forth above; and

In order for the faculty to more fully and effectively serve the university by participating in the consideration of academic policies and procedures; and

In order to facilitate participation and provide channels for faculty recommendations and suggestions to the president of the university via the provost, so the president may have advice and assistance from faculty in matters pertaining to the educational interests of the university; and

In order to allow the president via the chief operating officer to assign to faculty problems for investigation and report and to receive from them their recommendations and reports on their initiatives; and

In order to maintain morale and augment understanding and cooperation between the faculty and administration.

The faculty of Florida Tech is organized as the academic faculty; its membership, functions, and procedures, being set forth in the following constitution and bylaws:

Article I: The Academic Faculty

Section 1: Membership

The academic faculty of Florida Tech shall consist of the university president, the chief academic officer, deans, the heads of departments, those members of the faculty holding the rank of professor, research professor, university professor, associate professor, associate research professor, assistant professor, assistant research professor, clinical faculty, instructor, librarians (including assistant, and associate librarians) holding faculty rank who are full-time faculty, and temporary faculty (including adjuncts, visiting faculty, etc.), and such other members as may be duly elected provided for in the bylaws.

Section 2: Functions

The functions of the academic faculty shall be to approve candidates for degrees; to refer to the Faculty Senate's executive committee such matters as may affect the welfare of its members and the academic policies of the university for investigation and action; to receive reports from the Faculty Senate of its actions; and to act on any other matters brought before it by the Faculty Senate.

Section 3: Officers

The officers of the academic faculty shall consist of a chair and a secretary. The chief academic officer shall serve as chair, and he shall appoint the secretary and, when necessary, a presiding officer to serve in his/her absence.

Section 4: Meetings

A meeting of the academic faculty shall be held at least once each year, during which the chair of each of the standing committees will deliver their reports. The Faculty Senate may request that the chair call a special meeting of the academic faculty.

Article II: The Faculty Senate

Section 1: Definition

The academic faculty shall elect from among its members an executive committee to be known as the Faculty Senate.

Section 2: Membership

The Faculty Senate shall consist of those members elected by the faculty members of the academic units, as provided for in the bylaws.

Section 3: Functions

The functions of the Faculty Senate shall be to consider policies affecting the academic activities of the university, faculty, welfare, administration, scholarship, awarding of degrees and such other matters as may maintain and promote the best interests of the university. The Faculty Senate shall recommend to the chief academic officer the establishment of new policies or changes to existing policies and report its actions to the academic faculty.

Section 4: Officers

The officers of the Faculty Senate shall consist of a president, a president-elect and a secretary elected by the Faculty Senate from among its members. The election of officers shall be as provided for in the bylaws.

Section 5: Committees

The standing committees of the Faculty Senate shall be:

- Executive Committee
- Welfare Committee
- Scholarship Committee
- Faculty Excellence Committee

- Academic Policies Committee
- Administrative Policies Committee
- Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee

Special committees of the Faculty Senate may be appointed by the Executive Committee. The composition of the standing and special committees and the duties of the former shall be as provided for in the bylaws.

Section 6: Meetings

The Faculty Senate shall hold one regular meeting each month during the months of September through April at such times as specified in the bylaws.

Special meetings of the Faculty Senate may be called by the presiding officer at any time, including May, June, July and August, provided a majority of the members of the executive committee or their replacements, deem it necessary.

Except for meetings of the executive committee, all meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be open to any member of the faculty. Such visitors may be invited by a member of the executive committee to participate in particular discussions.

Any member of the faculty may present any problem or suggestion to the Faculty Senate for its consideration, provided the member notifies the senate president at least one week before the meeting at which he/she would like to appear.

The Faculty Senate may go into executive session by approval of the members present.

Article III: Rules of Order

www.rulesonline.com

The faculty may amend the constitution during any regularly scheduled meeting by a two-thirds' majority vote of the members present. A proposed amendment must be recommended by at least ten members of the faculty, submitted to the Faculty Senate at their next regular meeting, and submitted with the recommendations of the Faculty Senate to the members of the faculty in writing at least ten days before the next meeting at which action on the amendment could then be taken.

An Amendment shall become effective when approved by the Academic Faculty.

Bylaws

Article I: The Academic Faculty

Section 1: Membership

A petition for the election to membership in the academic faculty of any person who is not automatically a member as prescribed in Article I, Section I, of the Constitution, must be submitted to the Faculty Senate and referred by this body, with its recommendation, to the academic faculty for action at the next regular meeting. Election to membership shall be by a simple majority vote of the Academic Faculty members present.

Section 2: Quorum

A quorum for any meeting of the academic faculty shall be that number of members deemed necessary by the presiding officer to transact any business.

Article II: The Faculty Senate

Section 1: Membership

The members of the faculty, voting by academic unit for their individual representatives, shall elect members of the Faculty Senate for a three-year term. Each academic unit shall have one member on the Faculty Senate and an additional member for every ten full-time faculty.

The term academic unit throughout this section shall have the following meanings:

1. In the colleges, a department. For the purpose of senate apportionment, a program outside any department shall be attached to a department within the same college.
2. Each school as a whole within a college.
3. The library.

The chief academic officer shall notify the head of each academic unit as to the total number of senate members to which that academic unit is entitled for its first election. This original allocation shall continue for one year. Thereafter, the president of the senate shall obtain the new allocation from the chief academic officer in February of each calendar year. This new allocation shall be given to the head of each academic unit in time for the March election and will control the number elected to the senate at that time. If one member is gained, one shall be elected for three years, and one for two years, etc. If one member is lost in the new allocation, one less member shall be elected to the senate at that election.

Elections shall be held in March of each year, terms of office to begin with adjournment of the April meeting of the senate. The election of members to the senate shall be by secret ballot.

Vacancies created in the senate for any cause shall be filled for the unexpired term by supplementary elections within the academic unit concerned as soon as the vacancy occurs.

Each academic unit is authorized to hold a special election for the purpose of selecting temporary replacements for any senate member who will not be in residence for three or more consecutive months.

Any member of the academic faculty is eligible for membership on the senate.

Section 2: Officers

The officers of the senate shall be elected at the regular meeting held in April of each year.

Elections of officers shall be by a simple majority vote. In the case of the withdrawal of an officer other than the president by resignation or other cause, the senate should elect a successor for the unexpired term at the next regular meeting. In the case of the withdrawal of the president, the president-elect shall serve the president's unexpired term as well as the normal term as their president's successor.

The retiring officers shall serve at the April meeting, and the retiring president shall give the Faculty Senate report at the annual meeting of the academic faculty. The incoming officers shall assume their respective offices on adjournment of the April meeting.

Section 3: Meetings

The Faculty Senate shall hold its first regular monthly meeting on the first Tuesday in September and its regular meetings thereafter at such times as designated by the Executive Committee.

Section 4: Quorum

Fifty-one percent of the elected members of the Faculty Senate shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of all business.

Section 5: Committees

The chair and at least one voting member from each committee of the Faculty Senate shall be members of the Faculty Senate, and all other committee members shall be from the faculty. The basic function of the committees shall be to investigate and recommend changes in matters pertaining to the academic affairs of the university. They may do this either on their own initiative or on instruction from the Faculty Senate. The faculty, provost or the president of the university may ask through the Faculty Senate that the committee investigate and report on any academic matter. It is not envisioned that these committees shall operate in any administrative capacity; they will report only to the Faculty Senate.

The composition and duties of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate shall be as follows:

- 1. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee:** The committee shall be composed of the officers and chairs of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate and the immediate past president. The committee shall be chaired by the president of the senate. This committee coordinates the business to come before the senate.
- 2. Welfare Committee:** The committee shall be concerned with policies that affect faculty welfare and morale. This committee should make recommendations concerning fringe benefits, tuition benefits, equity raises, and other related matters.
- 3. Scholarship Committee:** The committee shall be responsible for the administration and financial aspects of the senate's scholarship program. The committee shall determine the number of scholarships and the departments to which scholarships will be awarded.
- 4. Faculty Excellence Committee:** The committee shall be concerned with providing opportunities that emphasize people and activities that significantly contribute to the excellence of the university's distinctive educational programs. Duties include providing recommendations on the use of monies for professional development; recognizing outstanding faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service; coordinating forums for faculty discussion on educational issues; and disseminating information about effective teaching. Committee membership will include representation from each college.

- 5. Academic Policies Committee:** The committee shall be concerned with all policies of an academic nature that pertain to students, including recruitment, entrance requirements, class attendance regulations, student counseling, and placement and academic misconduct.
- 6. Administrative Policies Committee:** The committee shall be concerned with policies that relate to the employment conditions of the faculty and make recommendations relative to such policies as qualifications for promotion, contract renewals, research, teaching loads, extracurricular assignments, summer employment, absence, sabbatical leaves, travel, dissemination of information to and from the faculty, academic freedom, and related policies.
- 7. Technology Resources and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee:** The committee shall be concerned with issues that relate to technology, resources, and infrastructure critical to faculty success in the core areas of teaching, research, and service. As an example, the committee shall provide recommendations to the faculty senate with regards to requirements in information technology, information assurance, educational equipment, learning management systems, enterprise architecture considerations, facilities and critical technologies, and resources and infrastructure for faculty to conduct, evolve and excel in their teaching, research, and service roles/missions. The committee will interact and participate with university committees as needed to represent faculty interests relative to technology, resources, and infrastructure.

Order of Business

Section 1: The Academic Faculty

- Call to order, reading, and approval of minutes
- Unfinished business
- Reports from the Faculty Senate
- New Business

Section 2: The Faculty Senate

- Call to order, reading, and approval of minutes
- Reports

- Unfinished business
- New Business
- Discussion and Adjournment

Amendment

The academic faculty may amend these bylaws at any of the regularly scheduled meetings by a simple majority vote of the members present. A proposal for amendment must be recommended by at least three members of the faculty, submitted in writing and, with the recommendation of the Faculty Senate, submitted to the members of the academic faculty at least ten days before the next meeting at which time action on the amendment could be taken. An amendment shall become effective when approved by the faculty.

FH 1.5 Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty

Effective Date Oct 30, 2015

FH 1.5.1 Library Committee

1. Faculty Library Committee Charter

1.5 Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty – Revised October 2015

1.5.1 Library Committee

PURPOSE

1. The Library Committee has advisory, consultative and interpretive roles with the Evans Library, the faculty and the university administration. Its value lies in communicating faculty opinions and needs to the Library administration and transmitting decisions regarding Library policies, services and resources to constituents.
2. Committee members represent and report the interests of their colleges and the faculty-at-large. Members will suggest policy, review policy changes and advise the Dean of Libraries on matters essential for the Library to achieve its mission and to strengthen its role as a major player in the institution's research and education.
3. The Committee consults with the Dean of Libraries and makes recommendations regarding issues identified by university leadership, the Faculty Senate, or the campus community.
4. Committee meetings are open to anyone who wishes to observe their proceedings.
5. The committee reviews proposed degree programs for the adequacy of library resources and services. The Library Committee members and the Library representative to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee are tasked with bringing forward these matters

for discussion and communication of concerns and possibilities.

STRUCTURE

The Library Committee shall consist of 16–17 members approved by the Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer. The size and composition of the committee may change in concert with development of the university's academic and research programs. Generally the committee will meet once per month during the academic year. The composition of the committee will be as follow:

1. One (1) faculty member, a Senator, nominated by the President of the Faculty Senate;
2. Faculty representatives from the five colleges, accordingly;
 1. College of Aeronautics (1)
 2. College of Business (2) (1, Melbourne campus; 1, Extended Studies, who may be faculty or staff)
 3. College of Engineering and Science (4)
 4. College of Psychology and Liberal Arts (2) (1, Psychology; 1, Arts and Communication)
 5. One Online Learning representative, who may be faculty or staff;
 6. The Dean of Libraries or designee as an ex-officio member of the committee and;
 7. 3–4 members of the library's leadership team, as ex-officio members.
 8. A student to be selected by recommendation of the Student Library Advisory Council.
 9. The committee will elect its chair from among its members.

TERM OF OFFICE

The term of office follows the academic year. Terms are for three years. Members may be re-appointed to non-consecutive terms.

RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The Library Committee shall advise and make recommendations on matters pertinent to the research and general service functions of the library, including resources.
2. The Library Committee shall serve as a conduit for suggestions from faculty for the improvement of the library.
3. The Library Committee shall report to the Chief Academic Officer annually to inform and advise on the adequacy and effectiveness of the resource and services, staffing and facility.
4. The Library Committee communicates its findings and recommendations to the faculty; and fosters and participates actively in dialogs with the academic community concerning the future and progress of the Library.
5. The Library Committee shall advocate for Library inclusion in grant proposals, college activities, alumni events and matters pertinent to the Library.
6. The Library Committee shall meet no less than two times a semester excluding summer.

OPERATING PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

1. The committee members shall relay to the university's leadership, the Faculty Senate and their college constituents Library progress, new services and issues related to resources or challenges, as well as any updated charter.
2. The committee chair will set meeting agendas and assign the task of keeping meeting minutes to any committee member.
3. A change to the Charter requires a majority vote of a quorum, which is 75 percent of voting members.
4. Rules of order shall follow the university's tradition in carrying out its meetings.

FH 1.5.2 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UGCC)

The UGCC is responsible for recommending the addition or deletion of existing undergraduate curricula and specific changes within the curricula to the chief academic officer. The voting membership of the UGCC is comprised of one full-time faculty from each academic unit offering undergraduate courses, one full-time library faculty, one representative from Military Science, one representative from Honors College, and one representative from Freshman-Year Experience. The College of Aeronautics, the College of Business, and the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts have additional members to represent the programs offering online courses. Selected units in College of Engineering and Science have two representatives to represent science and engineering programs separately. Voting members should have extensive university-level academic experience. The voting member will be elected by the academic unit's faculty and approved by the chief academic officer. The university registrar, academic deans, and representatives of the chief academic officer are ex officio, nonvoting members.

FH 1.5.3 Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)

This committee consists of at least four members of the academic faculty appointed by the vice president for research in accordance with the requirements of the National Institutes of Health. The vice president for research appoints the chair from among the faculty and also appoints a fifth member, who has no affiliation with Florida Tech other than by membership on IACUC.

FH 1.5.4 Intellectual Property Committee

This is a university-wide committee having significant faculty representation. The usual membership includes the chief academic officer as chair, the vice president for financial affairs, vice president for research, and three faculty.

FH 1.5.5 Graduate Council

See graduate policy "Graduate Council."

FH 1.5.6 Graduate Faculty

See graduate policy "Graduate Faculty."

FH 1.5.7 Ombudsman Committee

Three senior faculty members are appointed by the chief academic officer to serve as an ombudsman committee to hear grievances (other than those associated with termination) that a faculty member does not feel comfortable pursuing through the usual organizational structure, i.e., department head, dean, chief academic officer, or the president. Usually, the faculty member approaches one member of the committee and describes the problem. They then decide whether other members of the committee should be involved and the best approach to resolving the problem.

If resolution of the problem requires disclosure of the member's identity, such disclosure is made only with the approval of the faculty member.

FH 1.5.8

This section is blank.

FH 1.5.9 University Research Council

The University Research Council is responsible for representing the active research interests of the university, making recommendations to the chief academic officer and communicating to the faculty at large as needed. The council will consist of at least one representative from each college and from the Office of Research. Institutes and centers may send a representative if desired. The chair will be elected by the council and serve a one-year term.

FH 1.5.10 Institutional Review Board

<http://www.fit.edu/research/committees/irb/index.php>

Florida Institute of Technology is committed to full compliance with federal rules for the protection of human subjects in research. In accordance with federal regulations (45 CFR 46), all research involving human subjects must be reviewed, or determined exempt, by an institutional review board (IRB), to assure certain protections for human participants.

Any research involving human subjects should be reviewed if it is sponsored by the university, conducted by or under the direction of any university employee in connection with his or her university responsibilities, conducted on or with university property, or involves the use of the university's nonpublic information to identify or contact subjects or prospective subjects. Note that the IRB does not require review of student projects conducted in the context of coursework.

The IRB must review and approve human subjects research before any work is started and must review ongoing nonexempt research at least annually.

The IRB must also review all changes to research protocols before implementation (except when necessary to eliminate any immediate hazards to subjects or others).

FH 1.5.11 University Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure

Purpose and Composition

The University Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (UCFPT) shall be purposed with the task of providing oversight to ensure the uniform and objective application of procedures in college-level promotion and tenure committee reviews. The UCFPT shall have the following composition:

- College of Aeronautics: 2 members
- College of Engineering and Science: 4 members (2 from Engineering, 2 from Science)
- College of Psychology and Liberal Arts: 2 members
- Nathan Bisk College of Business: 2 members

At the university level, the members serve and represent the Florida Institute of Technology, not their academic units, following a diverse committee composition model. Members are selected through a nomination and election process conducted by the Faculty Senate. Members shall be tenured full professors. If no eligible full professors are available, then a tenured associate professor may be selected. Members serve for three-year terms with no more than two terms in succession. The terms of approximately one-third of the members will expire each year. If a member of the committee is to be considered for promotion, that member must first resign and be replaced by another representative of the college. In the absence of committee members (examples include recusal and illness) the Provost and the Faculty Senate president will identify alternate members. The operating procedures of the committee are described in faculty policy “FH 2.8.1 Tenure Policies And Procedures.” Members of this committee may not serve on a college promotion and tenure committee or on the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee simultaneously.

FH 1.5.12 University Teaching-track Promotion Committee

Purpose and Composition

The University Teaching-track Promotion Committee (UTPC) shall be purposed with the task of providing oversight to ensure the uniform and objective application of procedures in college-level promotion committee reviews. The UTPC shall have the following composition:

- College of Aeronautics: 2 members
- College of Engineering and Science: 4 members (2 from Engineering, 2 from Science)
- College of Psychology and Liberal Arts: 2 members
- Evans Library: 2 members
- Nathan Bisk College of Business: 2 members

At the university level, the members serve and represent the Florida Institute of Technology, not their academic units, following a diverse committee composition model. Members are selected through a nomination and election process conducted by the Faculty Senate. Members shall be teaching-track full professors or librarians. If no eligible full professors or librarians are available, then an associate professor or associate librarian may be chosen. Members serve for three-year terms with no more than two terms in succession. The terms of approximately one-third of the members will expire each year. If a member of the committee is to be considered for promotion, that member must first resign and be replaced by another representative of the library or college. In the absence of committee members (examples include recusal and illness) the Provost and the Faculty Senate president will identify alternate members. The operating procedures of the committee are described in faculty policy “FH 2.8.2 Teaching Track Promotion Policies And Procedures.” Members of this committee may not serve on a college promotion committee or on the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee simultaneously.

FH 1.6 Faculty Handbook Revision Procedure

Effective Date 12/08/2021

Revisions to the Faculty Handbook must be approved by both the Faculty Senate and the university president. Any member of the Florida Tech faculty, staff or administration may present a suggestion for revising the Faculty Handbook. A proposal with written explanation and justification of the proposed change must be submitted to the Faculty Senate president at least one week before the meeting at which he/she would like the Faculty Senate to consider the suggestion.

Suggested revisions will be first referred to the Faculty Senate's Administrative Policies Committee or, if the senate president chooses, to an ad hoc senate committee for consideration. Proposed revisions specific to FH 2.8.1 Tenure Policies and Procedures will be referred to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC). The committee will review the suggested revision and consult with the chief academic officer (CAO) and senate president. The CAO may also designate one or more administrators who will discuss the proposed revision with the senate committee. The committee will make its recommendation to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate shall discuss the proposed revision during at least one meeting prior to voting on the revision. The Faculty Senate shall approve the proposed revisions by a simple majority vote. The revision must then be approved by the university president in order to be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook. The revision will take effect at the beginning of the academic year following its approval. The CAO will announce these revisions to the general faculty via email in a timely manner.

In special circumstances, a proposed change to the Faculty Handbook may warrant expedited implementation. In these cases, in addition to the written explanation and justification of the proposed change, a request and justification for expedited implementation must be provided in the submitted proposal. The suggested revision and the expedited-implementation status request will be deliberated in the initial consultation between the CAO (and designated administrators), the Faculty Senate committee (Administrative Policies Committee, ad hoc senate committee, or AFTC), and the

senate president. The outcome will be communicated to the originator of the proposal prior to the committee's recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Handbook revisions that consist of simple updates to factual information or changes required in order to conform to applicable laws and accreditation agency policies are exempt from this policy. Such revisions require only the university president's approval and become effective immediately. In cases when such revisions are necessary, the CAO will consult with the Faculty Senate prior to the president's final approval. The CAO will announce these revisions to the senate president and to the general faculty via email in a timely manner. The second exception to this policy applies to revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Faculty and Faculty Senate (FH 1.4), which is amended according to the procedure described in that section.

FH 2.1 Faculty Rank

Effective Date Jan 14, 2013, Revised May 2, 2024

FH 2.1 Academic Rank

The academic ranks and minimum requirements for each are as follows:

Professor: A doctoral degree or its equivalent with at least five years of successful teaching as an associate professor, and undoubted evidence of scholarly attainments and/or outstanding ability as a teacher.*

Associate Professor: A terminal degree in the faculty member's field with at least five years of successful teaching as an assistant professor, and some evidence of scholarly attainment and/or superior ability as a teacher.*

Assistant Professor: A terminal or advanced degree in the faculty member's field with at least five years of college-level teaching or equivalent professional experience.*

Instructor: At least a master's degree or its equivalent with teaching experience is preferred but not required.

Librarian: At least a master's degree in library science with primary duties that do not include teaching (see also FH Appendix 6 for further information on librarian ranks).

Adjunct Faculty: Temporary, part-time teaching faculty.

See also faculty policy FH 2.2 "Conferring Titles of Emeritus" <https://www.fit.edu/emeritus/>.

**Note: Professors whose major function is research rather than teaching may have "research" preceding their academic title (i.e., research professor). The same approach applies to clinical faculty (i.e., Clinical Professor) visiting faculty, etc. Professors conferred with endowed chairs may have the*

endowment name preceding their academic title (i.e., Henry Professor). University Professor is a faculty appointment made by the president and chief academic officer.

To meet the requirements for appointment and promotion, faculty members should have earned degrees from institutions of recognized standing and should hold degrees appropriate for their subject field or work. The faculty member is responsible for furnishing transcripts certifying all degrees. The above rank-by-rank specifications are given only as a guiding policy and are not intended as justification for automatic promotion nor intended to prohibit appointment and/or promotion of rare individuals whose experience and accomplishments outweigh the lack of formal academic training.

The qualities to be recognized through appointments and promotions extend far beyond, and some cases may be independent of, the possession of advanced degrees and years of experience. These important though less tangible factors can be regularly evaluated, but can hardly be meaningfully enumerated on a rank-by-rank statement of policy. Nevertheless, it is not intended in any way to minimize their importance.

FH 2.2 Policy on Conferring Titles of Emeritus

Effective Date Jun 16, 2008

In recognition of faithful service, the title of Emeritus will be conferred on professors, associate professors and assistant professors who have a minimum of fifteen years' academic service, with at least ten at Florida Tech, at the time of their retirement from the university.

There shall be no distinction between retiring for age, length of service or disability, as long as the required minimum length of service is met.

For details see: <https://www.fit.edu/emeritus/>.

FH 2.5.1 Definition of a Full-Time Faculty Member

Effective Date August 1, 2024

A **full-time faculty member** is an individual employed by the institution on a full-time basis (as defined by the HR Recruitment and Employment Policy) whose primary responsibilities include a combination of teaching, scholarly activity, service, or, for library faculty, librarianship.

Full-time faculty members are generally expected to engage in a combination of:

- Teaching: Instructing students in credit-bearing courses and mentorship of students
- Scholarly activity: Conducting research, publishing academic work, or engaging in creative endeavors in their field
- Service: Participating in institutional governance, serving on committees, and contributing to the broader academic community
- Librarianship (for library faculty): Providing library services, managing collections, and supporting information literacy

The specific balance and expectations for these activities may vary based on the faculty member's academic appointment. A full-time faculty member's load is generally broken down into five units, each representing 20% of their time. However, one unit need not be exclusively dedicated to teaching, scholarship, service, or librarianship (e.g., one unit might be covered by teaching a three-credit course, or teaching a one-credit course with additional service or scholarly activity). Unless otherwise agreed upon in writing with the supervisor, duties, responsibilities, and assignment of a full-time faculty member must be consistent with the expectations established for the faculty member's track and rank within their respective academic unit.

Exclusion: Faculty members whose primary role is administrative (such as president, provost, vice presidents or equivalent, deans, academic unit heads/chair, directors, or other senior administrators) are

not considered full-time faculty for the purposes of this definition, regardless of any teaching or research activities they may perform in addition to their administrative duties.

FH 2.5.2 Policy on Periods of Faculty Appointments

Effective Date Jul 4, 2011, Revised July 1, 2024

The periods of faculty appointment at Florida Tech are as follows:

- Pre-Tenure Faculty – The probationary period before granting of tenure is usually six contract years for newly hired faculty with no prior appointments as faculty at other institutions. Pre-tenure contracts typically include an original one-year probationary contract at the time of hire, followed by a three-year pre-tenure probationary contractual appointment. The faculty member will undergo a pre-tenure review in the second year of the three-year pre-tenure probationary contract. If successful, the faculty member receives a four-year pre-tenure contractual appointment that replaces the current pre-tenure probationary appointment. If unsuccessful, the faculty member can remain employed for the remainder of the pre-tenure probationary appointment and will not proceed to a pre-tenure status. Tenure review and appointment are expected to occur in the third year of the four-year pre-tenure contractual appointment. If granted, tenure is effective at the beginning of the last contract year. If not granted, the faculty can remain employed during their last year of contract (see, FH 2.8.1.2.1.2 Pre-tenure Contract). Equivalency Credit and Reduction of Probationary Period and Extension of Probationary Period are described in FH 2.8.1.2.1.2.2 and FH 2.8.1.2.1.2.3, respectively. See also FH 2.8.1.2.1.2 Pre-Tenure Contract.
- Tenured Faculty – Upon receiving tenure, tenured faculty members receive a permanent appointment, subject only to sanctions described under FH 2.8.1.5.3.5 pertaining to outcomes of the post-tenure review process (see, FH 2.8.1.5).
- Non-Tenure Faculty – Length of non-tenure (teaching or clinical) faculty appointment is dependent upon the faculty member's rank. Full professors receive five-year appointments with renewal review during the Spring Semester of the fourth year of the appointment; associate professors, four-year appointments with renewal review during the

Spring Semester of the third year; and assistant professors, three-year appointments with the renewal review during the Spring Semester of the second year of the appointment.

A senior member of the faculty is one at the rank of professor, associate professor or assistant professor. A faculty member becomes “established” when he/she has progressed beyond the first year status, except in unusual cases when he/she is initially appointed as an established member. The chief academic officer must approve these unusual cases.

A new member of the senior faculty, unless initially appointed as established, receives an initial one-year probationary contract and will be informed before December 15 of their first year on the faculty if their services will not be used in the following academic year. The faculty member’s status will be reviewed in the Spring Semester of the first year when their appointments will either be renewed for four years in the case of a full professor and three years in the case of an assistant or associate professor, or they will be re-appointed on first-year status and subsequently treated as one who commences service the following Fall Semester. Professors without previous university faculty experience should expect a second one-year appointment. Reappointment may continue on a first-year status with the approval of the chief academic officer.

Non-tenured faculty members who serve as administrators of academic units (e.g., deans, associate/assistant deans, academic unit heads, institute directors and directors of off-campus instructional sites), will be considered to be serving in the penultimate year of their established period.

Non-tenured faculty members shall be notified of subsequent year salary and promotion no later than April 1 of each academic year.

- Librarians– Members of the library faculty receive a two-year appointment, irrespective of the faculty member’s rank. Consideration for appointment renewal occurs in the spring semester during the first year of the appointment. The library faculty members shall be notified no later than April 1 if a succeeding appointment will be offered.
- Research Faculty – Research faculty receive a temporary appointment period within the university, ranging from a semester to a few years. Appointment may be full-time (nine-month) or part-time. Full-time research faculty members receive a nine-month contract,

with the option of receiving a three-month appointment contract during the summer semester if they hold a research contract that can support such a contract. Consideration for renewal of the nine-month appointment occurs annually in the spring semester. The research faculty member shall be notified no later than April 1 if a succeeding appointment will be offered. Appointments for part-time research faculty members vary and are negotiated with the leadership of the academic unit(s) for which they will conduct research, with no expectation of being rehired once the appointment contract term expires.

- Instructor Faculty – Instructor faculty members receive a nine-month contract, with the option of receiving a three-month appointment contract during the summer semester for teaching services if desired by the university. Consideration for renewal of the nine-month appointment occurs annually in the spring semester. The instructor faculty member shall be notified no later than April 1 if a succeeding appointment will be offered.
- Visiting Faculty – Visiting faculty members receive a temporary appointment period within the university, ranging from a semester to a few years. Appointment may be full-time (nine-month) or part-time. Consideration for renewal of the nine-month full-time visitor appointment occurs annually in the spring semester. The visiting faculty members shall be notified no later than April 1 if a succeeding appointment will be offered.
- Adjunct Faculty – Part-time adjunct faculty members are hired on a semester-by-semester basis to teach one or more courses, with no expectation of being rehired once their contract term expires.

A member of the faculty may obtain a prompt Faculty Senate evaluation of any administrative action taken on his or her appointment status. The senate's recommendation is submitted to the chief academic officer.

This policy applies only to persons holding faculty rank whose primary duty is instruction and/or research. Therefore, those holding an administrative appointment such as the president of the university, the chief academic officer, vice-presidents or equivalents, deans, associate/assistant deans, academic unit heads, except where a tenured or an established faculty member as noted above, and ROTC officers will be automatically excluded from this policy.

FH 2.6 Statement of Equal Opportunity

The equal opportunity policy is identical to The Office of Human Resources policy on Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity (effective date April 1, 2018; revised July 2021).

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/human-resources-policies/equal-opportunity/affirmative-action/equal-opportunity/>

Procedure

If you feel that the university has discriminated against you during its employment process, please contact the Office of Human Resources (321) 674-8100 and/or the Title IX Coordinator (321) 309-3068.

It is Florida Tech's policy and practice to prohibit discrimination because of race, gender, color, religion, creed, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, disability, sexual orientation, protected veteran status or any other discrimination prohibited by law.

The university, as an Equal Opportunity Employer, has adopted standards and practices that ensure all applicants for employment and all employees are treated in a fair and impartial manner that recognizes the dignity of each individual and allows selection and advancement based on qualifications and abilities.

If a faculty member feels he/she has been discriminated against regarding access to employment, hiring, promotion, compensation, job assignment or fringe benefits solely because of race, gender, color, religion, creed, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, disability, sexual orientation, Vietnam-era veteran status or any other discrimination prohibited by law, he/she is entitled to request review by an ad hoc Faculty Senate grievance committee (see policy "Dismissals and Terminations"), or by the Ombudsman Committee in the policy "Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty", or by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (FH 2.8.1).

FH 2.6.1 Employment of Persons with Disabilities

Applications of persons with disabilities will be given equal consideration with other applications, and no restrictions will be established to prohibit employment of applicants with disabilities, except where a physician's statement indicates that employment in a particular position would create a potential hazard for the applicant, fellow workers, or the university. All efforts will be made to accommodate disabilities on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

FH 2.7 Guidelines for Faculty Promotion

Effective Date July 4, 2011, Revised May 2, 2024

Colleges develop their own promotion guidelines to supplement the general academic rank requirements noted in "Academic Rank" (FH 2.1). At the direction of the chief academic officer, the University Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure and the University Teaching-Track Promotion Committee are obliged to apply the promotion guidelines from individual colleges, including a teaching route to promotion, to that college's promotion candidates. All faculty members at Florida Tech are encouraged to enhance their professional credentials through their own initiatives in acquiring professional growth and development experience.

FH 2.8.1 Tenure Policies And Procedures

Effective Date 12/08/2021

Tenure safeguards academic freedom in teaching and research, and ensures continuous appointments at Florida Tech for tenured full-time faculty. Tenure is granted after extensive peer and institutional review following an intensive probationary period when work expectations and college criteria must be met.

Robust annual evaluation processes monitor performance after tenure appointment and, if necessary, a post-tenure review process. Review processes are governed in part by two university-level, faculty-led committees, which are listed and defined below:

- 1. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC):** The purpose of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC) is to oversee and maintain the integrity of academic freedom and the tenure system at the Florida Institute of Technology. The AFTC is responsible for (i) ensuring that tenure and promotions procedures are followed, (ii) ensuring that faculty are treated impartially through the promotions and tenure process, (iii) adjudicating appeals and grievances on procedures from faculty that are in or have gone through, the tenure or promotions process, and (iv) recommending resolutions to disputes between faculty and the university regarding academic freedom. The AFTC is a faculty-driven stand-alone committee that makes recommendations to the university President and Provost and informs the Faculty Senate through the President of the Faculty Senate. The AFTC also subsumes responsibilities that include overseeing periodic reviews of the tenure system; communication and coordination with the university administration, colleges, and other tenure system committees; quality assurance in all aspects of the tenure system; establishing and conducting periodic reviews; and, as needed, reporting findings and recommending improvements regarding any/all aspects of the tenure system to the faculty and administration. Any recommendations for revisions to the tenure process and changes in policies regarding the integrity of academic freedom will be reported to the Faculty Senate for endorsement. Policy topics include but are not limited to an appointment in tenure track positions, pre-tenure review, the tenure process, tenure review and recommendation, post-tenure review, and policies for the exceptional, expedited tenure review.

Faculty within each college will have the opportunity to vote for their respective AFTC members and inform the Faculty Senate of the outcome of the vote in writing. One tenured faculty member will be selected from each of the colleges of Aeronautics, Business, and Psychology and Liberal Arts, and two tenured faculty members from the College of Engineering and Science. Sitting senators cannot simultaneously serve at AFTC. When a senator decides to run for AFTC membership then the Senator, if elected to the AFTC, must resign from the Faculty Senate. Deans, department heads, administrators (i.e., the Chief Academic Officer or their representatives, and any other person directly serving in the upper administration) will not serve on the AFTC. If during their term an AFTC member is promoted to an administrative position within their unit, they will recuse themselves from any appeals involving members of their department or academic unit. AFTC members may not serve on a college promotion and tenure committee, University Committee on Faculty Promotion & Tenure (UCFPT), or University Teachingtrack Promotion Committee (UTPC) simultaneously. If a college has too few tenured faculty to independently propagate all said committees, the AFTC member with overlap will recuse themselves from any AFTC appeal relating to their respective college. Elected AFTC members will serve three-year terms and may be elected for consecutive terms but may serve no more than two terms. Terms are staggered so that no more than two AFTC members are elected each year. The members of the AFTC will elect their chairperson each year. While the AFTC handles a variety of appeals beyond tenure, the general procedures of the AFTC are as follows:

1. All appeal-associated documents that are submitted to the AFTC will be carefully and independently read by each AFTC committee member
2. The AFTC body will meet to discuss the appeal, which will include whether the faculty member was fairly and impartially treated according to academic freedom and tenure procedures and whether appropriate procedures were followed
3. If deemed suitable the AFTC will request additional documents from university-based faculty, staff, administrators, or university committees, which may help the AFTC clarify information regarding the appeal

4. If deemed suitable the AFTC will request interviews with university-based faculty, staff, administrators, or chairs of university committees to clarify any ambiguities that may be associated with an appeal
5. If deemed suitable the AFTC will interview the faculty member that appealed to clarify any ambiguities or discrepancies
6. The AFTC will make a recommendation to the university President and the Provost, and inform the President of the Senate of its recommendations

2. University Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (UCFPT): a committee with representatives from each college overseeing the procedure and making recommendations for the promotion and tenure of Florida Tech faculty.

2.8.1.1. Eligibility for Tenure

2.8.1.1.1 Eligibility

To be eligible for the granting of tenure, a faculty member must be a full-time employee of Florida Tech on a tenure-track appointment. The faculty member will have completed the number of requisite probationary period years of service to the university mandated in his/her initial contract letter. The faculty member will either hold a minimum academic rank of Associate Professor or will be applying for promotion to Associate Professor concurrent with seeking tenure.

2.8.1.1.2 Tenure on Appointment

New faculty hired at or above the rank of associate professor may be conferred tenure on employment only at the approval of the chief academic officer and the president. See Section 2.8.1.2.1.3 Hiring with Tenure and Section 2.8.1.4.7 Expedited Tenure Review Process.

2.8.1.1.3 Administrative Personnel with Academic Rank

New administrative personnel with academic rank of associate professor or higher may be conferred tenure on employment only at the approval of the chief academic officer and the

president. See Section 2.8.1.2.1.3 Hiring with Tenure and Section 2.8.1.4.7 Expedited Tenure Review Process.

2.8.1.1.4 Tenure Location

Faculty members will be granted tenure in one of the colleges of the university.

2.8.1.1.4.1 Joint Appointments

Faculty with joint appointments (i.e., two or more colleges) can only be appointed tenure to one college at any given time. The college to which the faculty member will pursue tenure appointment is at his/her discretion.

2.8.1.1.4.2 Transfer of Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members who are assigned or transferred to a different college will be given the following considerations, as applicable:

- a. Adequate time and resources to prepare for new responsibilities.
- b. In consultation with academic unit heads and/or deans, modifications to Statement of Expectations (Section 2.8.1.2.1.1) during the pre-tenure period in order to ensure fair treatment in all processes associated with appointment of tenure.

2.8.1.1.4.3 Transfer of Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty members who are assigned or transferred to a different college will be given the following considerations, as applicable:

- a. Adequate time and resources to prepare for new responsibilities.
- b. In consultation with academic unit heads and/or deans, modifications to annual reviews after tenure is appointed in order to ensure fair evaluation of meeting post-tenure expectations.

2.8.1.2. Conditions of Tenure-Track Appointments

2.8.1.2.1 Appointment

The chief academic officer will confer all appointments to tenure-track faculty candidates through a written contract at the time of hire. The original, one-year contract will confirm tenure-track status, the college in which the faculty will reside, and any joint appointments. It will also include a Statement of Expectations describing published, college-specific criteria, additional expectations specific to the candidate, annual plans of work, university policies, and the length of probationary period before tenure review.

2.8.1.2.1.1. The Statement of Expectations

The pre-tenured faculty member and the dean of the college, with input from the academic unit head, base the Statement of Expectations (herein called “Statement”) on college-level criteria, additional expectations, and annual plans of work that are agreed on. The chief academic officer and the president must approve the Statement before it is signed as verification that both parties understand tenure expectations, policy and procedures. Modifications to candidate-specific expectations can be made to the Statement with mutual consent of the pre-tenured faculty, academic unit head and dean, as evidenced by signature of all three on the modified document. Requests to modify the Statement in the period before pre-tenure evaluation can be initiated by the pre-tenured faculty, the academic unit head or the dean.

Requests to modify the Statement after the pre-tenure evaluation can only be initiated by the pre-tenured faculty. Both the original Statement and the modified document(s) must be kept on file in the office of the dean of the respective college for purposes of tenure consideration.

2.8.1.2.1.2 Pre-Tenure Contract

Pre-tenure contracts will be issued to tenure-track faculty for appointed terms of employment until such a time that either tenure is appointed or employment is terminated.

Tenure-track faculty who are not granted tenure can be considered for teaching and research faculty tracks based on need and availability of funds for salary.

2.8.1.2.1.2.1 Probationary Period

The probationary period before granting of tenure is usually six (6) contract years for newly hired faculty with no prior appointments as faculty at other institutions. Pre-tenure contracts typically include the original one-year probationary contract at time of hire, followed by a three (3)-year pre-tenure probationary contractual appointment. The faculty member will undergo a pre-tenure review in the second year of the three (3)-year pre-tenure probationary contract. If successful, the faculty member receives a four (4)-year pre-tenure contractual appointment that replaces the current pre-tenure probationary appointment. If unsuccessful, the faculty member can remain employed for the remainder of the pre-tenure probationary appointment and will not proceed to a pre-tenure status. Tenure review and appointment is expected to occur in the third year of the four (4)-year pre-tenure contractual appointment. If granted, tenure is effective at the beginning of the last contract year. If not granted, the faculty can remain employed during their last year of contract.

2.8.1.2.1.2.2 Equivalency Credit and Reduction of Probationary Period

Credit toward tenure can be granted at the time of hiring to pre-tenured faculty hired with prior full-time teaching and scholarship experience. If requested, the academic unit head and dean will perform evaluation of credit and make recommendations to the chief academic officer for final approval.

The probationary period can be reduced by a maximum of two (2) years, except by action of the president under special circumstances or in accordance with the Expedited Tenure Review Process described in Section 2.8.1.4.7.

2.8.1.2.1.2.3 Extension of Probationary Period

Extensions to the probationary period for a pre-tenured faculty member, as described within this section, will not increase the tenure expectations for the faculty member.

Documentation associated with extensions of the probationary period will be maintained in the dean's office of the pre-tenured faculty member's college.

2.8.1.2.1.2.3.1 Changes in Family Status

Changes in family status are defined as the birth or adoption of a child. Pre-tenured faculty who become parents before their tenure documentation is due will automatically be granted a one-year extension to the pre-tenure probationary period. Prior written notice of birth or adoption is required, which must be submitted before tenure documentation is due.

2.8.1.2.1.2.3.2 Leave of Absence

Pre-tenured faculty who are granted a leave of absence as defined in HR Policy 2.6 and FH Policy 2.13 in the Faculty Handbook will be granted up to a one-year extension of probationary period.

2.8.1.2.1.2.3.3 Temporary Assignment to Research Faculty Line

Pre-tenured faculty who wish to focus solely on research activities and who secure external funding to support those activities (including full salary and benefits) may request temporary assignment to a non-tenure track research faculty position for one year. Furthermore, they may also request a one-year tenure-clock extension during that period. Any scholarship completed in this period will be considered toward tenure and promotion once the faculty member return to his/her tenure-track position.

2.8.1.2.1.2.3.4 Extenuating Circumstances

In cases of extraordinary and extenuating circumstances (for example, illness and care or death of extended family members), pre-tenured faculty may request an extension of the probationary period. Requests will be considered up to

September 1 of the year of the faculty member's tenure review. The pre-tenured faculty member must submit a detailed, written request for the extension to his/her academic unit head. The academic unit head may request additional information, if deemed necessary. The academic unit head will forward the written request, along with his/her written recommendation, to the college dean. The college dean forwards the written request, the academic unit head's recommendation and his/her written recommendation to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer will review the request and recommendations and make a determination. The faculty member, academic unit head and college dean will be notified in writing of the extension decision and in the case of a positive decision, the projected tenure review date. All information associated with this process will remain confidential.

2.8.1.2.1.2.3.5 Reversal of Extension

A previously granted extension can be reversed on the pre-tenured faculty member's request. The request must be made in writing to the dean before the first day of the spring term preceding the requested tenure consideration date. Once such a reversal is requested in writing, the extension is automatically reversed.

2.8.1.2.1.2.4 Non-reappointment During Probationary Period (before Pre-Tenure Evaluation) Except in situations of financial exigency or program discontinuance, pre-tenured faculty facing non-reappointment to the tenure-track before pre-tenure evaluation, will be notified in writing by the college dean, as follows:

- a. In the first year of a tenure-track appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be given:
 - i. Before the start of classes in the spring semester. In this case, the pre-tenured faculty member's contract ends at the end of the current contract period.

ii. If notice is not given by the start of classes for spring semester, notice of non- reappointment must be given before April 1. In this case, the faculty member will be offered a contract for the following fall semester only.

b. In the second or third year of a tenure-track appointment, notice of non-reappointment to the tenure track must be given by April 1. The faculty member's contract ends at the end of his/her current contract period.

2.8.1.2.1.3 Hiring with Tenure

A faculty member can only be hired with tenure under the provisions expressed in Section 2.8.1.4.7 Expedited Tenure Review Process.

2.8.1.3. Criteria for Granting Tenure

2.8.1.3.1 University-Level Criteria

Tenure-track faculty are required to maintain thresholds of performances in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service as defined by college-level criteria. While effective teaching is of paramount importance to student success, scholarship is fundamental to the mission of the university. Service to the university is also recognized as a key contributor to the academic enterprise. Appropriate levels of engagement in each will be planned and agreed on in advance in order to ensure for appropriate professional development and work/life balance.

2.8.1.3.1.1 Teaching

Effective teaching, among other things, consists of clearly communicating special knowledge and expertise based on an understanding of curricular objectives and the learner's needs and abilities. Further, effective teaching entails advising and mentoring related to areas such as research projects, capstone projects, and thesis advising, selecting and using appropriate instructional methods and materials, which lead to learning, and providing fair and useful evaluations of the quality of the learner's work.

2.8.1.3.1.2 Scholarship

Faculty are expected to engage in disciplinary, interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary scholarship as measured by professional standards of documentation, peer review and dissemination. Colleges will choose areas of scholarship that are applicable to their mission and the mission of the university. Each college is responsible for defining what constitutes documentation, peer review and dissemination for its faculty. Categories of scholarship at the university include:

Scholarship of discovery: defined by the use of professional expertise to discover knowledge, invent, or create original material.

Scholarship of teaching/pedagogy: defined by the engagement in the scholarship of teaching practice through peer-reviewed activities to improve pedagogy.

Scholarship of integration: defined by the use of professional expertise to connect, integrate and synthesize knowledge.

Scholarship of application: defined by the use of professional expertise to engage in applied research, consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, or similar activities to solve problems.

Scholarship of engagement: defined as the engagement in scholarship that combines rigorous academic standards in any of the four other dimensions of scholarship and developed in the context of reciprocal and collaborative community partnerships.

Community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of an active collaborative process that leads to new understanding and knowledge that contributes to the public good.

2.8.1.3.1.3 Service

Faculty members are expected to provide some forms of service to the university, their college, their academic unit, their profession, and in some instances, the community at large.

2.8.1.3.2 College-Level Criteria

Each college will develop and publish its own specific teaching, scholarship and service criteria for tenure appointment and promotion in a tenure-track position. Criteria will be developed

and/or revised, and expectations defined, with input from tenure-track faculty and be endorsed by the Faculty Senate. The chief academic officer and the president of the university will have final approval of all college- level criteria for promotion and tenure appointment.

2.8.1.4. Tenure Process

2.8.1.4.1 Records Storage

All records associated with annual faculty reviews, pre-tenure evaluation, tenure appointment and post-tenure review will be kept on file in the office of the college dean of the respective college.

2.8.1.4.1.1 Confidentiality

To ensure candidness and accuracy, all letters and recommendations for or against awarding of tenure will remain confidential. Accessibility to specific documents associated with pre-tenure evaluation and tenure appointment are specified in tables found in Section 2.8.1.4.2.2.6 and Section 2.8.1.4.3.6.

2.8.1.4.1.2 Summary of Letters and Recommendations

At the request of the faculty member, the chief academic officer will summarize the content of all letters of review and recommendations while maintaining confidentiality.

2.8.1.4.2 Annual Faculty Reviews and Pre-Tenure Evaluation

2.8.1.4.2.1 Annual Faculty Reviews (Pre-Tenure)

Progress on tenure, based on criteria and annual work plans in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, will be monitored and reviewed annually up to the time that a decision to grant or deny tenure is made. Annual faculty reviews will be conducted by the pre-tenured faculty member's academic unit head and must conclude with a statement that addresses whether the pre- tenured faculty member is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward tenure. The pre- tenured faculty member, the academic unit head and the

college dean must sign annual review documents. By signing the form, the faculty member is not expressing agreement with the views that it represents but rather confirming that he/she received the document.

2.8.1.4.2.1.1 Rating Categories

Rating categories defined in this section apply to annual reviews conducted during both pre-tenure and post-tenure periods. Specific criteria for each rating category will be determined by academic program, unit and/or college and must be established and approved by faculty, academic unit heads and deans, as described in Post-Tenure Review process in Section 2.8.1.5 of this document.

2.8.1.4.2.1.1.1 Exceeds Expectations

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment that exceeds the expected level.

2.8.1.4.2.1.1.2 Satisfactory

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.

2.8.1.4.2.1.1.3 Needs Improvement

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment that need improvement. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

2.8.1.4.2.1.1.4 Unsatisfactory

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment well below the expected level. This is the sole category that constitutes unsatisfactory progress. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement during the following academic year.

2.8.1.4.2.1.2 Unsatisfactory Progress on Annual Reviews before Pre-Tenure Evaluation Unsatisfactory progress reported on annual reviews prior to the period of pre-tenure evaluation must be documented and may result in non-reappointment to the tenure-track (see Section 2.8.1.2.1.2.4). If reappointed, developmental modifications to annual work plans in the Statement of Expectations must address any deficiencies. Modifications are initiated in accordance with Section 2.8.1.2.1.1 at the time of annual reviews.

2.8.1.4.2.1.3 Unsatisfactory Progress on Annual Reviews after Pre-Tenure Evaluation Unsatisfactory progress reported on annual reviews after pre-tenure evaluation must be documented. If initiated by the pre-tenured faculty member, modifications of Statement of Expectations can be made in accordance with Section 2.8.1.2.1.1 at the time of annual reviews. Except in situations of financial exigency or program discontinuance, pre-tenured faculty will remain in tenure-track appointment if they receive unsatisfactory progress on annual reviews after successful pre-tenure evaluation. Unsatisfactory annual progress will be taken into account during consideration of tenure appointment.

2.8.1.4.2.2 Pre-Tenure Evaluation

Pre-tenure evaluation will typically occur during the third year of employment as a tenure-track faculty candidate. Tenure-track faculty granted credit toward tenure may undergo evaluation earlier. Tenure-track faculty with extended probationary periods will be addressed on a case-by- case basis.

2.8.1.4.2.2.1 Dossier and Schedule

Pre-tenured faculty will submit a completed dossier with all documentation specified in guidelines provided by their college of residence. Colleges will establish timelines and processes for receiving documentation and are responsible for communicating them in a timely fashion. Initial communication to the pre-tenured faculty for documentation marks the official start of the pre-tenure evaluation process.

2.8.1.4.2.2.2 Input from Academic Unit Head

The academic unit head will provide a written assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure. It is expected that input from program chairs will be solicited. The written assessment will be submitted at the time of submission of the candidate's dossier.

2.8.1.4.2.2.3 College Promotion and Tenure Committee (CPTC)

A college promotion and tenure committee (CPTC) will conduct the pre-tenure evaluation. Membership numbers and participants on CPTCs will be determined by college but must consist only of tenured faculty within the college.

2.8.1.4.2.2.4 Input from Tenured Faculty in Academic Program

The CPTC will seek letters from tenured faculty in the same program as the pre-tenured faculty member attesting to the candidate's satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward tenure. Information provided about the candidate's progress must be verifiable.

2.8.1.4.2.2.5 Pre-Tenure Evaluation Process

The CPTC will prepare a letter that provides an analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses based on review of input by tenured faculty in the same discipline. The CPTC's letter will state whether current performance would normally lead to a recommendation for tenure under current guidelines and will offer guidance for continuous improvement. The letter will include a summary of faculty letters without containing any information that could identify an individual faculty member as this letter will be made accessible to the candidate at the end of the pre-tenure evaluation process. Furthermore, if the candidate received an extension of probationary period as allowed in Section 2.8.1.2.1.2.3, the reasons behind this extension will not be disclosed within the CPTC's letter. The CPTC will forward its letter of review and all documentation to the dean.

After review of the candidate's complete file, the college dean will forward the CPTC's letter, the candidate's documentation, the academic unit head's letter, and the dean's recommendation letter to the chief academic officer. After review of the candidate's complete file, the chief academic officer's comments on the candidate's progress toward tenure will be sent in letter form to the dean. The dean and the candidate's academic unit head will discuss the pre-tenure evaluation with the candidate.

The pre-tenure evaluation process and receipt of official notification by the candidate must be completed within a two-week period.

Pre-tenure evaluation is a measure of a candidate's progress toward tenure and an opportunity to provide guidance for continued growth. However, it cannot predict the eventual tenure decision, whether positive or negative.

2.8.1.4.2.2.6 Allowable Access to Pre-Tenure Evaluation Documents

Allowable Access						
Documentation	Candidate	Academic Unit Tenured Faculty	Academic Unit Head	CTC	Dean	Chief Academic Officer
Candidate's Dossier		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate's Annual Reviews	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Tenured Faculty Letters	Summary Provided by CTC	No	Yes (at conclusion of review process)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Head Recommendation	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	Yes
College Tenure Committee (CTC) Recommendation	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	Yes
College Dean Recommendation	Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes
Chief Academic Officer Evaluation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	

2.8.1.4.2.2.7 Appeal Process for Negative Pre-Tenure Evaluation

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC), as an impartial entity, will hear appeal cases related to negative pre-tenure evaluations. A faculty member with a negative pre-tenure evaluation must appeal the decision within five (5) business days of meeting with the college dean and academic unit head to discuss the pre-tenure evaluation results.

2.8.1.4.2.2.7.1 Length of Time

The faculty member's request for an appeal initiates the committee's review period that will conclude within ten (10) business days during the academic year.

2.8.1.4.2.2.7.2 Process

On request, the college dean will forward the following to the AFTC within three (3) business days: the CPTC's letter, the candidate's documentation, the academic unit head's letter, the dean's recommendation letter, and the chief academic officer's comments on the candidate's progress toward tenure. The AFTC will share documents with the faculty member under review as appropriate while maintaining confidentiality.

The AFTC can request supporting documentation from the college dean and the faculty member under review to be received within three (3) business days of the request. The AFTC will review the faculty member's performance and consider all relevant evidence, which includes individual discussions with the dean and the faculty member under review. The faculty member may choose an advocate to be present when meeting with the AFTC. The AFTC may consult with additional faculty or administrators as necessary. Written summaries of all discussions will be recorded and stored in the respective office of the college dean.

2.8.1.4.2.2.7.2.1 Appeal Outcomes

The AFTC will vote to choose one of the following outcomes:

(1) Negative outcome to pre-tenure evaluation is upheld.

(2) Negative outcome to pre-tenure evaluation is not upheld.

The AFTC will prepare a written summary of its recommendation while maintaining confidentiality of individual members and forward it to the faculty member, academic unit head, college dean, and chief academic officer.

2.8.1.4.2.2.7.3 Final Decision on Appeal

On receiving a recommendation from the AFTC, the chief academic officer and president will make a final decision about the appeal. The chief academic officer and president may consult with faculty and/or administrators in order to make a final decision on the case.

2.8.1.4.3 Tenure and Promotion Review and Recommendation

An assistant professor in a tenure-track position must simultaneously be evaluated for promotion to rank as associate professor along with evaluation for awarding tenure. Academic unit heads, college- level promotion and tenure committees, deans, and the University Committee on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (UCFPT) will evaluate pre-tenured faculty. After reviewing all required documentation, the UCFPT will provide recommendations to the chief academic officer on candidates for promotion and tenure. The chief academic officer and president will review the UCFPT's recommendations and make the final decision on promotion and tenure.

2.8.1.4.3.1 Documentation

Guidelines for the contents of the promotion and tenure dossier are given in the faculty guideline "Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format" (FH Appendix 1). All candidates will follow these guidelines regardless of their college.

2.8.1.4.3.2 Beginning the Process

The academic unit heads and pre-tenured faculty members (herein, called candidates) will be advised of the beginning of the tenure and promotion review process one year before candidates are to be considered for promotion and tenure. Academic unit heads provide initial recommendations to candidates before the candidates submit their letters of intent to enter the promotion and tenure process and curricula vitae to the college promotion committees.

2.8.1.4.3.3 College-Level Review and Committee

College promotion and tenure committees (CPTCs) are responsible for communicating deadlines and points of contact with their colleges' candidates, providing preliminary feedback to candidates after reviewing their letters of intent and curricula vitae, providing feedback to candidates regarding suggested dossier revisions, requesting and receiving letters of recommendation from outside reviewers, and providing recommendations to academic unit heads and deans.

2.8.1.4.3.3.1 Membership

Membership numbers and participants on CPTCs will be determined by college but must consist only of tenured faculty within the college.

2.8.1.4.3.3.2 Input from Tenured Faculty in Academic Program

It is the responsibility of tenured Florida Tech faculty to participate in the tenure process. The CPTCs will solicit confidential letters from tenured Florida Tech faculty members in the candidate's program. Letters should express clear recommendations for or against tenure accompanied with supporting explanations. If letters are not received in a timely manner, the CPTC will attempt to obtain input from tenured faculty who did not respond.

2.8.1.4.3.3.3 Letters of Recommendation from Outside Reviewers

Letters of recommendation are also required from reviewers outside of Florida Tech (see definition of outside reviewers in FH Appendix 1). Candidates and academic unit heads should suggest potential reviewers to the CPTCs. The CPTCs are responsible for writing all requests for evaluations and receiving the external letters; the committee

chair may write the requests or distribute the responsibility among committee members. If the required number of recommendation letters (as stated in FH Appendix 1) has not been received, the CPTC is responsible for informing the candidate and requesting letters from additional outside reviewers.

Candidates' dossiers cannot be forwarded to academic unit heads or deans until all letters from outside reviewers are included.

2.8.1.4.3.4 Review Letters from Academic Unit Heads and Deans

The academic unit head will have monitored a candidate's performance during the probationary period via annual performance evaluations and the pre-tenure evaluation process (described in Section 2.8.1.4.2.2.5) and will provide a written assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure based on those evaluations performed throughout the probationary period. The written assessment will be submitted to the CPTC and included in the dossier before submission to the UCFPT. If a candidate for tenure received an extension to his/her tenure probationary period, the reasons behind this extension will not be disclosed with the academic unit head's letter.

Written reviews by deans will be included in dossiers before submission to the chief academic officer and review by the UCFPT. Deans will submit completed dossiers of all candidates to the chief academic officer by the second Monday in January for the UCFPT's review in the spring.

2.8.1.4.3.5 University Committee for Faculty Promotion and Tenure (UCFPT)

2.8.1.4.3.5.1 Membership

The UCFPT is composed as described in the faculty policy "Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty" (FH 1.5).

2.8.1.4.3.5.2 Process

There will be four meetings of the UCFPT during the spring semester: (1) an organizational meeting, (2) a review meeting after dossiers have been initially evaluated, (3) a voting meeting and (4) a post-review meeting. All voting members of the UCFPT are required to evaluate all complete dossiers with the appropriate colleges' promotion and tenure guidelines during a three-week review period.

2.8.1.4.3.5.2.1 Voting Meeting

In addition to the members of the UCFPT, attendance at the voting meeting will normally include the chief academic officer and/or his/her representative. The committee will engage in a thorough discussion of the candidates' qualifications as they relate to the colleges' promotion and tenure guidelines. Ballots consisting of a list of the candidates' names and boxes for yes, no and abstain votes will be prepared and provided by the chief academic officer. Negative votes must have written justification included in the allotted space on the ballot. The chief academic officer will collect the ballots after all candidates have been considered. The chair of the UCFPT will call out the votes to the committee members and at least two members will record the votes. Results will be tabulated at the meeting and made known to the members of the UCFPT. The results and all UCFPT deliberations are to be treated with complete confidentiality.

Compilations of the committee's anonymous comments will be sent to the deans of candidates who were not recommended for promotion and tenure.

2.8.1.4.3.6 Timeline for Promotion and Tenure Process

Date	Action
January (of preceding academic year)	Candidates discuss their intent to enter the promotion and tenure process with academic unit heads. Academic unit heads provide initial recommendations to the candidates.
April (of preceding academic year)	Candidates submit letters of intent to enter the promotion and tenure process and curricula vitae to the CPTCs. Academic unit heads share written assessments with CPTCs.
May	CPTCs provide preliminary feedback to candidates.
August	Candidates electronically submit preliminary dossiers in PDF format and lists of potential outside reviewers to CPTCs. Academic unit heads submit lists of additional potential outside reviewers to CPTCs.
September-October	CPTCs request letters from tenured faculty in the candidate's academic unit with a November deadline. CPTCs request letters from outside reviewers (including some of those suggested by both candidates and academic unit heads) with a November deadline. CPTCs submit feedback to candidates for revising dossiers.
November	Candidates electronically submit final dossiers in PDF format to CPTCs. CPTCs add letters from outside reviewers and the written assessment from academic unit heads to the dossiers. CPTCs meet and formulate recommendations.
December	CPTCs submit their recommendations and dossiers to the deans. Written reviews by deans will be added to the dossiers.
Early January	The chief academic officer calls an organizational meeting of the University Committee for Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (UCFPT). The UCFPT chooses a chair to officiate the process. Deans will submit completed dossiers of all candidates to the chief academic officer by the second Monday in January for the UCFPT's review in the spring.
Late January to mid-February	The UCFPT reviews dossiers and holds a second meeting for an initial review of candidates.

Mid-February to early March	The UCFPT meets to discuss candidates, vote and submit recommendations to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer and president review recommendations and make the final decision on promotion, which are communicated to the deans.
By March 15	Candidates are sent official written notifications from the chief academic officer, and the deans of candidates who were not recommended for promotion are sent compilations of the committee's anonymous comments.
April	The UCFPT holds a post review meeting. The chief academic officer notifies all members of the UCFPT of the final decision either by letter or at the post review meeting.

2.8.1.4.3.7 Allowable Access to Documentation for Tenure Review

Allowable Access						
Documentation	Academic Unit Tenured Faculty	Academic Unit Head	CPTC	Dean	UCFPT	Chief Academic Officer
Candidate's Preliminary Dossier	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate's Annual Reviews	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Tenured Faculty Letters		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Head Written Assessment	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Letters from Outside Reviewers	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
College Promotion and Tenure Committee (CPTC) Recommendation	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes
College Dean Recommendation	No	No	No		Yes	Yes
University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UCFPT) Recommendation	No	No	No	No		Yes
Chief Academic Officer Evaluation	No	No	Yes	No	No	

2.8.1.4.4 Disputes Between Voting Entities

If disputes about a candidate's viability arise between the dean and the UCFPT, the chief academic officer will convene a meeting of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC). The AFTC will review all available documentation along with college-specific promotion and tenure criteria and advise the chief academic officer on a final decision. The AFTC will relate its full findings in writing to the chief academic officer.

2.8.1.4.5 Granting or Denial of Tenure

Candidates will be sent official written notifications from the chief academic officer of the final promotion decision by March 15. If promotion and tenure are denied, the written notification will provide specific reasons, the UCFPT vote, the AFTC vote, if involved, and the recommendations from the academic unit head and dean.

If promotion and tenure are granted, they become effective on the first day of the following appointment year. If denied, the candidate will remain employed by the university on a one-year contract, during which time the candidate may apply for non-tenure-track or staff positions, if available.

2.8.1.4.6 Appeal of Denial of Tenure

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC), as an impartial entity, will hear appeal cases related to denial of tenure. A faculty member denied tenure must appeal the decision within five (5) business days of receiving written notification from the chief academic officer.

2.8.1.4.6.1 Length of Time

The faculty member's request for an appeal initiates the committee's review period that will conclude within ten (10) business days during the academic year.

2.8.1.4.6.2 Process

On request, the UCFPT will forward all information about its review to the AFTC within three (3) business days. The AFTC will share documents with the faculty member under review as appropriate while maintaining confidentiality.

The AFTC can request supporting documentation from the college dean and the faculty member under review to be received within three (3) business days of the request. The AFTC will review the faculty member's performance and consider all relevant evidence, which includes individual discussions with the dean and the faculty member under review. The faculty member may choose an advocate to be present when meeting with the AFTC. The AFTC may consult with additional faculty or administrators as necessary. Written summaries of all discussions will be recorded and stored in the respective office of the college dean.

2.8.1.4.6.2.1 Appeal Outcomes

The AFTC will vote to choose one of the following outcomes:

- (1) The decision for denial of tenure is upheld.
- (2) The decision for denial of tenure is not upheld.

The AFTC will prepare a written summary of its recommendation while maintaining confidentiality of individual members and forward it to the faculty member, academic unit head, college dean and chief academic officer.

2.8.1.4.6.3 Final Decision on Appeal

On receiving a recommendation from the AFTC, the chief academic officer and president will make a final decision about the appeal. The chief academic officer and president may consult with faculty and/or administrators in order to make a final decision on the case.

2.8.1.4.7 Expedited Tenure Review Process

An expedited tenure review process may be requested in the case of hiring a faculty member with tenure. The expedited process is normally considered for hiring of faculty currently appointed tenure at a regionally-accredited institution of higher education. In rare circumstances, an expedited process can also be considered for the hiring of faculty who

do not currently hold a tenure appointment at a regionally-accredited institution of higher education.

The request for an expedited review process will be initiated during the hiring process by the academic unit head and must be approved by the college dean, chief academic officer and president. If approved, depending on the faculty candidate's status, the processes outlined below will be followed. For either process, the academic unit head will request and compile application materials, including, at a minimum, the candidate's curriculum vitae, list of scholarly work, reference letters and teaching evaluations.

a. If the faculty member to be hired is tenured from a regionally-accredited institution of higher education, the academic unit head and college dean will evaluate all application materials and make a recommendation to the chief academic officer. Based on their recommendations, the chief academic officer will recommend the candidate to the president. The president makes the final decision on either granting tenure or granting a reduced probationary period in accordance with Section 2.8.1.2.1.2.2. This process should be completed within five (5) business days after receiving all minimum requirements for application materials. In accordance with Section 2.8.1.2.1, the initial one-year contract will identify the length of probationary period before tenure review or, if granted, tenured status will be specified in the appointment document.

b. If the faculty member to be hired does not hold a tenure appointment at a regionally- accredited institution of higher education, the chief academic officer will call a special meeting of the UCFPT to review all application materials. Due to the accelerated timeframe, electronic inputs from faculty members on the UCFPT are sufficient if they are not available to meet. Within ten (10) business days after receiving all minimum requirements for application materials as well as recommendations from the academic unit head and college dean, the UCFPT will evaluate the candidate and make a recommendation to the chief academic officer. Based on the UCFPT's recommendation, the chief academic officer will recommend

the candidate to the president. The president makes the final decision on either granting tenure or granting a reduced probationary period in accordance with Section 2.8.1.2.1.2.2. The final decision should be made no later than three (3) days after the UCFPT's recommendation is made known to the president. In accordance with Section 2.8.1.2.1, the initial one-year contract will identify the length of probationary period before tenure review.

c.

2.8.1.5. Post-Tenure Review Process

2.8.1.5.1 Purpose

The purpose of the post-tenure review (PTR) process is to ensure scholarship productivity and teaching effectiveness and promote continued professional development after faculty have been granted tenure. PTR will be conducted in a manner that respects faculty members' rights, including academic freedom and due process.

This policy is not intended to be a substitute for ongoing evaluation, mentoring and professional development provided at the academic unit or program level. Professional development is a responsibility of all faculty members from their hire to their retirement.

2.8.1.5.2 Annual Faculty Reviews (Post-Tenure)

Academic unit heads will continue the process of annual faculty reviews after tenure is appointed. The written portion assesses contributions in scholarship, teaching and service as well as the performance of responsibilities associated with the position. Items on the review forms will represent standard categories used across colleges and others will be program-specific. Each faculty member will meet with his/her academic unit head to discuss the annual review and goals for the following year. The faculty member, academic unit head and college dean will sign annual review forms. By signing the form, the faculty member is not expressing agreement with the views that it represents but rather confirming that he/she received the document.

2.8.1.5.2.1 Academic Unit Minimum Standards

Each academic program will develop its own set of criteria that defines the minimum performance standards expected for its tenured faculty. Faculty in a specific discipline will prepare the minimum standards in consultation with the academic unit head and college dean. Minimum standards are approved by a majority vote of the program's tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Minimum standards should include criteria for teaching, scholarship and service that are appropriate for tenured faculty in the program and will recognize the principles of academic freedom. The faculty member's overall rating for his/her annual performance evaluation should reflect all three of these areas. As tenured faculty are encouraged to continue existing lines of research and/or develop new ones, minimum standards in research must be distinct from tenure criteria for research. For example, after receiving tenure, faculty members may begin new long- term projects and the minimum standards should account for these activities. Minimum standards should reflect faculty members' effort and activity as well as effectiveness and accomplishments. Standards should be flexible in order to recognize that faculty assignments may differ within a program and provide faculty the ability to pursue innovative scholarship and teaching.

2.8.1.5.2.1.1 Influencing Factors

Annual faculty reviews should take into account factors that are outside of the faculty member's control, such as the availability of research funding in the faculty member's field of research and the types of classes assigned to the faculty member.

2.8.1.5.2.1.2 Rating Categories

Annual faculty reviews will use the same ratings as those for annual faculty reviews during the pre-tenure period. Refer to Section 2.8.1.4.2.1.1.

2.8.1.5.2.2 Unsatisfactory Progress on Annual Reviews after Tenure Appointment

Failure to meet academic unit minimum standards warrants a rating of "Unsatisfactory." This rating is equivalent to a level of incompetence or neglect of duty as defined in the

Faculty Handbook (FH 2.9.1). For an evaluation of scholarship, a rating of “Unsatisfactory” means that the faculty member is not maintaining an active scholarship program.

2.8.1.5.2.3 Performance Development Plan (PDP)

The academic unit head will create a Performance Development Plan (PDP) for a faculty member who has received a single overall rating of unsatisfactory performance in an annual evaluation.

2.8.1.5.2.3.1 Preparation of PDP

The PDP will be prepared by an ad hoc committee (see Section 2.8.1.5.2.3.2 below) using the standard university form. The academic unit head will review its terms with the faculty member. The faculty member, academic unit head and college dean will sign the PDP. By signing, the faculty member is not expressing agreement with the views that it represents but rather confirming that he/she received the document.

The PDP will identify specific areas of teaching, scholarship and/or service for the faculty member to address, goals to achieve, and resources needed to achieve these goals. PDP tasks may be actionable, meaning that the faculty member is entirely responsible for the task’s completion, or conditional, in which the completion of the task depends on both the faculty member and a third party. For conditional tasks, the PDP must include specific, additional resources that the university will provide to the faculty member in order to accomplish these tasks. For actionable tasks, the PDP may or may not include university-provided resources. The PDP will span one or more years. During the time that the PDP is in effect, the faculty member must attend mandatory, periodic meetings with a mentor chosen by the academic unit head.

2.8.1.5.2.3.2 Ad Hoc Committee

The academic unit head will consult with his/her college dean as well as at least two senior faculty (one selected by the academic unit head and one selected by the faculty member under review) in the faculty member’s area(s) of scholarship and/or teaching in the creation of the PDP. The academic unit head and senior faculty comprise an ad

hoc committee. The academic unit head acts as the chair and all decisions are determined by vote among its three members.

The ad hoc committee will meet each year during the time that a PDP is in place in order to assess the faculty member's progress. The committee may conclude at any time during the PDP period that the faculty member has made adequate progress toward achieving the goals identified in the PDP. In that case, the ad hoc committee disbands and no further action is necessary. A second consecutive annual evaluation rating of overall unsatisfactory performance causes the initiation of the PTR process.

2.8.1.5.3 Post-Tenure Review

2.8.1.5.3.1 Length of Time

The entire PTR process should take no more than fifty (50) business days to complete. Allowances for unavoidable delays by the faculty member, administration or committees should be accommodated.

2.8.1.5.3.2 Triggering Event for PTR

The PTR process is triggered when the academic unit head assigns an overall rating of unsatisfactory performance to a tenured faculty member in two consecutive annual reviews. The academic unit head or college dean may recommend a postponement or waiver of the PTR due to extenuating circumstances, such as those that lead to an extension to pre-tenure probationary period (see Section 2.8.1.2.1.2.3).

2.8.1.5.3.3 Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)

A Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) consisting of at least three tenured faculty from the appropriate academic program, conducts the PTR. If the academic discipline lacks sufficient numbers to form such a committee, then tenured faculty from the academic unit or college will be added. The PTRC will evaluate the faculty member's professional competence, effectiveness and contributions to the program, college, university, and profession in the areas

of teaching, scholarship and service. The committee will complete its review within twenty (20) business days during the academic year.

The PTRC will keep a written record of all meetings, which will be stored within the faculty member's file in the office of the dean of the respective college. It considers the effort and contributions made by the faculty member to the program, school, college, university and profession in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The burden of proof that the faculty member should receive sanctions rest with the academic unit head.

2.8.1.5.3.4 Documentation

The faculty member and academic unit head are responsible for providing all requested information. At a minimum, the faculty member should provide a current curriculum vitae, a statement describing current teaching, scholarship and service activities, the PDP, and the PDP committee's annual progress assessment. The committee may request other information from the past two years, such as annual evaluations (including the faculty member's responses to them), teaching assignments, teaching evaluations and reviews of any proposals or publications. The committee may request to meet separately with the academic unit head and faculty member as necessary. If meetings occur, they must be requested of both parties. The academic unit head and faculty member may provide additional information he or she deems appropriate.

The faculty member has ten (10) business days to provide all information. The academic unit head will provide information related to the faculty member's annual evaluations to the committee also within ten (10) business days.

2.8.1.5.3.5 PTR Outcomes

The PTRC will vote to choose one the following outcomes to a tenured faculty member's PTR:

- a. The faculty member's performance meets the academic program minimum standards. In this case, the review is complete and any subsequent annual evaluation resulting in an

overall rating of unsatisfactory performance counts as the first of the two-year sequence for triggering PTR.

b. The faculty member's performance does not meet the academic program minimum standards and the faculty member requires further remediation. The PTRC can recommend that the faculty member continue to follow an existing PDP or it can recommend that a new ad hoc committee create another PDP, following the procedure outlined above in 2.8.1.5.2.3.2. The PDP committee may conclude at any time during the extended PDP period that the faculty member has made adequate progress toward achieving the goals identified in the PDP. In that case, no further action is necessary and any subsequent annual evaluation resulting in an overall rating of unsatisfactory performance counts as the first of the two-year sequence for triggering PTR. A third consecutive annual evaluation rating of overall unsatisfactory performance returns the case to the PTRC for its review.

c. The faculty member's performance does not meet the academic discipline's minimum standards and warrants sanctions. These may include the following sanctions: reassignment of duties, loss of tenure or dismissal for cause. If the faculty member is not dismissed from the university and remains tenured but with reassigned duties, any subsequent annual evaluation resulting in an overall rating of unsatisfactory performance counts as the first of the two-year sequence that triggers PTR. The PTRC will prepare a written summary of its decision, including any dissenting opinions, while maintaining confidentiality of individual members. The summary will be forwarded to the faculty member, academic unit head, college dean and chief academic officer.

2.8.1.5.3.6 Appeal of PTR Sanctions

A tenured faculty member may appeal the PTRC's decision to the AFTC within five (5) business days of receiving the written recommendation of sanctions.

2.8.1.5.3.6.1 Length of Time

The tenured faculty member's request for an appeal initiates the committee's review period that will conclude within ten (10) business days during the academic year.

2.8.1.5.3.6.2 Process

On request, the PTRC will forward all information about its review to the AFTC within three (3) business days. The AFTC will share documents with the faculty member under review as appropriate while maintaining confidentiality.

The AFTC can request supporting documentation from the college dean and tenured faculty member under review to be received within three (3) business days of the request. The AFTC will review the faculty member's performance and consider all relevant evidence, which includes individual discussions with the dean and the faculty member under review. The faculty member may choose an advocate to be present when meeting with the AFTC. The AFTC may consult with additional faculty or administrators as necessary. Written summaries of all discussions will be recorded and stored in the respective office of the college dean.

2.8.1.5.3.6.3 PTR Appeal Outcomes

The AFTC will vote to choose one of the following outcomes:

(1) The faculty member's performance meets the academic program's minimum standards. In this case, the review is complete. All documentation created by the AFTC is sealed and no further action is taken. Any subsequent annual evaluation resulting in an overall rating of unacceptable performance counts as the first of the two-year sequence for triggering PTR.

(2) The tenured faculty member's performance does not meet the minimum academic program standards and warrants sanctions. These may include the following sanctions: reassignment of duties, loss of tenure or dismissal for cause. If the faculty member is not dismissed from the university and remains tenured but with reassigned duties, any

subsequent annual evaluation resulting in an overall rating of unsatisfactory performance counts as the first of the two-year sequence that triggers PTR. The AFTC will prepare a written summary of its decision while maintaining confidentiality of individual members and forward it to the faculty member, academic unit head, college dean and chief academic officer.

2.8.1.5.3.7 Final Decision for Sanctions

On receiving a recommendation of sanctions from the PTRC and following any appeals of that decision by the faculty member, the chief academic officer and president will make a final decision to apply sanctions. The chief academic officer and president may consult with faculty and/or administrators in order to make a final decision on the case.

If the faculty member is not dismissed from the university and remains tenured, any subsequent annual evaluation resulting in an overall rating of unsatisfactory performance counts as the first of the two-year sequence that triggers PTR.

A faculty member receives one academic year of employment following a decision of dismissal for cause.

FH 2.8.2 Teaching Track Promotion Policies and Procedures

Effective Date Mar 13, 2019

2.8.2.1. Criteria for Promotion in Teaching Track

2.8.2.1.1 University-Level Criteria

Teaching track faculty are required to maintain thresholds of performances in the areas of teaching and service as defined by college-level criteria. Scholarship is strongly encouraged for promotion considerations. Appropriate levels of engagement in each area will be planned and agreed on in advance in order to ensure for appropriate professional development and work/life balance.

2.8.2.1.1.1 Teaching

Effective teaching, among other things, consists of clearly communicating special knowledge and expertise based on an understanding of curricular objectives and the learner's needs and abilities. Further, effective teaching entails advising and mentoring related to areas such as research projects, capstone projects, and thesis advising, selecting, and using appropriate instructional methods and materials, which lead to learning, and providing fair and useful evaluations of the quality of the learner's work.

2.8.2.1.1.2 Service

Teaching track faculty members are expected to provide some forms of service to the university, their college, their academic unit, their profession, and in some instances, the community at large.

2.8.2.1.1.3 Scholarship

Teaching track faculty are expected to engage in disciplinary, interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary scholarship as measured by professional standards of documentation, peer

review and dissemination. Colleges are responsible for defining what constitutes scholarship for teaching track faculty, as well as defining what constitutes documentation, peer review and dissemination for this track.

2.8.2.1.2 College-Level Criteria

Each college will develop and publish its own specific teaching, scholarship, and service criteria for teaching-track promotion. Criteria will be developed and/or revised, and expectations defined, with input from faculty and endorsement by the Faculty Senate. The chief academic officer and the president of the university will have final approval of all college-level criteria for promotion in the teaching track.

2.8.2.1.3 Time in Rank

Assistant and associate faculty members must serve a minimum of five (5) full years in rank before beginning the promotion process. The process will begin in the sixth year of appointment at the lower rank. Exceptions may be granted with permission from the chief academic officer. Exceptions include time served at prior institutions or outstanding performance in all areas of promotion criteria.

2.8.2.2. Promotion Process

2.8.2.2.1 Records Storage

All records associated with annual faculty reviews, evaluations and promotions for teaching track faculty will be kept on file in the office of the college dean of the respective college. Access to files will be governed by policy (to be developed).

2.8.2.2.1.1 Confidentiality

To ensure candidness and accuracy, all letters and recommendations for or against awarding of promotion will remain confidential. Accessibility to specific documents associated with promotion are specified in tables found in Section 2.8.2.3.7.

2.8.2.2.1.2 Summary of Letters and Recommendations

At the request of the faculty member, the chief academic officer will summarize the content of all letters of review and recommendations while maintaining confidentiality.

2.8.2.2.2 Annual Faculty Reviews

2.8.2.2.2.1 Annual Faculty Reviews

Annual faculty reviews are required to monitor progress toward promotion to associate and full professor, as well as for determining contractual appointment renewals. They will be conducted by the academic unit head and must conclude with a statement that addresses whether the faculty member is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward promotion or meeting minimum work expectations. The faculty member, the academic unit head and the college dean must sign annual review documents. By signing the form, the faculty member is not expressing agreement with the views that it represents but rather confirming that he/she received the document.

2.8.2.2.2.1.1 Rating Categories

Specific criteria for each rating category will be determined by academic program, unit and/ or college, and must be established and approved by faculty, academic unit heads and deans.

2.8.2.2.2.1.1.1 Exceeds Expectations

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment that exceeds the expected level.

2.8.2.2.2.1.1.2 Satisfactory

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.

2.8.2.2.2.1.1.3 Needs Improvement

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment that needs improvement. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

2.8.2.2.2.1.1.4 Unsatisfactory

This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment well below the expected level. This is the sole category that constitutes unsatisfactory progress. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement during the following academic year.

2.8.2.2.2.1.2 Unsatisfactory Progress on Annual Reviews

Unsatisfactory progress reported on annual reviews prior to reappointment of a new contract may result in non-reappointment to the teaching track.

2.8.2.2.3 Promotion Review and Recommendation

Academic unit heads, college-level promotion committees, deans and the University Teaching-Track Promotion Committee (UTPC; see Section 2.8.2.3.5) will evaluate teaching track faculty for promotion to associate or full professor. After reviewing all required documentation, the UTPC will provide recommendations to the chief academic officer on candidates for promotion. The chief academic officer and president will review the UTPC's recommendations and make the final decision on promotion.

2.8.2.2.3.1 Documentation

Guidelines for the contents of the promotion dossier are given in the faculty guideline "Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format" (FH Appendix 1). All candidates will follow these guidelines regardless of their college.

2.8.2.2.3.2 Beginning the Process

The academic unit heads and teaching track faculty members (herein, called candidates) will be advised of the beginning of the promotion review process one year before candidates are to be considered for promotion. Academic unit heads provide initial recommendations to candidates before the candidates submit their letters of intent to enter the promotion process and their curricula vitae to the college promotion committees.

2.8.2.2.3.3 College-Level Review and Committee

College promotion committees (CPCs) are responsible for communicating deadlines and points of contact with their colleges' candidates, providing preliminary feedback to candidates after reviewing their letters of intent and curricula vitae, providing feedback to candidates regarding suggested dossier revisions, requesting and receiving letters of recommendation from outside reviewers, and providing recommendations to academic unit heads and deans.

2.8.2.2.3.3.1 Membership

Membership numbers and participants on CPCs will be determined by college but must include promoted faculty in the teaching track.

2.8.2.2.3.3.2 Input from Teaching Track Faculty in Academic Program

It is the responsibility of Florida Tech teaching track faculty to participate in the promotion process. The CPCs will solicit confidential letters from Florida Tech teaching track faculty members in the candidate's program. Letters should express clear recommendations for or against promotion accompanied with supporting explanations. If letters are not received in a timely manner, the CPC will attempt to obtain input from faculty who did not respond.

2.8.2.2.3.3.3 Letters of Recommendation from Outside Reviewers

Letters of recommendation are also required from reviewers outside of Florida Tech (see definition of outside reviewers in FH Appendix 1). Candidates and academic unit heads should suggest potential reviewers to the CPCs. The CPCs are responsible for

writing all requests for evaluations and receiving the external letters; the committee chair may write the requests or distribute the responsibility among committee members. If the required number of recommendation letters (as stated in FH Appendix 1) has not been received, the CPC is responsible for informing the candidate and requesting letters from additional outside reviewers.

Candidates' dossiers cannot be forwarded to academic unit heads or deans until all letters from outside reviewers are included.

2.8.2.2.3.4 Review Letters from Academic Unit Heads and Deans

The academic unit head will have monitored a candidate's performance during the period preceding promotion via annual performance evaluations and will provide a written assessment of the candidate's progress toward promotion based upon those evaluations. The written assessment will be submitted to the CPC and included in the dossier before submission to the UPC.

Written reviews by deans will be included in dossiers before submission to the chief academic officer and review by the UPC. Full dossiers of all candidates should be submitted electronically by the second Monday in January for the UPC's review in the spring.

2.8.2.2.3.5 University Teaching-Track Promotion Committee (UTPC)

2.8.2.2.3.5.1 Membership

The UTPC is composed as described in the faculty policy "Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty" (FH 1.5).

2.8.2.2.3.5.2 Process

There will be four meetings of the UTPC during the spring semester: (1) an organizational meeting, (2) a review meeting after dossiers have been initially evaluated, (3) a voting meeting, and (4) a post-review meeting. All voting members of

the UTPC are required to evaluate all complete dossiers with the appropriate colleges' promotion and tenure guidelines during a three-week review period.

2.8.2.2.3.5.2.1 Voting Meeting

In addition to the members of the UTPC, attendance at the voting meeting will normally include the chief academic officer and/or his/her representative. The committee will engage in a thorough discussion of the candidates' qualifications as they relate to the colleges' promotion and tenure guidelines. Ballots consisting of a list of the candidates' names and boxes for yes, no and abstain votes will be prepared and provided by the chief academic officer. Negative votes must have written justification included in the allotted space on the ballot. The chief academic officer will collect the ballots after all candidates have been considered. The chair of the UPC will call out the votes to the committee members and at least two members will record the votes. Results will be tabulated at the meeting and made known to the members of the UTPC. The results and all UTPC deliberations are to be treated with complete confidentiality.

Compilations of the committee's anonymous comments will be sent to the deans of candidates who were not recommended for promotion and tenure.

2.8.2.2.3.6 Timeline for Teach-Track Promotion Process

Date	Action
January (of preceding academic year)	Candidates discuss their intent to enter the promotion process with academic unit heads. Academic unit heads provide initial recommendations to the candidates.
April (of preceding academic year)	Candidates submit letters of intent to enter the promotion process and curricula vitae to the CPCs. Academic unit heads share written assessments with CPCs.
May	CPCs provide preliminary feedback to candidates.

August	Candidates electronically submit preliminary dossiers in PDF format and lists of potential outside reviewers to CPCs. Academic unit heads submit lists of additional potential outside reviewers to CPCs.
September-October	CPCs request letters from tenured faculty in the candidate's academic unit with a November deadline. CPCs request letters from outside reviewers (including some of those suggested by both candidates and academic unit heads) with a November deadline. CPCs submit feedback to candidates for revising dossiers.
November	Candidates electronically submit final dossiers in PDF format to CPCs. CPCs add letters from outside reviewers and the written assessment from academic unit heads to the dossiers. CPCs meet and formulate recommendations.
December	CPCs submit their recommendations and dossiers to the deans. Written reviews by deans will be added to the dossiers.
Early January	The chief academic officer calls an organizational meeting of the University Teaching-Track Promotion Committee (UTPC). The UTPC chooses a chair to officiate the process. Deans will submit completed dossiers of all candidates to the chief academic officer by the second Monday in January for the UTPC's review in the spring.
Late January to mid-February	The UTPC reviews dossiers and holds a second meeting for an initial review of candidates.
Mid-February to early March	The UTPC meets to discuss candidates, vote and submit recommendations to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer and president review recommendations and make the final decision on promotion, which are communicated to the deans.
By March 15	Candidates are sent official written notifications from the chief academic officer, and the deans of candidates who were not recommended for promotion are sent compilations of the committee's anonymous comments.
April	The UTPC holds a post-review meeting. The chief academic officer notifies all members of the UTPC of the final decision either by letter or at the post-review meeting.

2.8.2.2.3.7 Allowable Access to Documentation for Teaching-Track Promotion Review

Allowable Access							
Documentation	Candidate	Academic Unit Teaching-Track Faculty	Academic Unit Head	CPC	Dean	UTPC	Chief Academic Officer
Candidate's Dossier		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate's Annual Reviews	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Tenured Faculty Letters	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Academic Unit Head Recommendation	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
College Tenure Committee (CTC) Recommendation	No	No	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Letters from Outside Reviewers	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
College Dean Recommendation	No	No	No	No		Yes	Yes
University Teaching-Track Promotion Committee (UTPC) Recommendation	No	No	No	No	Yes		Yes
Chief Academic Officer Evaluation	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	

2.8.2.2.4. Disputes Between Voting Entities

If disputes about a candidate's viability arise between the dean and the UTPC, the chief academic officer will convene a meeting of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC). The AFTC will review all available documentation along with college-specific teaching-track promotion criteria and advise the chief academic officer on a final decision. The AFTC will relate its full findings in writing to the chief academic officer.

2.8.2.2.5 Granting or Denial of Teaching-Track Promotion

Candidates will be sent official written notifications from the chief academic officer of the final promotion decision by March 15. If promotion is denied, the written notification will provide specific reasons, the UTPC vote, the AFTC vote, if involved, and the recommendations from the academic unit head and dean.

If promotion is granted, it becomes effective on the first day of the following appointment year. If denied, the candidate may be eligible to remain employed at lower rank.

2.8.2.2.6 Appeal of Denial of Promotion

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC), as an impartial entity, will hear appeal cases related to denial of promotion. A faculty member denied promotion must appeal the decision within five (5) business days of receiving written notification from the chief academic officer.

2.8.2.2.6.1 Length of Time

The faculty member's request for an appeal initiates the committee's review period that will conclude within ten (10) business days during the academic year.

2.8.2.2.6.2 Process

Upon request, the UTPC will forward all information about its review to the AFTC within three (3) business days. The AFTC will share documents with the faculty member under review as appropriate while maintaining confidentiality.

The AFTC can request supporting documentation from the college dean and the faculty member under review to be received within three (3) business days of the request. The AFTC will review the faculty member's performance and consider all relevant evidence, which includes individual discussions with the dean and the faculty member under review. The faculty member may choose an advocate to be present when meeting with the AFTC. The AFTC may consult with additional faculty or administrators as necessary. Written

summaries of all discussions will be recorded and stored in the respective office of the college dean.

2.8.2.2.6.2.1 Appeal Outcomes

The AFTC will vote to choose one of the following outcomes:

- (1) The faculty member meets expected college-level criteria for promotion.
- (2) The faculty member does not meet college-level criteria for promotion.

The AFTC will prepare a written summary of its recommendation while maintaining confidentiality of individual members and forward it to the faculty member, academic unit head, college dean, and chief academic officer.

2.8.2.2.6.3 Final Decision on Appeal

Upon receiving a recommendation from the AFTC, the chief academic officer and president will make a final decision about promotion. The chief academic officer and president may consult with faculty and/or administrators in order to make a final decision on the case.

FH 2.9 Dismissal and Termination

See also The Office of Human Resources policy on Termination of Employment (effective date December 1 2014; revised December 2022).

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/human-resources-policies/discipline-and-rules/termination-of-employment/>

FH 2.9.1 Termination by the University

The university reserves the right to prematurely terminate any faculty member for any of the following reasons: incompetence, neglect of duty, insubordination, moral turpitude or financial necessity on the part of the university as a whole.

Incompetence

Incompetence occurs if a lack of ability renders the faculty member unable or unwilling to effectively perform teaching or other duties assigned by the university. The incompetence must be of a sufficient degree that remediation is unlikely within a reasonable period of time or the faculty member's attitude is such that he/she is unwilling or unable to make necessary changes. The university need not continue a faculty member whose methods are ineffective or whose attitude is improper, if his/her retention will directly harm students or otherwise impair the university's pursuit of its educational mission.

Neglect of Duty

Neglect of duty is the failure to meet a specific duty related to the express and implied obligations of a faculty member under the contract of employment, which may extend beyond teaching to requirements related to service and research.

Some of the enforceable duties at the university are for reporting, committee work, maintenance of office hours and other obligations of the employment relationship, such as best effort concerning research contract deliverables.

Insubordination

Insubordination generally means a willful disregard of reasonable directives or a defiant attitude of noncompliance toward regulations specifically applicable to the faculty member.

Dismissal on grounds of insubordination would be warranted for willful failure to follow directives that are reasonable and rationally related to the university's educational objectives. To justify dismissal, disobeying a directive must be shown to adversely impact the pursuit of educational goals or mission of the university.

Moral Turpitude

Moral turpitude occurs when the individual's private conduct adversely reflects on his/her ability to perform without harming the university's educational process. In accordance with the statement on academic freedom, a faculty member's opinions, personal moral code or religious belief shall not be used as criteria for appointment, promotion or dismissal. A faculty member's public actions may, however, be so used. Moral turpitude includes, but is not limited to, fraud in securing employment, dishonesty, drunkenness during working hours, conviction of a felony or misuse of university property or funds.

Anyone dismissed for moral turpitude need not be given prior notice and automatically forfeits all rights to benefits that would have otherwise accrued to him/her, excepting such benefits that have been paid through payroll deductions.

Financial Necessity

In the case of financial necessity, notice must be made by December 15 of the academic year before the year of the faculty member's dismissal. A faculty member will not be terminated because of declining departmental enrollment or shifting departmental emphasis during the time his/her appointment is in effect. Termination for financial necessity requires a written statement to that effect

by the chief academic officer with endorsement by the senior vice president for finance and the president.

FH 2.9.2 Appeal

A faculty member terminated for any reason may obtain a prompt evaluation of such administrative action by a Faculty Senate grievance committee on written request to the president of the Faculty Senate. Faculty can also appeal to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, and the Ombudsman Committee as appropriate.

Faculty Senate Grievance Committee

On being presented with a bona fide grievance from a member of the faculty of Florida Tech, the president of the Faculty Senate shall choose a committee of four senators to serve as a Faculty Senate grievance committee, so that fair and impartial consideration will be given to the grievance. If adequate balance to the committee composition cannot be obtained from members of the senate, the president may appoint non- senators. The senate president is at liberty to designate a fifth member as committee chair or may serve in that capacity him/herself, so long as there is a chair and four committee members.

In separate sessions, the committee shall interview all parties to the grievance and consider all materials submitted. In addition, the committee shall request and examine further materials it deems relevant and investigate the legitimacy of “standards” claimed by either party. These tasks identified by the committee are to be assigned by the committee chair.

The committee shall meet a minimum of three times or as often as the committee chair sees fit during the consideration of the grievance. These must include an initial, organizational meeting, an interim or progress report meeting and a concluding meeting at which a vote shall be taken. Before the vote at the concluding meeting, the parties’ positions will be thoroughly discussed. The committee chair shall vote with the committee members. The outcome of the vote, which shall be considered the decision of the committee, is to be reported at the next meeting of the senate executive committee. The

decision of the committee shall be reported to both parties to the grievance and to the chief academic officer.

Either party may petition the executive committee to re-open the investigation by reconvening the committee only if the party presents new and compelling evidence pertaining to the grievance.

FH 2.9.3 Termination by a Faculty Member

If a member of the faculty desires to terminate an existing appointment or to decline renewal in the absence of notice of nonrenewal, they shall give notice not less than three months before the end of his/her duties during an academic year exclusive of a summer session if their rank is instructor or assistant professor, and not less than four months if their rank is higher. They may request a waiver of this requirement in the case of hardship or in a situation where they would otherwise be denied substantial professional advancement.

Where the faculty member declines to accept the offered annual contract letter before the renewal date, usually May 1, the waiver is automatic.

FH 2.10 Policy on Academic Freedom

Effective Date Jun 16, 2008, Revised May 2, 2024

The university is committed to supporting and protecting the right of faculty and students to engage in academic pursuits in their discipline in accordance with the faculty's endorsement of the 1940 statement of the American Association of University Professors on academic freedom which follows:

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based on an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter that has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

The university will not infringe on the academic freedom of any faculty member or student.

The university provides opportunities for faculty members to resolve grievances, including those related to academic freedom. Those opportunities include (1) an appeal to the academic freedom and tenure committee (FH 2.8.1) (2) the ombudsman committee (FH 1.5.7) and (3) the faculty senate ad hoc

grievance committee (FH 2.9.2). For further details, faculty with a grievance related to academic freedom should consult the faculty grievance resolution procedure.

FH 2.11 Sexual Harassment, Non Discrimination And Complaint Procedure

Effective Date 12/08/2021

The sexual harassment policy is identical to The Office of Human Resources policy on Title IX Sexual Harassment

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/title-ix/>

The non-discrimination and Complaint Procedure policy is identical to The Office of Human Resources policy on Non Discrimination Policy and Complaint Procedure:

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/legal-compliance-and-risk-management/nondiscrimination-policy-and-complaint-procedures/>

FH 2.12 Sabbatical Leave

Effective Date Jul 14, 2016

Florida Tech recognizes the necessity for faculty members to acquire new and enriching experiences and to secure uninterrupted time for research, and thereby encourages and supports the sabbatical leave concept.

Eligibility: A faculty member whose service to Florida Tech for three or more continuous academic years meritoriously warrants sabbatical leave, may be granted leave of absence with part-time pay for a period not exceeding one year. Leave may be granted for the purpose of pursuing advanced study beyond the terminal degree, engaging in research or traveling in support of scholarly pursuits; in general, any activity that will enhance the professional and scholarly growth of the applicant. Sabbatical leave will not be granted more than once every seven years. The deadline for request is November 1 for a leave beginning the following academic year with a decision on the request by January 15. Applications for sabbatical leave must be made in consultation with the faculty member's supervisor and dean, and forwarded to the chief academic officer.

The sabbatical application should consist of a letter that states the date of the last sabbatical taken by the applicant, the time frame proposed for the requested sabbatical, a brief description of the activities planned during the sabbatical, and a description of the benefits of the sabbatical in terms of scholarly growth for the applicant and benefit to the university. Detailed proposals may be submitted as attachments.

If the sabbatical is approved, the precise terms of the leave of absence shall be in writing and given to the faculty member at the time of approval of the sabbatical leave.

Compensation: Sabbatical leave may be granted by the university for one academic term with full pay, or for one academic year with half pay. The amount paid shall not exceed half of the faculty member's regular salary for the academic year during which the leave takes place. Consultation between the faculty member and the chief academic officer will determine the applicable compensation option.

It is expected that a faculty member on sabbatical will not engage in remunerative employment. However, approval may be given if compensation for such employment amounts to not more than a half-year's salary plus \$5,000 for those on leave on half pay for a full year. This makes it possible for a faculty member to enjoy the salary equivalent to that of the university plus \$2,500 per term in consideration of the special expenses to the faculty member. Beyond such amounts of earning, the obligation of the university to the faculty member on leave will be proportionately reduced. However, foundation grants for research material or special travel will not reduce the obligation of the university, and in special cases, the common-sense

principle may be applied. The aim of the leave of absence and any obligation of the university do not extend beyond this point. In cases of outside remuneration beyond the points mentioned above, the faculty member may be granted leave at his own expense, or the university may be relieved of its obligation in proportion to the earnings involved.

Conditions: A faculty member is given sabbatical leave with the expectation that she/he will return to full- time service with the university at the conclusion of the sabbatical. A condition of accepting the sabbatical is that the faculty member must execute a formal contractual agreement that specifies the obligations of the university and the faculty member. Faculty not returning incur a financial obligation: The faculty member will, to the extent permitted by law, pay back funds received from Florida Tech during the sabbatical if the faculty member does not resume full-time employment with Florida Tech for at least one academic year after the sabbatical. Interest at the rate of 1.3 times prime will accrue on the sabbatical leave amount beginning with the end date of the sabbatical. Lump sum payback is expected. If not lump sum, the rate of payback will be determined by Florida Tech but will not exceed one year.

FH 2.13 Leave of Absence at Faculty Member's Request

Effective Date Jul 14, 2016

Unpaid leaves of absence may be granted to faculty members for medical or compelling personal reasons. A written request for a leave of absence must be submitted to the faculty member's academic unit head.

The academic unit head, dean of the college/school and the chief academic officer must approve the request.

The policy on attendance and time off is identical to The Office of Human Resources policy on Attendance and Time Off provided at:

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/human-resources-policies/attendance-and-time-off/>

FH 2.14 Policies Governing Hours of Work

Effective Date Jul 14, 2016

Full-time faculty covered by these policies are expected to give freely of their time, energy and ability to furthering the aims and purposes of the university and the accomplishment of their work. Because of the peculiar requirements of various positions, some variation in work schedule is normal. Except for formally scheduled classes and other activities, work schedules of full-time faculty members are necessarily flexible, and discretion must be used to guide their use of time in extracurricular and other duties related to proper professional services as teachers. Similarly, those employed for full- or part-time research, or part-time teaching and part-time research have work demands that do not conform to hourly schedules, and discretion must guide their use of time. The appropriate academic unit head will approve the normal work schedules for each individual and activity.

If the faculty member's arrival date on campus is after the beginning date of the faculty contract, it is the faculty member's responsibility to inform their department or academic unit head of when they will arrive on campus each term and why they will be absent from campus.

FH 2.15 Policies Governing Outside Work by Faculty Members

Effective Date Jan 9, 2013, Revised May 2, 2024

Full-time faculty at Florida Tech accept their appointment with the understanding that their primary employment responsibility is to the university. The university encourages faculty members to offer professional advice concerning the development of the natural resources of the state, or on new products or new scientific apparatuses and techniques; to conduct research, and prepare and publish results of their studies; to make addresses on subjects in which they are qualified and that are of public interest; and to serve as officers or as members of committees of learned and scientific societies. Such activities are not normally considered as outside work.

Ordinary private business of faculty members, such as investing money or the hiring of labor in private undertakings, is not considered to fall within the purview of regulation by the university, provided the business is of such a character as not to damage in any way the prestige of the university and entails no loss of time or efficiency in the performance of university duties.

Occasions may arise when it will be mutually beneficial to the university and the faculty member for the latter to serve as a consultant to local industry or national science organizations.

The principles are:

1. A member of the faculty who desires to engage in consulting shall do so only after obtaining the approval of his/her academic unit head.
2. Outside employment must not interfere with full and proper performance of university duties; shall not exceed one day per week; and in no way be detrimental to the best interest of the university.

3. No university equipment, supplies or clerical services may be used in the furtherance of outside work for pay except in highly unusual cases and following approval of appropriate administrative officials.

FH 2.15.1 Conflict of Interest

The Conflict of Interest policy is identical to The Office of Human Resources policy on Conflict of Interest.

<https://www.fit.edu/hr/conflict-of-interest-coi/>

FH 2.16 Policy Governing Purchases

Effective Date Jul 14, 2016

Florida Tech will not purchase from companies that are wholly or partly owned by a Florida Tech faculty member or a member of his/her immediate family. In addition, the university will not purchase from a company in which a Florida Tech faculty member or a member of his/her immediate family has a financial interest, e.g., stock dividends, commissions on sales, etc. Exceptions to this policy require approval of either the president or the chief academic officer.

The procurement/purchasing policies are identical to the Florida Tech policies, available at:

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/procurement-services/purchasing/procurement-policy/>

FH 2.17 Pursuit of Academic Degrees by Faculty

Effective Date Jul 4, 2011, Revised May 2, 2024

Florida Tech faculty of the professorial rank of assistant professor or higher are not allowed to pursue Florida Tech academic degrees. Only the chief academic officer may grant an exception/exemption to this policy.

Notably, the Office of Human Resources policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment applies to all Florida Tech full-time employees not on unpaid leave, their eligible dependent children, and their current spouses.

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/human-resources-policies/training-and-development/tuition-remission/>

FH 2.18 Policy on Faculty Advising

Effective Date Feb 6, 2014

See also faculty guideline “Faculty Advising” for guidelines and procedures for successful advising.

Every student at the university is assigned a full-time faculty member as his or her faculty advisor. Faculty advisors should instill in their advisees a confidence that the academic, professional and social development of the student is their serious concern. They should advise students concerning their courses of study after making a thorough examination of the student’s past academic performance, not only at Florida Tech, but also at any other school the student has attended. They assist students in career development and advise on course selection during registration. Faculty advising is one of the most important responsibilities of a faculty member outside the classroom.

Faculty should be familiar with policies covering confidentiality of student records and cheating/plagiarism, covered in the following two sections.

2.18.1 Employee Responsibilities Under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

<https://www.fit.edu/registrar/release-of-student-information/>

Security and confidentiality of student records are the responsibility of all faculty members. Adherence to the guidelines is absolutely required for all employees and enables the campus community to avoid student complaints under FERPA.

2.18.2 Cheating/Plagiarism

<https://www.fit.edu/policies/student-focused-policies/standards-and-policies/academic-honesty/>

(Note: For graduate students, see Graduate Policy 4.12.)

FH 2.19 Policy on Patents and Copyrights

Effective Date Jul 12, 2016

Preamble

In adopting this policy, the board of trustees recognizes there may be research projects sponsored by governmental authorities, industrial concerns or others, which may entitle the sponsors to the ownership, without payment or any royalty to any person. “Ownership” as used in this document refers both to ownership of a discovery or invention made by a faculty member as to which there is a reasonable likelihood of obtaining a patent; and to ownership of copyrightable material authored by a faculty. Software is considered a patentable discovery or invention under this policy.

FH 2.19.1 Creation of Patent and Copyright Committee

The board of trustees has authorized the president to appoint a Patent and Copyright Committee with the authority and responsibility provided for below, and that will be comprised of three members of the university faculty and three members of the university administrative staff.

FH 2.19.2 Discoveries and Inventions

1. Disclosure, Discoveries and Inventions

Any faculty member who has made a discovery or invention that in his/her judgment reasonably appears to be patentable, shall bring such discovery or invention to the attention of the president of the university or his designated representative, who will refer it to the committee to determine whether and to what extent the university has an interest in the discovery or invention. Any such discovery or invention shall be disclosed promptly, but in any event within 60 days.

2. Ownership of Discoveries and Inventions

- a.** A discovery or invention developed as a direct result of the regular duties of a faculty member or as a result of research done on or in connection with theses or dissertations or as a result of a program of research financed wholly or in part by university funds or by funds under the control of the university shall except otherwise owned for reasons mentioned in the Preamble, be the exclusive property of the university. The ownership of any such discovery or invention and any patent rights shall be assigned to the university or its designee and shall be administered in accordance with the determination of the committee.
- b.** A discovery or invention developed by a faculty member shall be the exclusive property of the inventor(s) if all the following conditions exist.

 - 1.** If the university has contributed nothing substantial or essential to the production and development of such discovery or invention in funds, space, facilities or personnel, including students.
 - 2.** If the discovery or invention is not related to any university research then in progress or to which the university is committed, and to which the faculty member is connected.
 - 3.** If the discovery or invention was developed by the faculty member(s) on his/her or their own time without any expense to the university.
- c.** If there is a difference of opinion as to whether a discovery or invention is within (a) or (b) above, or if within neither, the ownership and determination of any equities of the discovery or invention shall be decided by the committee, and subject to appeal to the president of the university. Once the decision has been rendered, it is binding on the university and the faculty member who made the discovery or invention.

3. Authority and Responsibility of Committee with Respect to Discoveries and Inventions

The committee, subject to appeals to the president listed here, has the following authority and responsibility with respect to discoveries and inventions:

- a.** To receive and act on reports of discoveries and inventions.
- b.** To determine the ownership of discoveries and inventions, and the dates of their conception, disclosure and reduction to practice.
- c.** To determine the equities of the university, the inventor(s) and any other parties in discoveries and inventions; and to provide equitably for sharing royalties received for any patented or patentable discovery or invention in which the university has a property interest between the university and the inventor with the following.
 - 1.** Where an agreement, letter or other document involving the university and another party having an interest in a discovery or invention requires royalties on the discovery or invention to be distributed in a particular manner. In all other cases, the procedure set out in 2, 3 and 4 shall be followed, provided that where an agreement, letter or other document places a limit on the amount of royalties to be paid, the amount of royalties paid shall not exceed that limit.
 - 2.** The university shall retain all royalties until it has fully recovered all expenses incurred in connection with the filing and prosecution of a patent application.
 - 3.** The next \$2,500 of such royalties shall be paid to the inventor(s) of the discovery or invention.
 - 4.** Royalties received beyond those required to meet the conditions specified in 1, 2 and 3 above shall be divided as follows:

- i.** One-third of royalties received shall be retained by the university.
 - ii.** One-third shall be paid to the inventor(s) in accordance with their rights.
 - iii.** One-third shall be paid to the primary academic department(s) of the inventor(s) according to proportionate participation as determined in “d” below.
- d.** To determine the financial returns from the discovery or invention due each inventor when there are co-inventors.
- e.** To determine whether the university should attempt to obtain a patent or submit the discovery to the university’s patent agent, in the case of the university having a property interest. Any such determination shall be made within two months from the date the discovery was disclosed to the committee or, if sooner, within 30 days after the written request is received from the president of the university or from the inventor.
- f.** To determine whether the university shall pursue a patent application or assign any right it may have in the discovery, when the committee submits a discovery or invention to the university’s patent agent and the agent decides either not to file the application or abandon an application already filed. The inventor shall be notified of the determination within 30 days after the receipt by the committee of notice from the university’s patent agent.
- g.** To report its findings and determinations to the president of the university and other interested parties within 120 days, except in those situations for which a different period of time for making a determination is established.
- h.** To report its findings to the president of the university on all matters pertaining to patentable research or patents offered to the university by gift, devise, purchase, sale

or assignment, regardless of the potential value or circumstances under which such patentable research or patents were discovered.

4. Management and Exploitation of Patents

The president of the university shall be the final authority to determine how patents that are the property of the university shall be managed and exploited.

FH 2.19.3 Copyrightable Material

1. Rights of Authors

In accordance with other institutions of higher learning and except as provided for in Paragraph 2 below, the right of first publication and of statutory copyright in any book, manuscript, television or motion picture script or film, educational material or other copyrightable work, whose author is a faculty member, shall be the property of the author.

2. Rights of the University

Copyrightable material resulting from a project assigned to faculty as a part of their regular duties shall inure to the university only if so specified in writing and signed by the faculty member, their department head, and the dean.

3. Authority and Responsibility of Committee with Respect to Copyrightable Materials

The committee has the same authority and responsibility with respect to copyrightable material authored by a faculty member as it has with respect to discoveries or inventions made by such persons and dealt with in “Discoveries and Inventions” (FH 2.19.2). The specific authority and responsibility of the committee with respect to discoveries and inventions described in Paragraph 3 of FH 2.19.2, shall apply with equal force to copyrightable material owned in total or in part by the university.

4. Notice to Committee

Department heads, deans and directors shall notify the committee in writing of any work assigned in accordance with Paragraph 2 above, “Rights of the University,” which might result in a manuscript or other property for which copyright may be obtainable.

FH 2.19.4 Publication of Material Relating to Discoveries, Inventions and Scholarly Investigation

The board of trustees recognizes and wishes to give the fullest possible cooperation to traditional principles and practices of academic freedom in connection with the publication of writings that relate to discoveries and inventions. At the same time, it is recognized that governmental authorities, industrial concerns or other organizations that sponsor research projects may require temporary restriction on publication to protect the sponsor’s interest in patentable inventions or discoveries, or because of the national interest or other reasons considered sufficient by the sponsor. The committee will determine if the university has been authorized or required by the sponsor to determine whether or not publication would be in compliance with such restrictions and/or conditions.

FH 2.19.5 Appeals from Committee Determinations

If any interested persons are dissatisfied with the determination by the committee of any matter relating to any discovery, invention, patent, copyright or copyrightable material, or publication of any writing, such person may request the determination be reviewed by the president of the university. Any such request shall be made in writing and delivered to the committee no later than fifteen (15) days after receipt of notice of the determination that he/she regards as unsatisfactory, or within fifteen (15) days after the expiration date when the committee should have reported its findings to interested parties. On receipt of such a request, the committee will forward it with its determinations and recommendations to the president, unless the committee reconsiders or modifies its previous determination to the satisfaction of all parties. The president may affirm, modify or revise the committee’s determination, and his determination shall be binding on all interested parties. The committee will assist the president in reviewing any such matter as the president may request.

FH 2.19.6 Policy on Stored Course Materials

The current Florida Tech intellectual property policy as contained in this document focuses on traditional copyright and patent issues, and creates a balance between the goals of creating and disseminating knowledge, and deriving revenue from commercially viable inventions. Through this policy faculty retain ownership of copyright material while they are required to disclose all creations or inventions that have patent potential to the standing committee on intellectual property. The committee reviews each circumstance and recommends a course of action (seek a patent, return the rights to the creator or some other appropriate process).

The policy also contains a provision where the university and the creator of copyright material can create a contract for the investment of resources, the control over the product and the associated rights. As educational material is now frequently created, stored and reused in a digital format, it is necessary to establish procedures to govern this stored course material.

Digital intellectual property creates new forms of value and has an extended life that makes it commercially viable. These products are changing the format, content and economics of educational delivery. This extension to the intellectual property policy sets out some basic principles for stored course materials that will mutually benefit the creators and the university, but does not address patent or trademark rights and is not intended to apply to traditional printed materials such as books and lecture notes. A primary concern is to promote the broadest possible creation and dissemination of knowledge while protecting academic freedom.

With the university's encouragement and support, faculty members are creating course material that can be reused. Digital course segments range from simple or inexpensive productions to major investments:

1. If the stored course material is created by full-time faculty in the context of the normal duties and does not involve substantial use of Florida Tech resources, the ownership of the intellectual property remain with the creator.

2. If a substantial use of Florida Tech resources is involved in the creation of the product, the university and the faculty member should plan together to recover its investment over time. A separate contract must be developed at the start of the project to cover the concerns and interests of the creator(s) and the university. This includes intellectual property rights as well as such matters as initial investments, protections, editorial control, marketing, royalties, extended use and eventual disposition.

Substantial use is defined as a threshold for the investment of institutional resources that requires additional planning and preparation to recover this investment over some period of time. If use is substantial, the university is acting with the faculty member as a partner in the development of stored materials and will have rights to those materials.

Defining Substantial Use

A faculty member makes substantial use of university resources if the use significantly exceeds the customary level needed to support teaching responsibilities. Under the supervision of the dean, the department head determines if the development of stored material makes substantial use of university resources. The input of service providers whose services were used or may be used is relevant to this determination. Factors to be considered in the determination include, but are not limited to, the following.

1. Use of an online presentation system like ANGEL, which is offered to all faculty for normal use in their courses does not count toward substantial use.
2. A course stored and offered later or offered remotely by the university does not count toward substantial use.
3. Use of any materials or services paid for out of an external grant to the faculty member does not count toward substantial use.
4. Technology Enhanced Content (TEC) resources, when providing faculty with basic training in multimedia course development, does not count toward substantial use.

5. TEC resources, if paid for by the faculty member at the university's then-current rate for use of the lab, does not count toward substantial use.
6. TEC resources, for which no reimbursement is made, is presumed to be substantial if the TEC staff considers it will be substantial or that further effort would make a use substantial.
7. Use of the library is not normally substantial, but extensive use of the library staff as research assistants could contribute toward a determination of substantial use.
8. Faculty developing and/or teaching a course as part of his/her normal teaching responsibilities on campus, and without a compensatory reduction in teaching load or significant additional teaching or support staff, DOES NOT count toward substantial use.

A determination of whether or not use of university resources is “substantial” is not a determination that the proposed use is reasonable or within the capacity of the university's service providers. Service providers (such as the library or TEC facilities) have limited resources. Whether or not a use is deemed substantial under this definition, the service provider may advise a faculty member the proposed use is significant, it must be approved by the department head or dean, extra funding will be required to provide the level of service requested or the service cannot be provided in the time frame requested.

NOTE: TEC resources are those facilities provided to develop technology-enhanced content. This is an expanding role in terms of services and service providers. TEC is subject to competing demands for limited resources and is required to maximize the use of institutional resources in achieving Florida Tech's educational and research goals.

When There Is No Substantial Use

If a faculty member does not make substantial use of university facilities in the development of copyrightable course materials, the copyright to those materials will belong to the faculty member,

not to the university. The university may not make use of these materials in other courses without permission of the faculty member. The faculty member has the same rights to use these materials in other courses or at other schools, as he/she would have if they were written lecture notes.

When There Is Substantial Use

If a faculty member does make substantial use of university resources in the development of copyrightable course materials, the university will have rights to those materials. The faculty member and the university should enter into a contract before development of any materials.

If there is no written contract between the faculty member and the university, a contract will be implied and include the following terms.

1. The faculty member will own the copyright to the materials, but the university will have a license to use the materials.
2. The university may use the materials in courses not taught by the faculty member for one year after the end of the first course that used the materials, even if the faculty member leaves the university before this year has ended. The university may continue to use the materials indefinitely if the faculty member does not instruct the university to stop using the materials.
3. The faculty member will have artistic and editorial control over the materials, subject to any constraints the university may impose on the nature and level of its investment.
4. The faculty member may revise the materials. Normally, the university will make reasonable efforts to work with the faculty member to revise the materials in a reasonable time. However, the university shall accelerate its efforts if the faculty member believes, in good faith that continued use of some material(s) would damage her/his reputation or expose the university or faculty member to a successful lawsuit. In either case, the university shall make its best effort to work with the faculty member to promptly revise the materials in a way that is satisfactory to the faculty member.

5. The faculty member will deposit a copy of the materials with the university library, which it will hold as noncirculating reference materials for local use only and not for use in interlibrary loans.
6. In the event of a lawsuit, the same rules for liability allocation apply to stored course materials as to live materials. However, (a) If the university or the faculty member uses the materials without revision after being advised of a legal risk by the other, the using party assumes all risk, and indemnifies and holds the other party harmless from all legal claims arising from matters warned about by the other party. (b) If the university sublicenses materials to a third party, it is the university that bears the risk of any liability in connection with the third party's use of the materials. (c) If one of the parties uses the materials outside of their geographic scope, that party assumes all risk and holds the other party harmless from all legal claims arising out of differences in legal rules in the out- of-scope geographic area. (The normal geographic scope is the country in which the faculty member teaches for the university.)

A typical contract will include additional terms, for example:

1. The university will normally be granted a longer term, at least two years after the end of the first course that uses the materials, during which it can use the materials.
2. In the absence of a contract, the university will not owe the faculty member a royalty or fee for using the materials in courses not taught by the faculty member. The contract may specify such a royalty or fee.
3. The university will normally be granted a right to sublicense the materials to other institutions, and the contract will specify the maximum term of the sublicense that the university may grant. In the absence of a contract, the university may not sublicense the materials.
4. If the university sublicenses the course materials, the license fee will normally be divided equally between the university, the faculty member's department and the faculty member.

5. The faculty member may be granted a right to sublicense the materials to other institutions.

The contract will specify the maximum term of the sublicense the faculty member may grant, and the royalty or fee due the university. In the absence of a contract, the faculty member may not sublicense the materials.

6. The faculty member may be granted the right to market and use these course materials in courses presented independently of the university. If so, it will specify the royalty or fee due the university for such presentations. In the absence of a contract, the faculty member may not market or use these materials outside of the university without permission of the university.

7. The university may be granted the right to modify the course materials. In the absence of a contract, modifications may not be made without the approval of the faculty member.

FH 2.20.1 Policy on Research Proposals

Effective Date Jul 4, 2011

The principal investigator is responsible for the scientific merit of a proposal. Adequate care must be taken to explain and document the proposed research topic. Proper consideration must be given to the procedure for carrying out the proposed investigation including the amount of time required and the total cost of the work. The principal investigator is also responsible for defending the proposal and must take into account that a proposal submitted to a funding agency reflects on the academic and research stature of the university.

The principal investigator should contact the Office of Sponsored Programs for current fringe benefits and indirect cost rates before preparing the budget. An internal budget form must also be completed. Approval by the principal investigator, academic unit head, dean, and vice president for research confirms and commits Florida Tech to the staffing requirements and support facilities, and any Florida Tech matching contributions, which are not necessarily a part of the budget submitted to the sponsoring agency.

FH 2.20.2 Research Salary Supplements

Effective Date Jul 14, 2016, Revised May 2, 2024

Full-time established faculty conducting funded research in a given fiscal year will be awarded a research salary supplement (RSS) to be paid in two equal installments during the following academic year equal to the sum of:

1. 10 percent of their academic year salary charged to research grants and contracts, and
2. Five percent of their summer salary charged to research grants, and
3. Five percent of all undergraduate and graduate student tuition, fees and stipends paid from the grants or contracts for which they are the principal investigator (includes student stipends under “participant support”), and
4. Five percent of all capital equipment expenditures from grants and contract for which they are the PI, and
5. Five percent of salary expenditures for post docs, research professionals, adjunct faculty and technicians paid from grants and contracts for which they are the principal investigator.

Note 1: Full-time faculty who served as Co-PI and whose academic year and/or summer salary was supported by an external grant or contract during the preceding fiscal year are eligible for an RSS based on the salary support received.

Note 2: Research-active administrators holding a full-time established faculty rank are eligible for an RSS.

The Office of Sponsored Programs will compute the RSS amounts using the official university expenditure report. The vice president for research will review the RSS data with the deans and submit the research salary supplements to the chief academic officer for approval and implementation.

Faculty hired as research professors on grants and contracts are not eligible for research salary supplements. Also, faculty who resign before award of the RSS are not eligible for an RSS. In addition, only projects with a demonstrable scholarly component and are overhead-bearing are eligible.

The supplements are awarded on a fiscal year basis and may be discontinued and/or the criteria changed as deemed necessary by the president based on the recommendation of the chief academic officer.

FH 2.20.3 Responsibilities in Academic Research

Effective Date Jun 16, 2008

The university and the sponsor recognize specific responsibilities in the performance of the proposed work once a research contract or grant has been awarded. The most important of these lies with the principal investigator and the academic unit head, as indicated in faculty policies "Research Duties and Responsibilities of the Principal Investigator," "Research Duties and Responsibilities of the Academic Unit Head" and "Research Duties and Responsibilities of Approval of the Senior Administrative Officers."

FH 2.20.4 Research Duties and Responsibilities of the Principal Investigator

Effective Date Jul 7, 2017

Principal investigators are responsible for the overall direction and management of their research programs. In this capacity, they have the authority to direct graduate students supported on their project, as well as that portion of other institution personnel whose time has been specifically budgeted to the program. The principal investigators monitor all expenditures on their grants or contracts, and are fully authorized to approve purchase orders that apply solely to their grants or contracts. Federal funding agencies generally regard the principal investigator as the primary individual to consult on all matters relating to carrying out the research objectives, keeping all expenditures within the research budget as negotiated and signed, and meeting the prescribed deadlines for filing administrative and technical research reports and project results.

FH 2.20.5 Research Duties and Responsibilities of the Academic Unit Head

Effective Date Jun 16, 2008

The approval of the academic unit head on the official copy of the research proposal means explicitly that the academic unit head:

1. Approves the work proposed by the principal investigator.
2. Considers the proposal to be a scholarly inquiry that reflects positively on the principal investigator and the university.
3. Assures the prospective sponsor that, if the proposal receives favorable consideration, the principal investigator and all other individuals listed in the proposal will be released from academic and administrative responsibilities for the amount of time indicated in the proposal.
4. Assures the prospective sponsor that if the proposal receives favorable consideration he/she will render all administrative assistance required by the principal investigator to meet the prescribed program objectives within the specified time span.

FH 2.20.6 Research Duties and Responsibilities of Approval of the Senior Administrative Officers

Effective Date Jun 16, 2008

The approval of the senior administrative officers on the official copy of the research proposal means explicitly that:

1. The research budget calculations have been verified by the Office of Sponsored Programs of the university, working with the principal investigator and other university personnel.
2. The senior administrative officers concur with the decisions reached by the academic unit head concerning the caliber of the proposal and its relevance to planned and projected activities in the department.
3. The senior administrative officers provide assurance to the prospective sponsor that, if the proposal receives favorable consideration, these officers will render all administrative assistance required by the academic unit head and the principal investigator in order to meet the program objectives within the specified time span.

FH 2.20.7 Policy on Research Misconduct and Fraud

Effective Date Jul 4, 2011, Revised May 2, 2024

Fortunately, research misconduct and fraud are rare events. However, because of the seriousness of misconduct and the special responsibilities of universities in such circumstances and in accordance with federal regulations, the university has developed a set of explicit policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of research misconduct and fraud. These are outlined in

<https://www.fit.edu/research/faculty--researchers/regulations/reporting-misconduct-and-fraud/>.

FH 2.21 Safety Compliance and Identification of Hazardous Materials

Effective Date Jul 14, 2016

Employees are required to comply with the provisions of the *Safety Manual*. It is particularly important for employees to report the generation or acquisition of hazardous materials and to know the safe treatment and storage of those materials.

FH 2.22 Policy on Objectivity in Research

Effective Date Jul 4, 2011, Revised May 2, 2024

Objectivity is one of the cornerstones of the research enterprise. To ensure the university fulfills its role as careful steward of the public and private research resources entrusted to it, the university is in the process of developing a set of explicit policies and procedures for disclosing, reviewing and managing conflicts that may naturally arise in the course of carrying out the university's mission goals in research and technology transfer. These policies and procedures are outlined at:

<https://www.fit.edu/research/faculty--researchers/regulations/> and at

<https://www.fit.edu/research/research-toolbox/policies-and-references/>.

Procedures

Advising International Students

Effective Date Feb 6, 2014

English Proficiency Testing

See academic policy "English Language Proficiency" or "English and Languages" in the university catalog.

Full Time vs. Part Time

Immigration regulations set forth by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) governing the enrollment of international student's state they must be registered full time. A full-time course of study is defined for the fall and spring semesters as follows:

- Undergraduate study – a minimum of 12 semester credit hours
- Graduate study – a minimum of nine semester credit hours

If the summer semester is an international students' first semester, they are required to be registered full time. Returning international students are not required to be registered in the summer.

No more than one online/distance learning course or three credits per semester may count toward the full- time course load requirement.

International students should maintain full-time student status to avoid problems with the USCIS and/or their own sponsor's requirements. International students considering a reduction of their course load below that of full-time status should first consult the Office of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS). If international students are dropping courses that affect their credit-hour total, the signature of the director of ISSS is required. However, if a student is dropping and adding courses for the same amount of credits, no signature is required.

There are certain conditions where an international student may be enrolled less than full time, providing they follow the appropriate authorization procedures. An up-to-date Less Than Full Time Course Load form is available from ISSS. The form must be filled out in its entirety and signed. The exceptions to less than a full load are as follows:

- English language difficulties (acceptable only in the first semester of enrollment)
- Unfamiliarity with American teaching methods and requirements (acceptable only in the first semester of enrollment)
- Improper course-level placement
- Completion of course requirements (available only in last semester and Petition to Graduate has been filed)
- Medical (official documentation must be submitted)

Graduate students may register for less than full load if they are registered in a course that the university considers to be full time, for at least three semester credit hours if they have been awarded a full-time GSA, or six semester credit hours if they have been awarded a half GSA.

Note: Financial reasons are never an acceptable reason for a less than full-time course of study.

See academic policy "English Language Proficiency" for information about registration procedures.

Change of Major

Many international students have been permitted to enter the country to study a specific curriculum. When an international student who is being sponsored by an agency or government decides to change his/her major, special permission must be obtained from the student's sponsor before a change of major can take effect. In addition, changes must be reported to the federal government and documentation updated and processed accordingly. Therefore, ISSS must sign all Change of Major forms for international students.

Dual Major

International students are prevented by USCIS regulations from officially carrying a dual major only if the dual major will adversely affect the forward progress of a student's course of study and require extensions of his/her program of study. International students can carry a dual major with careful planning and academic guidance.

Time Limits on Academic Programs

There are time limits for completion of degrees by international students. Per USCIS regulations, international students must make "normal progress" in the pursuit of a degree. Extensions of course study may be granted if the student's advisor makes a recommendation BEFORE their current program end date. The extension process involves the student receiving a letter from their academic advisor clearly stating the reason(s) why an extension is required and the new expected completion date. The student must present this letter to ISSS, along with a new financial statement showing that the student has the resources to continue their studies until the new completion date is reached. Again, AN EXTENSION MUST BE ISSUED BEFORE THE CURRENT PROGRAM END DATE IS REACHED. Failure to do so will result in the student considered to be out-of-status and will be reported as such to immigration.

Academic advisors of international students should also be aware that some sponsors place time restrictions on international students. Advisers are encouraged to contact the ISSS (ext. 8053) whenever they have questions about procedures governing international students.

Recommendation for Less Than Full-Time Load

This form is available from the ISSS office and is provided to facilitate the communication of certain information required by regulations of the USCIS. Its completion is needed for a student in F-1 and J-1 status to be granted permission to carry less than a full-time academic load and still maintain visa status during the academic semester specified on the form.

1. Permission to take less than a full-time load must be received before dropping any courses.

Failure to obtain prior approval will result in the student being considered out-of-status and must be reported to the USCIS.

2. Documentation is required if dropping a course for medical reasons.
3. Taking less than a full-time course load can only be used ONCE, unless the student is in their last semester of study. Students should be absolutely certain that they will graduate in the current semester before choosing to register for less than a full-time course load. Failure to graduate after dropping below full time will result in the student being out-of-status and the loss of F-1 benefits.
4. Permission to take less than a full load is limited only to the choices listed on the form. Dropping a course due to concerns of possible failure in that course is not a legal reason with USCIS.

Students who fall out of status may be eligible for reinstatement with the USCIS, providing they meet eligibility requirements as described in U.S. federal regulations.

Please be aware that applying for reinstatement is not a guarantee that you will be reinstated. for a complete list of full-load courses, contact the Office of Graduate Programs at ext. 8137.

Advising Students for Directed Study

Effective Date Jun 16, 2008, Revised May 2, 2024

When a student, for reasons beyond his/her control, must earn credit for a particular course before the next time at which the course will be offered, it is occasionally possible to arrange for personal study of the subject as directed by a qualified full-time faculty member. (see academic policy "Directed Study").

To enroll for a directed study course, the student should initiate a Request for Directed Study form and obtain the needed approvals as directed on the form. Approval is given at the discretion of the academic unit offering the course.

Normally, evidence of a compelling need (e.g., course required for graduating before course's next scheduled offering) and due diligence by the student regarding taking the course when offered are required for approval. Not taking the course at its last scheduled offering because of an unpopular class time or instructor is never an acceptable justification.

The appropriate form for Directed Study is: https://www.fit.edu/media/site-specific/wwwfitedu/registrar/documents/registrar-forms/20220409c_FINALfillable_Directed-Study.pdf

Advising to Improve Grades

Effective Date Feb 6, 2014

First-year students are contacted by their advisors and notified of their current academic situation if their grades need improving. Any student deficient in one or more courses should be informed so changes can be made.

During the eighth week of each term, instructors of 1000- and 2000-level courses enter all midterm grades (A.B.C.D.F or I) online. During the ninth week, students are alerted and are encouraged to visit their faculty advisor, who also has been alerted.

The advisor should review the student's folder before an advising meeting. Each folder should contain placement test scores, course placements and test descriptions, high school and previous college transcripts (or an abstract of relevant information), correspondence, previous grade reports and the student's current schedule.

During the advising session, the advisor should:

- Review the student's academic progress. If she/he has a D or F, the options include prompt consultation with pertinent instructor(s), dropping a course before the ninth week, and/or seeking tutoring through the Academic Support Center.
- Review curriculum requirements and weigh the workload vs. demonstrated capacities.
- Review the academic regulations with the student, including necessary prerequisites.
- Review the Student/Faculty Complaint Procedure, if appropriate.
- Inform the student about personal counseling and academic counseling available at CAPS and the Academic Support Center.
- Be alert to other contributing factors such as study habits, time management, memory development, personal relationships with peers and/or instructors, knowledge of resources, health,

test preparations, money management or other sources of stress. The Academic Support Center can assist in these areas

Faculty Grievance Resolution Procedure

Effective Date Dec 14, 2015, Revised May 2, 2024

This procedure is intended to provide a fair, internal process for resolving complaints and or grievances that may arise from faculty members. This procedure only applies to faculty members as defined within the Faculty Handbook of Florida Institute of Technology under FH 2.1 Academic Rank.

General

A faculty member who believes that he/she has a legitimate grievance should attempt to resolve the matter informally. The faculty member should bring the complaint or dispute to the individual or group with whom he/she has the grievance in an attempt to resolve the problem through informal discussion. The formal procedure set forth below is not meant to supersede attempts to resolve complaints through other means.

The procedure should be used only after every effort has been made to settle the dispute informally. This procedure has been modeled after several other such university procedures throughout the United States.

Procedure

The following procedure should be used for faculty members wishing to file a formal complaint.

1. The faculty member must use the organizational structure to which he/she reports.
2. The complaint must be in writing and contain at a minimum the following information:

- a. The nature and extent of the problem;
 - b. An indication of what policies and/or procedures are allegedly being violated;
 - c. Identification of the alleged person/persons responsible for the problem;
 - d. The attempts made to resolve the problem; and
 - e. Remedy sought.
3. The complaint will be acted on within a two to three-week timeframe to find a suitable solution.
4. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the resolution of the complaint at the organizational reporting level, this matter may be taken to the Faculty Ombudsman Committee^[2]

Ombudsman Committee: Three senior faculty members are appointed by the chief academic officer to serve as an ombudsman committee to hear grievances (other than those associated with termination) that a faculty member does not feel comfortable pursuing through the usual organizational structure, i.e., department head, dean, chief academic officer or the president. Usually, the faculty member approaches one member of the committee and describes the problem. They then decide whether other members of the committee should be involved and the best approach to resolving the problem. If a resolution of the problem requires disclosure of the member's identity, such disclosure is made only with the approval of the faculty member making the complaint.

5. If the faculty member is still not satisfied with the resolution of the complaint at the Faculty Ombudsman Committee, a request can be made for the chief academic officer (or designee) to handle the complaint. This request must be submitted in writing to the office of the chief academic officer within two weeks after the notice of resolution by the department head, dean and/or Ombudsman Committee. The decision made by the office of the chief academic officer shall be deemed as final.

Clarification

A grievance is a complaint by a faculty member that he/she has been adversely affected in his/her professional activities as a result of an arbitrary and capricious act or failure to act or a violation of a university or college procedure or regulation by the complainant's supervisor, administrator, peer or administrative body.

The grievance procedure may **NOT** be used for:

1. Complaints alleging discrimination or harassment on the basis of race, color, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, national or ethnic origin, disability, marital status or veteran status. As referenced in FH2.6, *"It is Florida Tech's policy and practice to prohibit discrimination because of race, gender, color, religion, creed, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, protected veteran status or any other discrimination prohibited by law."*
2. The university, as an Equal Opportunity Employer, has adopted standards and practices that insure all applicants for employment and all employees are treated in a fair and impartial manner that recognizes the dignity of each individual and allows selection and advancement based on qualifications and abilities. If a faculty member feels he/she has been discriminated against regarding access to employment, hiring, promotion, compensation, job assignment or fringe benefits solely because of race, gender, color, religion, creed, national origin, ancestry, marital status, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, protected veteran status or any other discrimination prohibited by law, he/she is entitled to request review by an ad hoc Faculty Senate grievance committee (see policy "Dismissals and Terminations"). See references to the Ombudsman Committee in the policy "Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty."
3. Complaints pertaining to general levels of salary, fringe benefits, or other broad areas of financial management and staffing.
4. Disputes that are personal in nature or do not involve the complainant's professional activities.

5. A complaint, the resolution or remedy of which would conflict with a current policy approved by the Faculty Senate, university administration, current policy of Florida Institute of Technology, federal, state or local law or regulation, or any contract to which the university is a party.
6. A complaint pertaining to an issue within the purview of any other standing committee or policy of the university or college, unless the complaint arises from a committee's alleged failure to act or to follow the policies or procedures of the university or college.

[1] The terms grievance and complaint will be used interchangeably throughout this procedure.

[2] Section [FH1.5 Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty](#)

[3] Subject to change.

Faculty Online Grading Procedure

Effective Date Aug 7, 2009

Online grading is the official mode of submitting grades. All grading is completed through Web for Faculty (www.fit.edu/paws). Instructors/faculty will be informed via email from the Registration Center that grading is enabled in Web for Faculty. Web for Faculty will list only the courses taught by the faculty member logged in for the selected term. Only the instructor of the course listed in Banner will be able to enter grades.

The drop-down grade box will show only those grades to be used for the course (i.e., A-F, I, P/F, S/U). Faculty may enter grades and/or change grades online up until the 4 p.m. deadline. Any grades not entered by 4 p.m. on the day grades are due will be defaulted to a grade of NR (no record). Contact the Registration Center for instructions on submitting grades to replace NRs.

Faculty of 1000- and 2000-level courses must enter midterm grades.

FH 2.3-2.4 Basis and Procedures for Faculty Appointment and Promotion

Effective Date Jul 4, 2011

FH 2.3 Basis for Appointment and Promotion

Appointments to the faculty or promotion from one academic rank to another shall be primarily based on education, experience, effective performance and in recognition of special merit in some or all of the activities listed above. The criteria for recognition and evaluation of merit shall become progressively more exacting from lower to higher academic ranks. Promotion to the rank of professor shall be reserved to those members who have demonstrated outstanding performance in their respective fields.

Training and experience are generally recognized in the educational world as basic requirements for appointments and promotions. They are also recognized by Florida Tech, but without the rigidity so often found in automatic promotion plans. Florida Tech subscribes to the belief that alert and progressive faculty members will benefit from their experience, and that graduate study increases knowledge and broadens perspectives. It is definitely expected that each faculty member will endeavor to earn the terminal degree in his/her field.

Under the qualifications indicated above, the university does have a guiding policy on training and experience. It is given here as a general policy to which justified exceptions may be made.

FH 2.4 Procedures for Appointment

Recommendations for appointment should be initiated at the department level. It is suggested that department heads consult with senior members of their respective departments and wherever feasible permit the senior members to meet the prospective appointee. Normally appointments will be the

result of a national search, but will always comply with applicable federal and state laws and statutes including recordkeeping to assure compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) requirements (see faculty policy “Statement of Equal Opportunity”).

Normally, the search for a faculty position is initiated at the department head level with the approval of the dean and the chief academic officer. An open, nationwide search should be conducted for all academic positions, including advertisement in appropriate publications. The announcement should contain the position description and responsibilities, degrees and experience required, citizenship and application materials (résumés, references and transcripts).

The screening process within the department is as follows. The department head appoints a search committee composed of several faculty members of the department, a chair and an individual responsible for assuring affirmative action compliance. The search committee maintains a log of the applications received. The chair may pre-screen applications for the rest of the committee, removing those candidates who do not satisfy the job criteria. One copy of the application is routed through the search committee members with a request for an evaluation, and comments are to be returned directly to the search committee chair. The search committee convenes when the routing has been completed, at which time each candidate is discussed. Candidates are ranked according to desirability. The search committee chair shall contact the references of the top candidates to verify their experience. The search committee chair shall have a discussion with the candidates starting with the most desirable that will include approximate salary, more detailed teaching and research interests, and availability. If this discussion is satisfactory, the résumé should be submitted to the dean for approval and to arrange an interview trip.

During the on-campus visit, interviews are scheduled with most, if not all, of the academic unit faculty, the academic unit head, heads of the other related academic units and the dean. Usually the candidate presents his/her work at a seminar attended by faculty, graduate students and, frequently, undergraduate students.

Whenever possible, the candidate should be scheduled for a short, courtesy visit with the chief academic officer.

After the visit, the search committee chair solicits the evaluation of the academic unit faculty and those outside the unit who interviewed the candidate(s), and calls another meeting of the search committee. Based on the recommendations of the committee, the academic unit head makes the final decision to recommend a candidate, including appropriate salary and rank, to the dean and chief academic officer. Official transcripts should accompany the written recommendations. It is the responsibility of the academic unit head to check the validity of the candidate's academic credentials. Only the chief academic officer may make salary or employment commitments unless specifically delegated to a dean.

There are very limited special circumstances in which the full faculty search process may be shortened, e.g., an opportunity arises in which a nationally prominent faculty member becomes available and expresses an interest in Florida Tech. In such a circumstance, the chief academic officer may be solicited for permission to conduct an abbreviated "search." The process would include a review (including on-campus interview) and recommendation by departmental faculty, endorsement by the dean of the college and submittal to the chief academic officer. The chief academic officer would present the findings to the president and, if appropriate, request permission to negotiate directly with the potential faculty member.

New Programs Process, Guidelines & Template

Effective Date Dec 15, 2016, Revised July 1, 2024

POC:	Effective Date:	Approved by:
Chief Academic Officer	December 2016	Monica H. Baloga, Ph.D. Senior Vice President for Academics and Provost

This document outlines the process and guidelines for the Florida Tech academic units to introduce new programs (options, minors, degree, and for-credit certificate programs). When academic units are proposing new programs, information is needed by the chief academic officer (CAO), the Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC), and either the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UGCC) (<https://www.fit.edu/ugcc/>) or the Graduate Council (<https://www.fit.edu/office-of-graduate-programs/graduate-council/>) as appropriate. This document provides the necessary information to make a decision to approve, disapprove, or ask for modification of the proposal. The information also provides a basis for evaluating an approved program over the next 5 years.

I. Proposal

A completed proposal with appropriate academic unit approvals must be submitted to the CAO for review. A completed proposal includes:

1. A completed New Program Case Statement
2. A detailed business plan
3. Submitting a proposal in Curriculog.

New Program Case Statement: Use the appended template. It is expected the proposal for a new degree program will address most if not all of the items in the template, while a proposal to create an option, minor, or certificate program will only require responses to some of the items. If a new option, minor or certificate program requires no new resources and no new faculty or

courses, most of the sections in the template will not apply.

Detailed Business Plan: As part of the program proposal, a five-year financial model or five-year business plan must be submitted. The financial model will include enrollment projections for each year and the resultant revenue, as well as any other sources of income/funding. It will also list the anticipated incremental labor costs (salaries and fringe benefits) for additional faculty and staff who will be hired to support the program and provide a forecast of the program's operating expenses for each year. Finally, it will list the additional capital costs (office and lab space, building improvements, equipment, instructional technology, and library resources) required each year to implement the program.

The full new program proposal is submitted to the CAO for initial review. The complete proposal is then forwarded to the Office of Financial Affairs, which coordinates its review with Enrollment Management to complete a return on investment analysis to determine the program's economic impact. When complete, the financial affairs office submits comments, questions or concerns to the CAO.

A New Program 5-Year Financial Plan spreadsheet template has been created to guide academic units in building the proposed program's financial model.

The planning template requires the following information:

- Enrollment estimates by term for each fiscal year
 - Summer / part-time
 - Fall and Spring semester (Full-time and Part-time)
- Tuition (use current rates) and Fee revenues
- Salary expense estimates
 - Additional Faculty
 - Departmental expense (provide salary estimate)
 - Service course faculty (provide salary estimate)
 - Additional Support Staff

- GSAs, Adjuncts
- Summer faculty teaching
- Fringe benefits
- Operating expense estimates
 - Materials & Supplies, Travel, Services, Utilities, and Other expense
 - Depreciation (for new capital purchases – Financial Affairs will calculate based on projected capital spending)
 - Program recruiting *
- Capital Investment / Start-up costs
 - Building / Building Improvements
 - Furniture
 - Equipment / Lab Equipment
 - Computers / Servers / Software
 - Library resources
 - Vehicles / Boats / Airplanes

Note: Financial Affairs can assist with forecasting capital investment spending if needed

New programs often require additional resources and incur additional expenses for start-up costs during the first year, and consequently produce an operating loss. While this is generally unavoidable, the objective is for a new program to be generating positive returns as soon as possible. The program's initial business plan/ financial model review by the Office of Financial Affairs examines projected revenue, expense and capital spending components, and the cash flows they produce. Future period cash flows will be discounted by the university's cost of capital and the present value will be calculated. Proposed programs are expected to demonstrate the ability to produce a positive return on investment and net present value.

New programs will follow the University's Budget Calendar, and Operating and Capital Budget Policy.

Proposal in Curriculog: Requests to add a new major or minor to the curriculum are done through Curriculog at <https://fit.curriculog.com>. Approvals are required before submitting to the CAO.

II. Chief Academic Officer Approval Process

The CAO reviews the proposed program for both its consistency with the Florida Tech mission and its financial viability. If the CAO agrees that the program is consistent with the mission of Florida Tech and is financially viable, the New Program Case Statement is submitted to APAC for review and approval of program-level assessment-based materials. The completed proposal is then submitted to the appropriate university curriculum committee for review.

Before submission to UGCC or Graduate Council, other documents will need to be completed before course/curriculum approval is granted. These are:

1. Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum proposal in Curriculog;
2. Adding a New Course to the Curriculum proposal in Curriculog (one for every new course to be developed and approved);
3. Detailed syllabi for all new courses (as part of the new course proposal in Curriculog); and
4. Course descriptions for all new courses (as part of the new course proposal in Curriculog).
5. A cover memo from the program coordinator briefly describing the requested changes and rationale for doing so, as part of each proposal in Curriculog.

Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum proposal in Curriculog: In Curriculog (<https://fit.curriculog.com>), the originating academic unit must complete the electronic form for a new program corresponding to the program's college. Include a cover memo from the program coordinator describing the new program, the program's curriculum, and all other relevant documentation. Electronically submit the proposal for review.

Adding a New Course to the Curriculum proposal in Curriculog: In Curriculog (<https://fit.curriculog.com>), the originating academic unit must complete the electronic form for a new course corresponding to the program's college. Include a cover memo from the program

coordinator describing the new program, a detailed course syllabus (contact the UGCC or Graduate Council chair for syllabi requirements), and all other relevant documentation. Electronically submit the proposal for review.

Once UGCC or Graduate Council makes a recommendation with appropriate comments, the proposal will be returned to the CAO for a final decision.

III. Other Administrative Processes

Once the CAO approves the initial New Program Plan, as indicated by signature on the New Program Case Statement, additional administrative processes need to be completed.

Working with the Accreditation Liaison

- If the new program (whether a full degree program or certificate) is a substantive change (i.e., a significant departure from previously approved programs), the Accreditation Liaison must be contacted in order to report it to our regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

Working with the Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC)

- Submit program name to the chair of APAC, who will create an entity for it in WEAVE, the web-based assessment management software, and work with the academic unit to enter the approved assessment plan.

Once the new program has been approved through either UGCC or Graduate Council and has received final approval from the CAO, the following administrative processes will need to be completed. Please follow the processes outlined below, as necessary:

Working with the Registrar

- All programs need a separate program code (not major code) for each campus/site where the program will be offered. It is up to the originating academic unit to confirm this information with the Office of the Registrar so the program can be offered at the additional campus/site.
- Once the new program has been approved and through its review, the catalog office sends the originating academic unit head a proof of the program from the working catalog for the following academic year.

Working with undergraduate and/or graduate admissions

- Add program to student application.
- Inquire about advertising and publications for the program.
- Programs are only effective the following academic year and once they appear in the catalog.
- To allow for early marketing, the catalog director, on request by Marketing, opens a tab in the university's program manager, without including unpublished catalog information.

Working with Student Financial Services' office

- Confirm billing times, if different from standard.
- Confirm payment process, if different from standard.

New Program Case Statement Template

(The template be as complete as possible. Any skipped questions may result in processing/approval delays.)

I. Program Relevance

How is this program consistent with the mission of Florida Tech?

- How is this program consistent with the mission of the department/college?

II. Program Demand

Market

- Are there current trends or forecasts for interest in this program? If so, what are they and what are your sources of information.
- What is the local market for this program?
- What is the state/regional market for this program?
- What is the national market?
- What is the international market?
- Enrollment
 - How many new full-time/part-time students are expected to enroll in the first year?
 - What is the enrollment outlook five years from now?
 - What other universities offer this program? How large (enrollment) are those programs?
- Academic/Employment Opportunities:
 - What are the employment opportunities after graduation?

- If this is an undergraduate program, what are the graduate program opportunities?

Delivery Aspects

- Will this program be offered to a “non-traditional” audience (part-time students, evening/ weekend classes, distance learning, other)? Please indicate all that apply.
- Is internship part of the program? If so, will it be required? Will the internship be paid or unpaid?
- In the case of the Department of Extended Studies, will the program be site-specific or will it be available to all sites?

III. Academic Considerations

- What are the admission requirements? For example, will the admission requirements be the same as those given in the university catalog for undergraduate and graduate applicants, or will there be additional requirements?
- Is the proposed program a substantive change according to SACSCOC? (Please verify with the university’s Accreditation Liaison.)

Student-Learning Assessment (see the *APAC Policies and Procedures* document at www.fit.edu/apac for the required number and type of assessment items. These must be approved by the APAC before the program is reviewed by any curriculum committees. Refer to the approval procedure flowchart at the end of this document.)

- In what courses, or program deliverable (such as thesis, dissertation, final program examination, etc.), will the students be assessed for program-level student learning?
- List the program-level student-learning Outcomes, Measures, and expected Targets for this program.

- Is programmatic accreditation required or proposed for the program? If so, what are the minimum requirements for accreditation? What is the timetable for achieving accreditation status? (Please verify with the departmental/college accreditation liaisons.)
- What impact will the program have on existing programs within the academic unit, college, or university? For example, will it replace an existing program or complement/compete with another program? Which programs will be affected?
- What impact will this program have on the resources of other academic units? Will other academic units have to offer new or more sections of existing courses to accommodate this program?

IV. Financial Resources/Uses

- Can the program support itself financially? Provide a completed 5-year financial plan (use Excel template) to support your answer.
- Will new courses (academic unit and/or service) be required? Explain.
- Will new faculty (academic unit and/or service) be required? Explain.
- Will new support staff be required? Explain.
- Will new GSAs or adjuncts be required? Explain.
- Will new equipment, labs, or other facilities be required? Explain.
- Will new library resources be required? Explain.

Signature Page for initial approval of proposed program

Department Head/Program Chair

Date

Dean or Associate Dean

Date

Chief Academic Officer

Date

Online Degree Evaluation and Advising

Effective Date Sep 4, 2009

The degree evaluation tool in Banner (CAPP), accessed from the [PAWS homepage](#) by logging in with TRACKS information, lets students and their advisors plan course schedules and view degree evaluations. It can also show what courses would be needed if the student changed major.

The tool analyzes where the student is in terms of their major. It shows what classes have been taken that will be applied to their degree, their program and overall GPA and any classes that have not been used.

Advisers can also view the student's current enrollment and any previous evaluations that have been run, run a new evaluation, and to find out how many courses would be needed if the student added a minor.

Detailed instructions and more information about how and when to use the degree evaluation tool may be accessed from the [Office of the Registrar homepage](#) by clicking on "Degree Evaluation Instructions/ Faculty" in the Fast Access box, or by clicking on Degree Evaluation (CAPP) under "Web for Faculty" on the [PAWS homepage](#).

Guidelines

Faculty Advising

Effective Date Feb 6, 2014

The Academic Advising Role

Undergraduates have been described by Dr. Thomas H. Peake, School of Psychology, as being in the latter stages of becoming adults. They display, in varying degrees of competence, emotions and independence, a sense of personal identity, relationship skills, purpose, and integrity.

The primary purpose of academic advising is to assist students in their pursuit of a college experience to help them fulfill their life goals. Advisers, thus, need to assist students in:

- clarifying life goals,
 - developing their educational plans,
 - selecting appropriate courses and other educational experiences, using university support services,
 - developing decision-making skills, and
- developing the capacity to evaluate alternatives and direct their efforts productively.

Some Strategies for Advising

Basic strategies of advisement used to assist in individual student development are emphasized below.

Become acquainted with the advisee in as many aspects as possible

Getting to know the advisee outside the formality of the office can be extremely valuable. Knowing the academic abilities and background of the advisee is also important. Having good documentation (the advising folder) such as high school courses with grades, rank in graduating class, ACT or SAT scores, transfer courses and grades from other universities, and present academic status is essential

when assessing a student's ability and future direction.

Explore the objectives, interests, and motivations of the advisee

The advisee's actual certainty of future objectives and goals is difficult to ascertain. When the advisor has some knowledge of the advisee's nonacademic background—such as home influence, hobbies and friends—a more thorough type of advisement is possible.

Develop rapport with advisee

If the student knows the advisor as a professional person who has a genuine interest in students, the advisement process becomes much more beneficial for both the advisor and advisee.

The student should be encouraged to become acquainted with other faculty members in the academic unit, because multiple contacts can be useful to the student who is attempting to assess his/her personal goals.

Become knowledgeable concerning university rules, policies, regulations, and procedures that affect academic programs and activity

Every advisor must be well-informed regarding current academic policies and procedures. Prior review of policies and study of policy changes should be a regular activity of each advisor before beginning each registration period. Familiarity with courses generally taken by advisees, the characteristics of teachers of the courses and how prior students have appraised the courses can make the advisement process smoother and more successful. Suggesting student involvement in campus activities is often the key to retention in school.

Evaluate student motivation

Enhancing a student's motivation by capitalizing on good academic planning can be a very helpful strategy. Suggested strategies might include:

1. Matching courses early in the program to the student's academic strengths, interests and backgrounds.

2. Helping the student to build on success rather than failure.
3. Challenging capable students to continue their efforts toward academic excellence.
4. Explaining the rewards of a strong academic program and associated good grades.

Be aware of the limitations of responsibility as to where the burden of the advisement process falls on the shoulders of the student

Advisers cannot make decisions for an advisee, but they can be a sympathetic listener and offer various alternatives for the advisee's consideration. Advisers cannot increase the ability of a student, but can encourage the maximum use of that ability. While advisors cannot change some aspects of course schedules or employment loads, the students can be referred to the proper offices for such adjustments.

Seek to determine the level of advisement appropriate for your own comfort and the student's training

Advisers should not attempt to personally handle complex problems concerning financial aid, mental or physical health, or personal or social counseling. When these situations arise, the faculty advisor should refer students to professional personnel who are specially trained and knowledgeable about dealing with such problems.

Online Degree Evaluation and Advising

The degree evaluation tool, CAPP, lets students and their advisors plan course schedules and view degree evaluations. It can also show what courses would be needed if the student changed major. The tool analyzes where the student is in terms of their major. It shows what classes have been taken that will be applied to their degree, their program and overall GPA and any classes that have not been used.

Advisers can also view the student's current enrollment and any previous evaluations that have been run, run a new evaluation, and to find out how many courses would be needed if the student added a minor.

Some Interview Techniques Used in Advising

Opening: Greet students by name, be relaxed and warm. Open with a question.

Phrasing Questions: Avoid yes/no questions to increase conversational flow.

Listening: Don't out-talk a student. Listening allows one to identify the feelings behind words. Be silent and let the student search for his/her own words or ideas.

Accepting the Student's Attitudes and Feelings: Convey acceptance in a nonjudgmental way. If the student thinks it's a problem, so does the advisor. Try to understand where the student is coming from.

Cross-examining: Don't rapidly fire questions at the student.

Admitting Your Ignorance: Admit when you do not know the answer. Go to your resources for the information or call the student back later when you have the information.

Setting Limits on the Interview: It's better if the advisor and the student realize from the beginning that the interview will last for a fixed length of time.

Ending the Interview: It's best to end the interview at the agreed time. Offer to schedule another appointment.

Key Reminders for Effective Advising

1. Care about advisees as people and keep in frequent contact.
2. Establish a warm, genuine and open relationship.
3. Evidence interest, helpful intent and involvement.
4. Be a good listener.
5. Establish a rapport with advisees by remembering personal information. Keep a record of past conversations.
6. Be available, keep office hours and appointments, and seek out advisees in formal settings.

7. Provide accurate information.
8. Refer to the current University Catalog, etc.
9. Know how and when to make referrals, allow the students to do it in your presence and be familiar with referral sources.
10. Don't attempt to handle situations for which you are not qualified.
11. Help students make their own decisions.
12. Focus on the advisee's strengths rather than limitations.
13. Determine reasons for poor academic performance and direct advisees to appropriate support services.
14. Clearly outline the advisee's responsibilities and monitor their progress toward educational goals.
15. Follow up on commitments made to advisees.
16. Encourage advisees to consider and develop career alternatives when appropriate.
17. Evaluate the effectiveness of your advising.
18. Don't be critical of other faculty or staff to anyone.
19. Be knowledgeable about career opportunities and the job outlook for various majors.
20. Don't betray confidential information.

Advising Undecided Students

Use this plan in a 20-minute advising session or over an extended period of time. A trusting advising relationship needs to be established; the first contact is critical. Remind the students your role is one of support to provide continuity and stability.

Step 1: How undecided is the student?

- Why are they undecided?
- What majors are they considering? What majors have they eliminated?
 - (If they can't answer either question, go through a complete list of the majors offered, giving an explanation of each.)
- Be sensitive to sex-role stereotyping.
- Listen for students' values when identifying alternatives.

Step 2: How should the advisor help students to organize a plan for gathering information?

- What type of information do they need?
- Devise a plan for gathering information.
- Refer to campus resources.
- Establish a timeline.

Step 3: How should the advisor help the student organize the information gathered?

- Integrate personal assessment into career choices.
- Help them understand academic and occupational relationships, including majors that lead to occupational possibilities.
- Help them understand how majors fit values and goals. Help them narrow their options to two or three.

Step 4: How should advisors support students while they make decisions?

- Offer feedback on the process.
- Help identify external factors.
- Help them understand their decision-making process.
- Support their decision.

Step 5: How should the advisor help students initiate an action plan?

- Help identify actions, steps and resources needed to take action. Help set up a realistic timetable for taking action.
- Remind students that no plan is static; as changes take place, new decisions may need to be made.

Step 6: How does an advisor encourage future contact?

- Be available to help them to assess further or update their decision.

Standards

Standards for Faculty Credentials & Records

Effective Date September 1, 2019

Note: This document and relevant procedures may be downloaded in pdf format [Faculty Credentials Standard](#)

Florida Institute of Technology is committed to hiring qualified, effective faculty members to carry out the goals of the institutional mission and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs. In doing so the institution meets and strives to exceed, the minimum requirements set forth by regional accreditation. Academic credentials are the primary and standard qualification for faculty members; however other types of qualifications may prove to be appropriate. Documentation and justification of qualifications for each person who teaches a course, regardless of faculty status, including both full-time and part-time, are the responsibility of the entire institution.

SACSCOC Standard 6.2.a (2024 version): For each of its educational programs, the institution justifies and documents the qualifications of its faculty members.

SACS Faculty Credential Guidelines: Faculty credential guidelines to demonstrate faculty qualifications are provided by SACS Commission on Colleges. These are:

When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the following as credential guidelines:

Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level doctoral or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

Faculty teaching associate degree courses designed for transfer to a baccalaureate degree: doctoral or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

Faculty teaching associate degree courses not designed for transfer to the baccalaureate degree: bachelor's degree in the teaching discipline, or associate's degree and demonstrated competencies in the teaching discipline.

Faculty teaching baccalaureate courses: doctoral or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

Faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work: earned doctoral/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.

Graduate teaching assistants: master's in the teaching discipline or 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline, direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline, regular in-service training, and planned and periodic evaluations.

Faculty Credential Records Requirements: Florida Tech maintains a record of faculty credentials for every faculty member in the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Each file must include: (1) an official transcript for the highest degree earned, as well as those for any other relevant degrees, such as master's and bachelor's degrees; (2) official transcripts or official versions of certificates and licensures, if applicable; (3) a curriculum vitae, and (4) a statement of alternative qualifications (SOAQ) specific to each course being taught for any faculty member not meeting the Faculty Credentials guidelines as articulated by SACSCOC.

If required, SOAQs must address how the candidate's alternative qualifications relate to each specific course to be taught and should include as many of the following as apply to a particular situation:

1. competence and effectiveness
2. as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees
3. non-teaching work-related experience in the field
4. professional licensure and certifications
5. honors and awards
6. continuous documented excellence in teaching
7. other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes

The current curriculum vitae must include the following sections, if applicable:

1. Education: include all Bachelor's, Master's, Ph.D., and/or terminal degrees
2. Academic appointments with dates: including current position
3. Other credentials: any professional licensures, certificates, honors and/or awards that relate to courses to be taught
4. Related professional experience: list additional work-related experiences that relate to courses to be taught
5. Grants, publications, presentations: as they relate to courses to be taught
6. Membership in professional organizations

For purposes of accreditation, transcripts/certificates/licensures are considered official only if they are sent directly from or on behalf of the granting institution to Office of the Provost.

No faculty member will be allowed to teach until faculty credential records are complete.

University Mission Statement

Effective Date Jul 13, 2016, Revised May 2, 2024

Florida Tech educates global thinkers, resilient problem solvers, and future leaders, ready to support industry and societal needs by responsibly integrating science, technology, and other key disciplines to advance knowledge across the universe.

FH Appendix 1 Promotion Dossier Format

Effective Date Aug 1, 2010

Brief History of the Candidate

This section should be a narrative summarizing the candidate's activities since the last promotion and emphasizing those activities for which promotion is deserved. For candidates recently employed by Florida Tech, appropriate activities at the former employment, as well as at Florida Tech should be delineated and discussed. The current résumé contained in "Résumé" (Appendix A1) should be referenced.

The relative weighting of the dossier sections on "Teaching," "Research" and "Service" may be in any ratio mutually agreeable to the candidate, department head, and dean. Once agreed on, such a ratio should be stated in the department head's nomination letter and should be the basis for consideration of the candidacy at the university level.

Teaching and Related Activities

This section should begin with a brief statement of the candidate's role in our teaching program. It should indicate any areas of special notes such as course development, unique student response, teaching awards, and/or particular effectiveness with unique groups (for example, individual instruction of graduate students or teaching large lecture classes).

Provide a general statement concerning the types of courses taught, i.e., lower-division, upper-division, and graduate-level courses, and a list of courses taught in at least the three years in inverse chronological order.

Identify which courses were developed by you or which had extensive new material added by you. For each course indicate enrollment, whether the course is required for majors, recommended for majors, or service for non-majors, and indicate what majors, if appropriate, and which of these

courses have student-teacher evaluations available. Attach these evaluations as part of "Supporting Documentation for Teaching and Related Activities" (Appendix AII). If student comments are submitted, all students' comments in that course-section must be submitted, i.e., you cannot pick and choose.

Provide a list of graduate students supervised. List separately Ph.D. and master's students. Give names, dissertation/thesis titles, dates of study and current employment, if known. If any postdoctoral fellows have been supervised, list names, name of fellowship or source of support and dates. Provide a statement concerning participation on graduate student committees or include in the list above, but clearly identify whom you supervised (primary thesis/dissertation advisor) and for whom you were a committee member.

The candidate should provide a statement summarizing his/her interpretation of his/her teaching role and success in teaching at Florida Tech. The statement should present a picture of yourself as a teacher describing, where appropriate, teaching practices in areas such as:

- a.** the setting and communicating of course goals;
- b.** overall course organization;
 - class preparation and methods used;
- d.** use of supplementary materials such as audiovisual aids, library, laboratory or field experiences;
 - . grading your student work; and
- f.** your availability to students having difficulty with course materials or wishing further discussion of course topics.

Where appropriate, comment on:

- a.** the method(s) you use to evaluate your teaching;
- b.** what you regard as your main strengths as a teacher;

. what you regard as areas in which you need improvement as a teacher;

d. what you are doing to improve upon these

goals; course innovations or

development; and

f. any other item(s) relating to teaching effectiveness

What evidence do you have that your students have the same picture of you?

List academic advising activities. Either give the names of where too many, the approximate numbers of your academic undergraduate and graduate advisees. It would be helpful if you could estimate your advisees retention (conversely attrition) rate for the last several years. It is recognized that your advising is but one factor in retention, but performance significantly better than the Florida Tech average is a powerful attribute to your advising. If the graduate rate of your students over several years is known, please provide.

List other advising, such as student clubs sponsorship and other student counseling. These activities should cover the last three years or more. Provide a separate statement about this advising role and its impact on students and student programs.

Research and Scholarly Activities

The term "research" is used in its broad sense of intellectual inquiry. Essentially, the term "research" is used interchangeably with the term "scholarly activities."

Review briefly the highlights of your research contributions. Emphasize specific contributions to knowledge, but do not become overly technical.

Review your current and future research plans. Review your research support history and future plans.

List in reverse chronological order externally funded grants and contracts. Include for each the sponsoring agency or company, dates and period of support, number of students supported and amounts funded. Give a separate or contiguous list of projects internally funded or unfunded.

List publications and contributions. List these publications in the following order or in chronological order indicating in the margin the appropriate category. Copies of some or all publications should be included in "Supporting Documentation for Research and Related Activities" (Appendix AIII). If too bulky, part or all of this section may be separated from the main dossier.

- Books and monographs

Articles in refereed journals and books

- Articles in non-refereed journals or books Articles in refereed journals or books in press
- Articles in non-refereed journals or books in press
- Articles in refereed journals or books submitted Articles in non-refereed journals or books submitted
- Conference presentations and whether the entire paper and/or the abstract only was reviewed.

Published technical reports.

- Other publications such as course manuals, guidebooks, etc.

List and describe briefly any disclosures of inventions or resulting patents.

Provide a brief statement regarding the impact of these publications in the field of research. A recommended indicator of scholarly impact would be a review of the candidate's publications citation rate. Include a statement of the ranking of these journals in the candidate's research field.

List invited lectures of special note during the last three years.

The candidate should provide a brief statement on his/her interpretation of the role and success of his/her scholarly activities and discuss plans for future creative work and research. Comment on how

you have developed yourself professionally in your discipline since your last promotion/appointment to Florida Tech.

Service Activities

Provide a statement of the candidate's department and university service for at least the last three years. List in reverse chronological order all significant university, college/school and department/program committee service. Identify your role on each committee and explain the purpose of the committee and explain the purpose of the committee if not obvious.

List committee service for other universities and national or regional educational or professional committees (e.g., review committees, accreditation committees, technical societies, etc.).

Provide a statement of the nature and impact of any unremunerated community service.

Documentation of Professional Practice Activities

This section should be used for candidates to report professional activities that do not fit conveniently under the above headings. Such activities might include consulting, professional clinical practice, short-course development, etc.

List organizations, approximate level of effort and period of consulting. To the extent propriety permits, describe the consulting effort and the work product(s); e.g., reports, drawings, software, new test procedures, etc.

List short-course offerings by title, date, duration, location and approximate attendees. Describe your role as course developer and/or presenter.

Résumé

The résumé should be current and detailed. If the résumé provides the information requested in the above sections, that section can reference the résumé. For example, it is not necessary to list

publications in "Research and Scholarly Activities" (Section III) if the data requested is clearly given in the résumé.

Supporting Documentation for Teaching and Related Activities

Items included in the appendix could include, but not be limited to, student evaluations, peer evaluations, outlines of new courses developed and/or course or laboratory handouts (significant ones only) or manuals. Letters from former or current students could be included as well as copies of instructor/course evaluations. Peer evaluations could include letters from colleagues and/or formal peer reviews if available. Anecdotal information is valued less than is broad based, quantifiable data such as formal evaluations.

Supporting Documentation for Research and Related Activities

Items in this appendix would normally include copies of papers, but could also include copies of proposal abstracts, letters of research awards, or letters of notification of honors, such as outstanding paper awards. If the list of research activities called for in "Research and Scholarly Activities" (Section III) is extensive, it could be included here and referred to in that section.

Supporting Documentation for Service Activities

Items included here could be letters of commendation, copies of service reports authored by the candidate, or more detailed descriptions of service than is possible in "Service Activities" (Section IV).

Supporting Documentation for Professional Practice

Items included here might include notification of professional registration, letters of commendation for consulting or clinical practice, or syllabi and manuals developed for short-courses, workshop or conferences.

Department Head Letter of Nomination

This appendix will contain two important letters:

A brief letter from the candidate addressed to the department head/program chair that states "This letter certifies that I have reviewed my dossier and that the entries and substantiation thereof are accurate."

A letter from the department head/program chair nominating the candidate for promotion. The letter should state the degree of support for the nomination in the department/program. For promotion to full professor, identifying the support of the department's/program's full professors is important. Copies of the faculty member's annual goal/performance evaluations for the past three years could be included in this appendix.

Letters of Recommendation from Outside Reviewers

Include a brief statement of the credentials of each person from whom letters have been solicited. It is expected that for promotion to full (associate) professor at least five (three) letters will be solicited.

Include what aspect of the candidate's performance the referee is competent to judge and why.

Include all letters received. These letters should be added to the dossier by the department head/program chair after the candidate has made his/her final review of the dossier to afford the recommender's confidentiality.

The academic unit head should write all requests for evaluations. The candidate should not solicit these letters although s/he may suggest names of references. The letters of request should clearly state what kind of an evaluation is being sought (the factors to be evaluated, the rank for which the person is being recommended and other pertinent information). Wherever reasonable, one or both of the following questions should be asked. From what you know of this person, would you recommend him/her for promotion at your institution?

Where does the candidate rank among his/her peers? As a courtesy to those being asked to write letters, a current copy of the candidate's résumé should be sent.

FH Appendix 2: Promotion Guidelines: College of Engineering and Science (COES)

- Teaching Submitted by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Science (M. Carvalho, Jun 26'th, 2018)
- Reviewed and approved by the Senior Vice President for Academics and Provost (M. Baloga, Aug 1st, 2018)

Effective Fall 2018

Conditions for Promotion Consideration of Teaching Faculty:

- A COES faculty member may be considered for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Full Teaching Professor after a minimum of five years at their current rank. Faculty members who join Florida Tech mid-career may be eligible for an accelerated path to promotion if authorized by the Provost at the time of hiring.
- The promotion dossier must follow all guidelines provided in FH Appendix 1 Promotion Dossier Format.

For three years prior to seeking promotion, the candidate should maintain a minimum average rating of “at expectations” or above in teaching and service activities, as assigned by the Department Head and Dean. Any ratings below “at expectations” during that period may be accepted by the Dean if they are thoroughly explained and satisfactorily justified.

Some candidates may have a scholarship component associated with pedagogy in engineering and science education. The balance between teaching load and scholarship will be determined by the Department Head and Dean.

Meeting the conditions for promotion consideration does not guarantee promotion. The University Promotion Committee makes the final recommendation to the Provost and

President based on the overall faculty performance as defined in the promotion criteria. The promotion criteria are periodically updated based on faculty performance metrics at target tier institutions.

Promotion to the Rank of Teaching Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor must exhibit consistent, high-level performance in teaching and service. Candidates with an expected scholarly component must demonstrate sustained and nationally recognized innovation and impact.

Teaching

A candidate must:

Teach courses at all levels appropriate to the program with consistently good student and peer evaluations

- Lead course assessment for accreditation efforts, as

appropriate Supervise undergraduate research or

capstone design projects

- Work with and train teaching assistants

Lead efforts to develop or improve courses, labs, or enhance curricula

- Maintain a full-time presence and availability on campus during normal

business hours A successful candidate will typically.

Receive average teaching evaluations equivalent to 4.0/5.0 or higher from students and peers

- Maintain innovative and state-of-the-art course content in a range of

courses Participate in a wide range of introductory and advanced

courses

- Supervise and mentor undergraduate or capstone design projects

Service

A candidate must:

Take on leadership roles in department, college, and university committees

- Perform undergraduate student advising as assigned
- Take on leadership roles in professional activities within their field external to the university
Participate as a mentor for new faculty in the area of teaching and course

development A successful candidate will typically.

Serve on MS thesis and PhD dissertation committees

- Actively participate and take leadership roles on department, college and/or university committees

Scholarship

For those candidates with a scholarship component, the load distribution will be determined annually and on a case-by-case basis depending on departmental needs and faculty interest.

Candidates with expectations of scholarly activity should demonstrate an impact in development and innovation of pedagogy, which results in a strong record of:

Indexed, peer-reviewed publications in education and pedagogy development

- Citations and recognition of that work by recognized scholars and researchers in

their field Invited talks and lectures at universities, research centers, and national

conferences

The candidate's body of scholarly work will be evaluated both internally according to University and College guidelines, as well as externally for impact by experts in their field.

A successful candidate will typically.

Produce a substantial publication record in quality journals and well ranked conference proceedings devoted to pedagogy in their field of specialty, with a reasonable number of indexed, peer-reviewed publications per year depending on the area (typically a minimum average of 2 per year).

Obtain extramural funding (e.g., federal, state, industry funding) to support pedagogy development and implementation.

- Receive 5 strong letters of recommendation solicited from experts in their field.

Deliver invited talks at major conferences and peer institutions.

- Participate in professional review committees (e.g., editorial boards, technical committees, reviewer for journals, session chairs in conferences) and/or federal funding agency panels (e.g., NSF, DOD, NASA, NIH).

The performance metrics of the successful candidate described above, such as number of publications and average annual extramural funding, may have some variability depending on the candidate's specific field of scholarship.

Conditions for Promotion Consideration of Research Faculty:

- Research Submitted by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Science (M. Carvalho, Jun 26", 2018) Reviewed and approved by the Senior Vice President for Academics and Provost (M. Baloga, Aug 1st, 2018) Effective Fall 2018

Conditions for Promotion Consideration:

A COES faculty member may be considered for promotion to Associate Research Professor or Full Research Professor after a minimum of five years at their current rank. Faculty members who join Florida Tech mid-career may be eligible for an accelerated path to promotion if authorized by the Provost at the time of hiring.

The promotion dossier must follow all guidelines provided in **FH Appendix 1 Promotion Dossier Format**

- For three years prior to seeking promotion, the candidate should maintain a minimum average rating of “at expectations” or above in research as well as research-related teaching and service activities, as assigned by the Department Head and Dean. Any ratings below “at expectations” during that period may be accepted by the Dean if they are thoroughly explained and satisfactorily justified.
- Some candidates may have a teaching component. The balance between teaching load and scholarship will be determined by the Department Head and Dean.
- Meeting the conditions for promotion consideration does not guarantee promotion. The University Promotion Committee makes the final recommendation to the Provost and President based on the overall faculty performance as defined in the promotion criteria. The promotion criteria are periodically updated based on faculty performance metrics at target tier institutions.

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Research Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Research Professor must exhibit high-level performance in scholarship and research-related teaching and service.

Scholarship

A candidate must demonstrate a sustained, extramurally funded, ongoing, year-round research program, which results in a consistent record of:

Indexed, peer-reviewed publications

- Citations and recognition of that work by recognized scholars and researchers in their field
- Invited talks and lectures at universities, research centers, and national conferences
- Externally funded research projects
- Supervision of doctoral candidates in their research program
- The candidate’s body of

scholarly work will be evaluated both internally according to University and College guidelines, as well as externally for impact by recognized experts in their field.

A successful candidate will typically:

- Produce a substantial publication record in quality journals and highly ranked conference proceedings within their field of specialty, with a reasonable number of indexed, peer-reviewed publications per year depending on the research area (typically a minimum average of 3 per year).

- Produce a strong record of publications with students supervised by the candidate

Obtain average annual extramural funding (e.g., federal, state, industry funding) required to support a minimum of 75% of the faculty's salary through fall and Spring, at least two graduate students, operation of a year-round research program, and the faculty's summer salary.

Fully support graduate students for multiple semesters with the candidate's research funding.

- Served as major advisor for 2 or more Ph.D. students who have graduated or are candidates.
- Receive 3 strong letters of recommendation solicited from experts in their field.

Deliver invited talks at major conferences and peer institutions.

The performance metrics of the successful candidate described above, such as the number of publications and average annual extramural funding, may have some variability depending on the candidate's specific field of scholarship, but is expected to be higher than regular faculty.

Teaching

For those candidates with a teaching component, the load distribution will be determined annually and on a case-by-case basis depending on departmental needs and faculty interest. A candidate must:

Teach graduate and research-related undergraduate courses appropriate to the program

- Supervise and/or mentor undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral

research A successful candidate will typically.

Integrate their areas of research expertise into new, or current, graduate-level courses

- Mentor researchers and provide state-of-the-art training in advanced techniques and methodologies

Service

A candidate must:

- Actively serve on department, college, and university committees related to research activities Participate in professional activities within their field external to the university

A successful candidate will typically:

- Serve on MS thesis and PhD dissertation committees
- Actively participate on department, college and/or university committees related to research
- Serve on professional review committees (e.g. editorial boards, technical committees, reviewer for journals, session chairs in conferences)
- Participate on federal funding agency panels (e.g. NSF, DOD, NASA, NIH)

Promotion to the Rank of Research Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Research Professor must demonstrate an international reputation for scholarship and impact in their field and research-related teaching and service.

Scholarship

A candidate must demonstrate a sustained, extramurally funded, on-going, year-round research program,
which results in a consistent record of:

- Indexed, peer-reviewed publications

Citations and recognition of that work by recognized scholars and researchers in their field

- Invited talks and lectures at universities, research centers, and major conferences
- Externally funded research projects

Supervision of doctoral candidates in their research program

The candidate's body of scholarly work will be evaluated both internally according to University and College guidelines, as well as externally for impact by recognized experts in their field.

A successful candidate will typically:

Produce a substantial publication record in quality journals and highly ranked conference proceedings within their field of specialty, with a reasonable number of indexed, peer-reviewed publications per year depending on the research area (typically a minimum average of 5 per year).

Produce a strong record of publications with students supervised by the candidate.

- Obtain average annual extramural funding (e.g., federal, state, industry funding) required to support a minimum of 25% of the faculty's salary through fall and Spring, at least four graduate students, operation of a year-round research program, and the faculty's summer salary.
- Lead successful multi-investigator research grants and major infrastructure grants.

Maintain a substantial group of graduate students with the candidate's research funding.

- Served as major advisor for several Ph.D. students through graduation (typically at least 5).
- Receive 5 strong letters of recommendation for promotion, solicited from experts in their field.

Deliver invited and keynote talks at major conferences and peer institutions.

The performance metrics of the successful candidate described above, such as number of publications and average annual extramural funding, may have some variability depending on the candidate's specific field of scholarship, but is expected to be higher than regular faculty.

Teaching

For those candidates with a teaching component, the load distribution will be determined annually and on a case-by-case basis depending on departmental needs and faculty interest. A candidate must:

- Teach graduate and research-related undergraduate courses appropriate to the program Supervise and/or mentor undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral research

A successful candidate will typically:

- Integrate their areas of research expertise into new, or current, graduate level courses Mentor researchers and provide state-of-the-art training in advanced techniques and methodologies

Service

A candidate must:

- Actively serve on department, college, and university committees related to research activities Participate in professional activities within their field external to the university

A successful candidate will typically:

- Serve on MS thesis and PhD dissertation committees Actively participate on department, college and/or university committees related to research

- Serve on professional review committees (e.g. editorial boards, technical committees, reviewer for journals, session chairs in conferences)

Participate on federal funding agency panels (e.g. NSF, DOD, NASA, NIH)

• **Conditions for Promotion Consideration of Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty:**

- Submitted by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Science, (M. Carvalho, May 10, 2018)

Reviewed and approved by the Senior Vice President for Academics and Provost (M. Baloga, May 16, 2018)

Effective Fall 2018

Conditions for Promotion Consideration:

- A COES faculty member may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor after a minimum of five years at their current rank. Faculty members who join Florida Tech mid- career may Require additional time before promotion consideration and in some cases, an accelerated path to promotion may be authorized by the Provost when the faculty member is hired at Florida Tech.

The promotion dossier must follow all guidelines provided in **FH Appendix 1 Promotion Dossier Format**

- For three years prior to seeking promotion, the candidate should maintain a minimum average rating of “at expectations” or above in research, teaching, and service activities, as assigned by the Department Head and Dean. Any ratings below “*at expectations*” during that period must be thoroughly explained and satisfactorily justified and accepted by the Dean
- Meeting the conditions for promotion consideration does not guarantee promotion. The University Promotion Committee makes the final recommendation to the Provost and President based on the overall faculty performance as defined in the promotion criteria. The promotion criteria are periodically updated based on faculty performance metrics at

target tier institutions and University ranking.

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must exhibit high-level performance in scholarship, teaching, and service.

Scholarship

A candidate must demonstrate a sustained, extramurally funded, on-going, year-round research program, which results in a consistent record of:

- Indexed, peer-reviewed publications

Citations and recognition of that work by recognized scholars and researchers in their field

- Invited talks and lectures at universities, research centers, and national conferences

Supervision of doctoral candidates in their research program

The candidate's body of scholarly work will be evaluated both internally according to University and College guidelines, as well as externally for impact by experts in their field.

A successful candidate will typically:

Produce a substantial publication record in quality journals and highly ranked conference proceedings within their field of specialty, with a reasonable number of indexed, peer-reviewed publications per year depending on the research area (typically a minimum average of 2 per year).

Produce a strong record of publications with students supervised by the candidate

- Obtain average annual extramural funding (e.g., federal, state, industry funding) required to support at least one graduate student, operation of a year-round research program, and summer salary support.
- Apply for competitive early career awards at the national level.

Fully support graduate students for multiple semesters with the candidate's research funding.

- Serve as major advisor for 1 or more Ph. D. students who have graduated or are candidates.
- Receive 3 strong letters of recommendation solicited from experts in their field.

Deliver invited talks at major conferences and peer

The performance metrics of the successful candidate described above, such as the number of publications and average annual extramural funding, may have some variability depending on the candidate's specific field of scholarship.

Teaching

A candidate must:

Teach courses at all levels appropriate to the program with consistently good student and peer evaluations

- Support course assessment for accreditation efforts, as appropriate

Supervise and/or mentor undergraduate research and/or capstone design projects

Develop and/or improve courses, labs, and/or enhance

curricula A successful candidate will typically:

Receive average teaching evaluations equivalent to 3.5/5.0 or higher from students and peers

- Integrate their areas of research expertise into new, or current, graduate level courses
- Have taught different courses at all levels appropriate to the

program Supervise and mentor undergraduate research or capstone

design projects.

Service

A candidate must.

- Actively serve on department, college, and university committees
Perform undergraduate student advising as assigned
- Participate in professional activities within their field external to the

university A successful candidate will typically:

Serve on MS thesis and Ph.D. dissertation committees

- Actively participate on department, college and/or university committees
Serve on professional review committees (e.g. editorial boards, technical committees, reviewer for journals, session chairs in conferences)
- Participate on federal funding agency panels (e.g. NSF, DOD, NASA, NIH)

Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate an international reputation for scholarship and impact in their field as well as exhibit high-level performance in teaching and service.

Scholarship

A candidate must demonstrate a sustained, extramurally funded, on-going, year-round research program, which results in a consistent record of:

Indexed, peer-reviewed publications

- Citations and recognition of that work by recognized scholars and researchers in their field
Invited talks and lectures at universities, research centers, and major

conferences

- Supervision of doctoral candidates in their research program

The candidate's body of scholarly work will be evaluated both internally according to University and College guidelines, as well as externally for impact by experts in their field.

A successful candidate will typically.

- Produce a substantial publication record in quality journals and highly ranked conference proceedings within their field of specialty, with a reasonable number of indexed, peer-reviewed publications per year depending on the research area (typically a minimum average of 3 per year).
- Produce a strong record of publications with students supervised by the candidate.

Obtain average annual extramural funding (e.g. federal, state, industry funding required to fully support at least two graduate students, operation of a year-round research program, and summer salary

- Lead successful multi-investigator' research grants and major- infrastructure grants.

Maintain a substantial group of graduate students with the candidate's research funding.

- Served as major advisor for several Ph.D. students through graduation (typically at least

3.) Receive 5 strong letters of recommendation for promotion, solicited from experts in their field.

- Deliver invited and keynote talks at major conferences and peer institutions.

The performance metrics of the successful candidate described above, such as number of publications and average annual extramural funding, may have some variability depending on the candidate's specific field of scholarship.

Teaching

A candidate must:

- Teach courses at all levels appropriate to the program with consistently good student and peer evaluations
- Support course assessment for accreditation efforts, as appropriate.

Supervise and/or mentor undergraduate research and/or capstone design projects

- Develop and/or improve courses, labs, and/or enhance

curricula A successful candidate will typically:

Receive average teaching evaluations equivalent to 4.0/5.0 or higher from students and peers

- Maintain leading edge areas of research in new, or current, graduate level courses Continue to teach different courses at all levels appropriate to the program
- Supervise and mentor undergraduate research or capstone design projects.

Service

A candidate must:

- Take on leadership roles in department, college, and university committees Perform undergraduate student advising as assigned
- Take on leadership roles in professional activities within their field external to the university Participate as a mentor for new faculty development

A successful candidate will typically:

- Serve on MS thesis and PhD dissertation committees

Actively participate and take leadership roles on department, college and/or university committees

- Serve on professional review committees with increasing responsibility and impact (e.g. editorial boards and reviewer for top journals, session chairs in top conferences)

Participate and chair on federal funding agency panels (e.g. NSF, DOD, NASA, NIH)

FH Appendix 3 Promotion Guidelines: College of Aeronautics

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines: College of Aeronautics

Reviewed and approved by the College faculty on September 27, 2018

- These guidelines may be reviewed and revised by the College of Aeronautics as needed and shall be reviewed at least every 5 years.

Introduction

The College of Aeronautics (the College) faculty is comprised of highly qualified individuals from both academia and a variety of disciplines related to aviation who work in harmony to execute the College's mission, which is: (a) to prepare students for success and advancement in the aviation professions, (b) advance aviation knowledge through faculty and student research, scholarly activity and projects, and (c) encourage and enable student and faculty service to the university, community and aviation professions.

Primary Areas

Concomitant with this mission is promotion and tenure, which are earned by faculty members' demonstration of overall excellence in three primary areas: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. All College faculty are expected to engage in the three interrelated areas.

Teaching includes effective teaching and student advising

- Scholarship includes the contribution of work to the advancement of knowledge within faculty members' research field—which will vary given the interdisciplinary nature of the College—as well as the publications and venues in which the work is presented

Service includes faculty members' participation across a wide spectrum of activities that are

both internal and external to the university

The relative weighting of these three areas shall be determined in agreement between the faculty member and the COA dean and also shown on the COA Faculty Evaluation Form and in the Statement of Expectations. Thus, final decisions for promotion and tenure may be based on different relative weightings for different faculty members.

College of Aeronautics Model of Academic Professionalism

The College's promotion and tenure criteria are organized on the College's Model of Academic Professionalism, which is then applied across the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. This model consists of the following six dimensions, which were adapted from Kern's (2011) Domains of Professionalism in Aviation: (a) *Excellence in the Field*, (b) *Professional Ethics* (c) *Continuous Improvement*, (d) *Professional Engagement* (e) *Professional Image* and (f) *Service to the Profession*. The focus of each dimension is given in Table 1 while Tables 2-7 give examples of experiences related to each dimension.

Table 1: College of Aeronautics "Model of Professionalism."

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Focus</i>
<i>Excellence in the Field</i>	Recognized for excellence in teaching and scholarship Obtains credentials that acknowledge level of knowledge and achievement Contributes to field in by engaging in scholarship
<i>Professional Ethics</i>	Displays integrity Maintains high professional standards Understands and follows university policies and procedures Follows ethical guidelines of research organizations
<i>Continuous Engagement</i>	Continues to invest in self-improvement as an educator and scholar
<i>Professional Engagement</i>	Stays current in the field Keeps up with best practices Collaborates with others in teaching and scholarly Shares with and learns from others
<i>Professional Image</i>	Perceived as capable, trustworthy and authentic Builds credibility

	Respectful to others
<i>Service to the Profession</i>	Takes a leadership role in the university and profession Volunteers for activities that improve the profession and community at large Mentors others

Examples of Experience

Examples of experience for the three primary areas and across each dimension of the College's Model of Academic Professionalism are provided in Tables 2—7. These tables are to be used as examples and not as a checklist when preparing the Statement of Expectation and the promotion dossier.

Although quantity generally is easier to measure than quality, the College recognizes that quantity is subordinate to quality. The College defines quality relative to: (a) the work's perceived reputation within the faculty member's research field, which will vary given the interdisciplinary nature of the College; (b) the extent to which the work is used to establish relationships within a faculty member's discipline; (c) the scope of the work from a practitioner perspective; and (d) the work's novelty.

Statement of Expectation

Recognizing that contribution to the advancement of knowledge, quality, and effort vary widely with different experiences, the College does not prescribe a specific quantity of work for promotion and tenure. Rather, College faculty who petition for promotion and tenure are expected to include their Statement of Expectation, agreed to between the faculty member and the College dean. The statement will include, in part, the weighting of the areas and what specific experiences are expected to be completed so that the faculty member's overall experiences reflect the level of accomplishment appropriate for the rank being sought. For faculty hired before implementation of tenure, the current and previous Faculty Workload Forms will serve as the initial draft of the statement of expectations.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty members considering promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure must meet the

minimum qualifications for the rank, and must have a documented record of experience in each of the required primary areas that builds on their accomplishments since their last promotion in rank and shows that they have met the expectations in their Statement of Expectation.

Minimum Qualifications

- A minimum of 5 years in rank as Assistant Professor or equivalent
- A doctoral degree

A Statement of Expectation or similar alternative agreement defining specific criteria for promotion and tenure

Promotion to Professor with Tenure

Faculty members considering promotion to Full Professor with Tenure must meet the minimum qualifications for the rank, and must have a documented record of experience in each of the required primary areas that builds on their accomplishments since their last promotion in rank and shows that they have met the expectations in their Statement of Expectation.

Minimum Qualifications

- A minimum of 5 years in rank as Associate Professor or equivalent
- A doctoral degree

A Statement of Expectation or similar alternative agreement defining specific criteria for promotion and tenure

Table 2 Examples of Experience for Dimension 1: Excellence in the Field

Promotion Rank: Tenured Associate Professor

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
• Uses end-of-course student evaluations to guide changes to instructional/assessment • Uses peer or supervisor classroom observations to guide changes to instructional/assessment • Maintains scheduled advisement/office • Serves as an academic advisor (undergraduate/ graduate). • Teaches international • Develops instructional/ assessment materials related to course or program • Member of Graduate Faculty at master's • Prepares/submits education-based grants or gifts directly related to • Recipient of recognition/awards for teaching or advising • Industry recognition of teaching • Other	• Applies research-based best practices to • Publishes research in refereed journals (print/electronic). • Presents papers/posters at professional • Serves as a reviewer for a journal or government • Serves as a reviewer for conference • Member of discussion panels at local, state, national • Engages in unfunded research such as: ○ Nonthesis/ nondissertation research projects ○ University/College supported research projects ○ Thesis/dissertation committee chair (major advisor) • Engages in externally funded research such as: ○ Sponsored research grants/contracts from public organizations such as NSF, FAA, NOAA, and ○ Grants/contracts from private organizations and/or foundations ○ Paid consulting projects ○ Preparation/ administration of sponsored research grants ○ Funding proposals submitted but not funded (rejected)	• Participates on College-and/or University-wide • Member of thesis/ dissertation committees (COA non- chair or as outside member). • Performs administrative duties assigned by • Participates in local, state, or national professional meetings, panels, or • Recipient of local, state, or national awards/recognition. • Participates in student enrichment/outreach • Serves as an advisor to student • Participates in co- curricular • Member of professional • Other

Promotion Rank: Tenured Full Professor

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
- Major advisor for thesis/dissertation committees. - Member of Graduate Faculty at doctoral - Recognized by former undergraduate/graduate students whose professional and/or personal success was attributed directly to faculty - Noteworthy achievements by current and/or former undergraduate/graduate - Other	- Author of book reviews, essays, op/ed pieces published in refereed - Author of book chapters, book supplements, - Author of books or - Editor of journals or conference - Editor of - Member of discussion panels at international - Member of editorial - Invited keynote presenter at professional - Recipient of research-based awards, prizes - Recipient of intellectual properties such as software and - International research - Other	- Participates in student enrichment and outresearch activities such as student diversity/inclusion - Participates in local outreach to underrepresented or underserved - Recipient of international awards/recognition - Participates in international collaborations or - Participates in international professional meetings, panels, or - Participates on external boards, commissions, or advisory - Participates as an expert - Industry recognition of service - Other

Table 3 Examples of Experience for Dimension 2: Professional Ethics

Promotion Rank: Tenured Associate Professor and Tenure Full

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
- Course syllabi contain appropriate information about academic dishonesty and plagiarism. - Creates/maintains supportive, safe, ethical learning	- Follows IRB guidelines for human subject research. - Follows professional journal guidelines for articles submissions. - Follows appropriate	- Follows University Title IX guidelines. - Follows professional code of conduct for external organizations. - Demonstrates understanding

environment - Follows University guidelines for student advising. - Follows University guidelines for addressing academic dishonesty issues - Demonstrates understanding of relevant issues/strategies for responsible/ethical use of electronic technologies for teaching profession. - Understands and applies Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) when dealing with parents/guardians of students - Other	guidelines for grant submissions to public funding organizations. - Follows appropriate guidelines for grant submissions to private foundations. - Demonstrates understanding of relevant issues/ strategies for responsible /ethical use of electronic technologies in research. - Other	of the relevant issues/strategies for responsible/ethical use of electronic technologies relative to social media. Other
---	--	---

Table 4 Examples of Experience for Dimension 3: Continuous Improvement

Promotion Rank: Tenured Associate Professor

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
- Acquires additional academic qualifications, licenses/ratings, or credentials to improve teaching effectiveness. - Completes a formal undergraduate or graduate course to improve teaching effectiveness or assessments - Participates in professional in-service faculty training to improve teaching effectiveness or assessments. - Seeks/applies constructive feedback from supervisors/peers to improve teaching practices. - Other	- Attends grant writings workshops. - Participates in professional /In service sources/webinars to improve research opportunities. - Peer reviewer for journal articles, books, or other publications. - Contributes to the editing of professional publications.	- Increase in membership of professional organizations such as NBAA, AAAE, HFES, ESA and others. - Assumes role within professional organizations other than member (committee chair, officer). - Other

Promotion Rank: Tenured Full Professor

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
• Performs peer-bases classroom observations of faculty instruction. • Develops new courses, curricula, or academic programs. • Conducts professional in services workshops. • Other	• Increase in number of submitted sponsored research grants. • Increase in number of /ended sponsored research grants. • Recipient of competitive grants or contracts such as SBIR awards for a start-up business. • Other	• Increase in number of College or University wide committees served on. • Increase in level of activity and membership in professional organizations. • Other

Table 5 Examples of Experience for Dimension 4: Professional Engagement

Promotion Rank: Tenured Associate Professor and Tenure Full

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
• Helps peers restructure their courses to follow a CIA (Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment) alignment. • Helps peers integrate learning theory and practice into their instruction an assessment. • Provides suggestions to colleagues to help improve instruction/assessment strategies. • Other	• Offers peers the opportunity of coauthor article. • Offers peers the opportunity to serve as cop-PIs on sponsored research proposals. • Offers peers the opportunity to be part of funded consulting projects. • Other	• Offers peers the opportunity of coauthor article. • Offers peers the opportunity to serve as cop-PIs on sponsored research proposals. • Offers peers the opportunity to be part of funded consulting projects. • Other

Table 6 Examples of Experience for Dimension 5: Professional Image

Promotion Rank: Tenured Associate Professor and Tenure Full

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
- Projects a professional appearance in classroom. - Accepts constructive feedback from peers/supervisor to enhance professional image. - Avoids discussing personal life and opinions as part of classroom instruction. - Develops, nurtures, and maintains a positive classroom reputation among students. - Other	- Completes research assignments with designated deadlines. - Maintains a professional image within the research Community. - Other	- Respectful of others in the community/workplace. - Expresses oneself in a professional manner. - Maintains a professional online image. - Communicates and engages with members of the University and community in a professional manner. - Responds constructively to question posed during meetings. - Develops, nurtures, and maintains a positive reputation across the University. - Other

Table 7 Examples of Experience for Dimension 6: Services to the Profession

Promotion Rank: Tenured Associate Professor and Tenure Full

Examples of Teaching Effectiveness	Examples of Scholarship	Examples Service /Professional Activities
- Volunteers to be a teaching mentor to junior faculty. - Other	- Volunteers to be a research mentor to junior faculty - Holds leadership roles within the academic research community. - Other	- Holds leadership roles within the University. - Holds leadership roles such as an officer of an academic or professional organization. - Other

Promotion Guidelines (Non-Tenured Teaching Track): College of Aeronautics

Reviewed and approved by the College faculty on September 6, 2018

These guidelines may be reviewed and revised by the College of Aeronautics as needed and shall be reviewed at least every 5 years.

Overview

The College of Aeronautics faculty is comprised of highly qualified individuals from both academia and the aviation profession who work in harmony to execute the College's primary educational function of preparing students for the inherent challenges associated with all facets of the aviation profession through effective teaching. Concomitant with these functions is promotion, which is earned by faculty members' demonstration of overall excellence in teaching effectiveness, which includes *teaching, advising, scholarly activities, professional development, and service*. Faculty appointed as teaching professors are expected to have appropriate knowledge and experience in their field. They also are expected to develop their pedagogical expertise as they apply their knowledge and experiences to traditional classroom and/or online instruction, student mentoring and advising, and curriculum and professional development. Faculty who are hired and appointed to a teaching track are expected to remain active in their field.

Assistant Professor of Instruction

Faculty members considering promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor of Instruction must meet the minimum qualifications for Assistant Professor of Instruction and must have a documented record of experience in each of the required areas that builds on their accomplishments at their last promotion in rank. Required areas of accomplishment are:

- Teaching excellence and advising Scholarly activities
- Professional development in education Professional development in their field
- Service

Minimum Qualifications

- A terminal degree in the discipline
- A minimum of 18 graduate semester hours of aviation-based course work or alternative qualifications in domain-specific industry experience in the area being taught
- Licenses/ratings or industry-based credentials appropriate to the courses being taught
- At least 3 years in the rank of Instructor or similar years experience in industry related to their field. This time may be waived once the faculty member has completed a doctoral degree.

Samples of Experience

Teaching Excellence and Advising

- Classroom observations conducted by peers, academic unit head, and/or Dean/Associate Dean
- Student evaluations
- Academic advisor for undergraduate students
- Eligible for membership on Graduate Faculty at master's level
- Alternative qualifications based on domain-specific industry experience

Scholarly Activities

- Pedagogical activities such as curriculum development or course revision
- Demonstrated alignment among course content (curriculum) with outcome-based student learning outcomes (SLOs) and assessment methods to document SLOs

- Alternative qualifications based on industry experience in their

Professional Development as an Educator

- Evidence of improvement in teaching skills and/or teaching materials
- Apply research-based best practices to improve instruction
- Participate in action research/teacher mentorship program
- Alternative qualifications based on domain-specific industry experience

Professional Development in the Discipline

- Discipline-specific professional development such as advanced qualifications or certifications Scholarly achievement related to:
 - pedagogical research activities such as examining the effect different instructional strategies or resources have on achievement
 - attending conferences related to education or their field
 - presenting papers, participating on panels, or conducting workshops at education-related or conferences related to their field
 - domain-specific industry experience

Service

- Some service to the College, University, or discipline
- Active membership in professional organizations

Associate Professor of Instruction

Faculty members considering promotion from Assistant Professor of Instruction to Associate Professor of Instruction must meet the minimum qualifications for Associate Professor of Instruction and must have a documented record of experience in each of the required areas that builds on their accomplishments at their last promotion in rank. Required areas of accomplishment are:

- Teaching excellence and advising Scholarly activities
- Professional development in education
- Professional development in their field
- Service

Minimum Qualifications

A minimum of 5 years in rank as Assistant Professor of Instruction or equivalent

- A doctoral degree related to their field

Samples of Experience

Teaching Excellence and Advising

- Recipient of recognition related to teaching or advising Industry recognition related to teaching activities
- Member of Graduate Faculty at doctoral level Member of thesis or dissertation committees

Scholarly Activities

Creative instructional endeavors/scholarly activities such as

- publishing education-related material

- authoring domain-specific material

Professional Development as An Educator

- Pedagogical-specific professional development such as completing activities designed to improve teaching, participating in inservice programs, or taking enrichment courses

Professional Development in the Discipline

Discipline-specific professional development such as completing industry or graduate- level courses related to the discipline

- Acquisition of additional academic qualifications, licenses/ratings, or credentials

Service

- Continued active membership in professional organizations
- Continued service to the College, University, or discipline with respect to improving teaching and training practices

Professor of Instruction

Faculty members considering promotion from Associate Professor of Instruction to Professor of Instruction must meet the minimum qualifications for Professor of Instruction and must have a documented record of experience in each of the required areas that builds on their accomplishments at their last promotion in rank. Required areas of accomplishment:

- Teaching excellence and advising
- Scholarly activities
- Professional development in education
- Professional development in their field

- Service

Minimum Qualifications

- A minimum of 5 years in rank as Associate Professor of Instruction or equivalent
- A doctoral degree related to their field

Samples of Experience

Teaching Excellence and Advising

- Recipient of teaching-related recognition at the national level
- Major advisor to students' thesis/dissertation committees
- Recognition from former students (undergraduate or graduate) whose professional and/or personal success is attributed directly to the candidate

Scholarly Activities

- Improve domain-specific education at a national level such as helping to develop standards, accreditation or certification criteria,
- Develop education material such as a textbook, book chapters, or similar material
- Develop new courses, curricula, or academic programs

Professional Development as An Educator

- Pedagogical-specific professional development such as completing graduate-level courses related to teaching

Professional Development in the Discipline

- Nationally and/or internationally recognized expert within their field

Service

- Serve as a mentor to junior faculty
- Leadership in professional organizations
- National and/or international recognition for service
- Perform peer-based classroom observations of faculty instruction
- Demonstrated leadership within the academic unit, College, University

FH Appendix 4: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines: College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

Proposed Revisions of [Faculty Handbook](#) 10/2/18

Reviewed and approved by the chief academic officer, 1/8/2015

These guidelines provide a basis for judgment in evaluating and rewarding the meritorious performance of faculty in Florida Institute of Technology's College of Psychology and Liberal Arts. Promotion and tenure are an acknowledgment of a faculty member's achievements in the areas of teaching/supervision, research/ scholarship, and service/ administration.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Faculty Handbook (FH) 2.8 Tenure Policies and Procedures details the procedures that candidates, academic unit heads, promotion committees, and deans must follow. Collection of documentation for the dossier is the responsibility of the candidate going up for promotion and tenure. The dossier must follow the same organization and use the same headings and sub-headings as those that are listed in FH Appendix 1.

Appointment as Assistant Professor

Appointment as an assistant professor is based on a candidate's potential to teach effectively, develop a meaningful research/scholarship program, and contribute service to the program, school, college, and university. Potential is determined typically through the examination of a curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, an invited interview, and a research presentation or seminar.

Promotion and Tenure Eligibility Associate Professor with Tenure

A candidate will be considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure in his/her sixth year in rank as an assistant professor. Procedures involving extensions to the probationary period for a pre-

tenured faculty member are identified in Section 2.1.2.3 of FH 2.8 Tenure Policies and Procedures.

Promotion of candidates to associate professor and the granting of tenure are based on the fulfillment of potential in teaching/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration.

Teaching/supervision performance of high quality is expected of all faculty, and such performance is evaluated on the basis of current and former student evaluations, peer evaluations, and the demonstration of effective and innovative teaching. The candidate must provide sufficient documentation to support his/her candidacy for promotion and tenure.

Candidates for promotion and tenure must evidence a meaningful program of research/scholarship and a record of academic achievement. Candidates are expected to demonstrate that they will be able to establish national and international reputations in their fields and continue to be productive researchers and scholars. The "Promotion Criteria" section below details the types of research/scholarship considered for promotion and tenure to be submitted for review. The candidate's research/scholarship program is evaluated by the committee and at least three associate or full professors in the candidate's area of specialization.

Service/administration is a category that includes a faculty member's contributions to the program, school, college, university, and profession. Qualification in university and professional service is based on letters from administrators, supervisors, and colleagues in those endeavors and other documentation of activity. For faculty members with administrative roles as part of their workload, those contributions are represented within this category.

Professor

A candidate can be considered for promotion to professor in his/her sixth year in rank as an associate professor. There is no maximum time limit.

Promotion to professor is based on a record of academic achievement and the establishment of a university- wide and national or international reputation for research/scholarship.

The criterion elements for promotion to professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor. However, the requirements within these criteria are more extensive for promotion to

professor, and letters will be solicited from at least five full professors who are well-established in the candidate's area of specialization.

Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The three areas in which a candidate is evaluated for promotion and tenure are teaching/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration. Each area represents an important measure of a faculty member's performance. As merit in individual areas is evaluated in relation to the candidate's official roles and responsibilities, the weight of the individual categories may vary.

The criteria for promotion and tenure are described below. These criteria set minimum thresholds for promotion and tenure eligibility and the CoPLA promotion committee will use these criteria in making a promotion and tenure recommendation to the dean. Faculty who meet these criteria may be considered for promotion and tenure, but candidates are encouraged to exceed the minimum standards to make a stronger case for promotion and tenure. The lists of general categories for consideration and sources for evaluation in the three areas are not all-inclusive, and candidates are encouraged to highlight all relevant contributions in the dossier.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Teaching/Supervision

Candidates seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate a record of achievement in teaching. The candidate's narrative should characterize his/her teaching philosophy and contributions to the program, school, college, and university. Candidates should identify courses that they created and/or taught and discuss curriculum development, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and advising as well as other types of contributions to teaching, including the development of pedagogical tools or methods.

Supporting evidence for teaching includes the following: Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

- Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching
- Student Evaluation of Student Supervision/Training (including Clinical Supervision)
- Formal Recognition of Distinction in Teaching
- External Evaluation of Teaching
- Effectiveness Course
- Administration/Coordination
- Academic Unit Head's Appraisal of Candidate's Teaching Ability

Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

A candidate will submit his/her end of course evaluations for all of his/her courses and/or supervision units from the past two years and provide a statistical summary for all of his/her courses and/or supervision units at his/her current rank.

Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

The academic unit head (or designee) is responsible for assigning two senior faculty members to conduct individual peer appraisals of the candidate's teaching activities. A candidate must have at least two peer appraisals conducted by senior faculty during the pre-tenure period before going up for promotion to associate professor and tenure. Evaluation of teaching activities may be done by the academic unit head, program chair, or by other senior faculty members who are recognized as excellent teachers. Individuals outside the academic unit may also be enlisted. Scheduling of observations should be arranged with the candidate in advance.

These peer evaluations should, at a minimum, specifically address and provide relevant examples of the candidate's ability to present course content and/or skills to students, integration of topics, structure of the teaching session, and congruence between course goals and accomplishments.

An important part of peer review is the evaluation of instructional materials prepared by the candidate. General categories for consideration and sources for evaluation:

- Strong teaching/supervision record in classroom/online teaching and research supervision
- Current student evaluations
- Former student evaluations Peer evaluations
- Developed and introduced innovative pedagogical techniques Commentary from peers and students
- Syllabi and representative lesson plans/assignments
- Introduced new courses into the curriculum, developed new academic programs or made significant modifications to existing academic programs at the undergraduate or graduate level, or contributed to development of university assessment measures
- Syllabi, program descriptions, assessment measures, and commentary from peers and program chairs
- Received funding from outside agencies or foundations for curriculum development, enhancing teaching laboratories,
- Published or made significant contributions to textbooks in his/her field or published articles/essays on pedagogy
- Excerpts from textbooks
- Articles/essays
- Development of teaching manual, study guide, workbook,

Threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

- Successful candidates will have the majority of evaluative ratings (two-thirds or more) in the good to excellent categories. Candidates must also demonstrate achievements across the categories listed

Research/Scholarship

Candidates must demonstrate a record of academic achievement in their fields and promise of continued growth and productivity. It is expected that assistant professors will develop the foundation of their scholarly programs during their minimum five years in rank. Promotion to associate professor Candidates must demonstrate a record of academic achievement in their fields and promise of continued growth and productivity. It is expected that assistant professors will develop the foundation of their scholarly programs during their minimum five years in rank. Promotion to associate professor and the granting of tenure recognize the promise of an active and vigorous research agenda and output. The candidate should demonstrate a line of thematic or programmatic research and not simply a number of unrelated studies, presentations, and publications. Hence, in addition to the demonstration of activity listed below, a characterization of the programmatic quality and overall contribution to the scholarly field is expected from the candidate's narrative and external references. Where available, formal measures of the candidate's scholarly work (e.g., h-index from Google Scholar, ResearchGate Score, journal impact factor, and Social Sciences Citation Index), published reviews of the candidate's scholarly work, and assessments of the quality and reputation of the journals and/or publishers should also be provided by the candidate and external references. Sources for evaluation include copies of articles and essays, tables of contents, award letters, etc.

General categories of scholarship for consideration:

Scholarly books in field

- Editor of book series or book collection

Refereed articles (print and online): these must be published in a journal that requires peer review prior to publication

- Book chapters

Publications with students as coauthors

- Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources

Awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national, or international organizations

- Editor or associate/assistant editor of professional journal in field Journal editorial board member
- Development of assessment instruments Computer software
- Recordings as primary performer or composer
- Published musical compositions

Invited presentations at regional, national, or international conferences

- Conference presentations with students as coauthors

Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences

- Invited presenter, conductor, or performer at regional, national, or international venues Non-refereed publications and public scholarship
- Reviewer of books or journal articles

Served as session organizer/chair at regional, national, or international conferences

Threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

Refereed articles or book chapters: **at least five** wherein the candidate is a major contributor, published in high-quality journals or books as evaluated by the committee and outside reviewers. With multiple-authored texts, candidates should represent their levels of contribution and indicate the significance, if any, of their positions in the author

Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences: **at least five** wherein the candidate is a major contributor

A published monograph (full-length book) can substitute for two journal articles.

- Funded large grant application (e.g., an RO1 federal grant) can substitute for two

- Submission of a large grant application (e.g., an RO1 federal grant) can substitute for one publication.

Candidates with published monographs and/or large grant applications must also have published **at least three** refereed articles or book

The above scholarship must be published (or submitted, for the grant) during the candidate's time in However, candidates may represent their entire bodies of work as relevant to demonstrating the establishment and sustainment of a solid research program.

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

Additional scholarly books (monographs, edited essay collections, or textbooks) in field

- Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources

Awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national, or international organizations

- Editorial board member or editor for a professional journal in field

Service/ Administration

Service activities include but are not limited to the following: committee work for the program, school, college, or university; student advising; faculty mentoring; coordinating programs linking student or faculty expertise to opportunities outside the university; and service to the faculty member's discipline through involvement in professional organizations and conferences.

Contributions in administrative/leadership roles are considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor although it is recommended that tenure-track faculty delay taking on administrative positions until after they have received tenure and promotion to associate professor. Service should reflect continued/consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review. For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities/roles in other committees or evidence of new initiatives on the existing committees.

General categories of service for consideration: Program

- School College
- University
- Professional organizations (regional, national, or international) Program chair

General categories of administration for consideration include but are not limited to the following:

Academic unit head

- Center/institute director
- Assistant/associate dean

Sources of evaluation of administration should include a list of activities and accomplishments while serving in administrative roles, which can be documented through letters, memos, catalog entries, contracts, or other relevant evidence. Candidates should also submit letters from their supervisors outlining and evaluating their performance and contributions to the university.

Threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure and sources for evaluation:

Membership on **at least two** committees at the program, school, college, or university levels

- Letters/emails of appointment/election

Membership on **at least two** capstone, thesis, or dissertation committees. For graduate faculty affiliated with a graduate program, chair **at least one** master's or doctoral committee.

- Candidates may document chairing an undergraduate or graduate thesis or doctoral committee in the teaching
 - List of students and type of committee with year and committee role (i.e., chair or internal/ external member)

Service involvement in a professional organization for **at least three** years prior to

- List of service activities/organizations/years. (Examples include the following: paper reviewer for professional association conference; conference organizer; committee

member; conference panel moderator [note, discussant can be listed under scholarship]; leadership position in professional organization)

- Thank you letters/emails for service (specific)
- Published lists of reviewers, committee members, or organizers
- Copies of relevant portions of conference programs

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for

promotion: Student organization advisor

- Student recruitment/marketing efforts
 - Evidence of meetings or presentations to student groups, developing or coordinating social media campaigns
- Newsletter editor or contributor (for school, college, university, professional, or community organization)

Community service (volunteer activities, board membership, or service learning activities in courses)

- Appointment to state or federal advisory committees

Promotion to Professor

Teaching/Supervision

Candidates seeking promotion to professor must demonstrate a record of achievement in teaching.

The candidate's narrative should characterize his/her teaching philosophy and contributions in teaching to the program, school, college, and university. Candidates should identify courses that they created and/or taught and discuss curriculum development, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and advising as well as other types of contributions to teaching, including the development of pedagogical tools or methods.

Supporting evidence for teaching includes the following:

- Student Evaluation of Faculty

Teaching Peer Evaluation of

Faculty Teaching

- Student Evaluation of Student Supervision/Training (including Clinical Supervision)

- Formal Recognition of Distinction in

Teaching External Evaluation of

Teaching Effectiveness

- Course Administration/Coordination

Academic Unit Head's Appraisal of Candidate's Teaching Ability

Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

A candidate will submit his/her end of course evaluations for all of his/her courses and/or supervision units from the past two years and provide a statistical summary for all of his/her courses and/or supervision units at his/her current rank.

Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

The academic unit head (or designee) is responsible for assigning two senior faculty members to conduct individual peer appraisals of the candidate's teaching activities. A candidate must have at least two peer appraisals conducted by senior faculty during his/her time at the rank of associate professor before going up for promotion to professor. Evaluation of teaching activities may be done by the academic unit head, program chair, or by other senior faculty members who are recognized as excellent teachers. Individuals outside the academic unit may also be enlisted. Scheduling of observations should be arranged with the candidate in advance.

These peer evaluations should, at a minimum, specifically address and provide relevant examples of the candidate's ability to present course content and/or skills to students, integration of topics, structure of the teaching session, and congruence between course goals and accomplishments.

An important part of peer review is the evaluation of instructional materials prepared by the candidate. General categories for consideration and sources for evaluation:

Strong teaching/supervision record in classroom/online teaching and research supervision

- Current student evaluations
 - Former student evaluations
 - Peer evaluations
- Developed and introduced innovative pedagogical techniques
 - Commentary from peers and students
 - Syllabi and representative lesson plans/assignments

Introduced new courses into the curriculum, developed new academic programs or made significant modifications to existing academic programs at the undergraduate or graduate level, or contributed to the development of university assessment measures

- Syllabi, program descriptions, assessment measures, and commentary from peers and program chairs
- Received funding from outside agencies or foundations for curriculum development, enhancing teaching laboratories,
 - Documentation of awards
 - Published or made significant contributions to textbooks in his/her field or published articles/essays on pedagogy
 - Excerpts from textbooks
 - Articles/essays

Development of teaching manual, study guide, workbook, etc.

Threshold criteria for promotion to professor:

- Successful candidates will have the majority of evaluative ratings (two-thirds or more) in the good to excellent categories. Candidates must also demonstrate achievements across the categories listed above. It is expected that associate professors have made significant contributions to their programs at this stage in their

Research/Scholarship

Candidates must demonstrate an ongoing record of academic achievement and establishment of national or international reputation in their fields. It is expected that associate professors will solidify their scholarly programs during their minimum five years in rank. Promotion to professor recognizes an active and vigorous research agenda and output. The candidate should have established a line of thematic or programmatic research and not simply a number of unrelated studies, presentations, and publications.

Hence, in addition to the demonstration of activity listed below, a characterization of the programmatic quality and overall contribution to the scholarly field is expected from the candidate's narrative and external references. Where available, formal measures of the candidate's scholarly work (e.g., h-index from Google Scholar, ResearchGate Score, journal impact factor, and Social Sciences Citation Index), published reviews of the candidate's scholarly work, and assessments of the quality and reputation of the journals/publishers should also be provided by the candidate and external references. Sources for evaluation include copies of articles and essays, tables of contents, award letters, etc.

General categories of scholarship for consideration:

- Scholarly books in field

Editor of book series or book collection

- Refereed articles (print and online): these must be published in a journal that requires peer review prior to publication
- Book chapters
- Publications with students as coauthors

Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources

- Awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national, or international organizations Editor or associate/assistant editor of professional journal in field

- Journal editorial board member

Development of assessment

instruments

- Computer software

Recordings as primary performer or composer

- Published musical compositions
Invited presentations at regional, national, or international conferences
- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences
Invited presenter, conductor, or performer at regional, national, or international venues

- Conference presentations with students as
coauthors Non-refereed publications

- Reviewer of books or journal articles

Served as session organizer/chair at regional, national, or international

conferences Threshold criteria for promotion to professor:

- Refereed articles or book chapters: **at least seven** wherein the candidate is a major contributor, published in high-quality journals or books as evaluated by the committee and outside reviewers. With multiple-authored texts, candidates should represent their levels of

contribution and indicate the significance, if any, of their positions in the author lists

- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at national or international conferences: **at least five** wherein the candidate is a major contributor; **at least two** of these must include serving as chair, discussant, or moderator
- Appointment for a journal in field: ad hoc reviewer; part of a panel of reviewers; editorial board member; editor

A published monograph (full-length book) can substitute for two journal articles.

- Funded large grant application (e.g., an RO1 federal grant) can substitute for two publications.

Submission of a large grant application (e.g., an RO1 federal grant) can substitute for one publication.

- Candidates with published monographs and/or large grant applications and/or funding must also have published **at least five** refereed articles or book chapters.

The above scholarship must be published (or submitted, for the grant) during the candidate's time in rank.

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

Additional scholarly books (monographs, edited essay collections, or textbooks) in field

- Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources

Awards for scholarly activities from university and regional, national, and international organizations

Service/ Administration

Service activities include but are not limited to the following: committee work for the program, school, college, or university; student advising; faculty mentoring; coordinating programs linking student or faculty expertise to opportunities outside the university; and service to the faculty member's discipline through involvement in professional organizations and conferences.

Contributions in administrative/leadership roles are considered for promotion to professor.

Service should reflect continued/consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review. For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities/roles in other committees or evidence of new initiatives on the existing committees. For promotion from associate professor to professor, candidates should have service commitments at the university level and in the larger academic community in national or international organizations.

General categories of service for consideration:

Program

- School College
- University
- Professional organizations (regional, national, or international) Administration

General categories of administration for consideration include but are not limited to the following:

Program chair

- Academic unit head
- Center/institute director
-

Assistant/associate dean

Sources of evaluation of administration should include a list of activities and accomplishments while serving in administrative roles, which can be documented through letters, memos, catalog entries, contracts, or other relevant evidence. Candidates should also submit letters from their supervisors outlining and evaluating their performance and contributions to the university.

Threshold criteria for promotion to professor and sources for evaluation:

- Membership on **at least three** committees at the program, school, college, or university levels

- Letters/emails of appointment/election
- Membership on **at least three** capstone, thesis, or dissertation committees. For graduate faculty affiliated with a graduate program, chair **at least two master's** or doctoral committees. Candidates may document chairing an undergraduate or graduate thesis or doctoral committee in the teaching section.
 - List of students and type of committee with year and committee role (i.e., chair or internal/ external member)

Service involvement in a professional organization for at least five years prior to promotion with at least one leadership role.

List of service activities/organizations/years. (Examples include the following: paper reviewer for professional association conference; conference organizer; committee member; conference panel moderator [note, discussant can be listed under scholarship]; leadership position in professional organization)

Thank you letters/emails for service (specific)

- Published lists of reviewers, committee members, organizers Copies of relevant portions of conference programs

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

- Student organization advisor

Student recruitment/marketing efforts

- Evidence of meetings or presentations to student groups, developing or coordinating social media campaigns

Newsletter editor or contributor (for school, college, university, professional, or community organization)

- Community service (volunteer activities, board membership, or service learning activities in courses) Appointment to state or federal advisory committees

Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Guidelines: College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

- Proposed Revisions of Faculty Handbook 10/2/18

http://www.fit.edu/registrar/faculty-handbook.php#policy_S719

- Reviewed and approved by the chief academic officer, 1/8/2015 Note: added Faculty Review Guidelines and evaluation form, 1/8/15

Note: edited by Chief Operating Officer (formerly titled 'Provost') for title updates: 7/4/11

- *Note: edited by Provost for currency: 3/31/05*

These guidelines provide a basis for judgment in evaluating and rewarding meritorious performance of non-tenure-track teaching faculty in Florida Institute of Technology's College of Psychology and Liberal Arts.

Promotion is an acknowledgment of a faculty member's achievements in the areas of teaching/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration. Non-tenure-track faculty in the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts will be evaluated in these three categories with an emphasis on their contributions in teaching/ supervision and service.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Faculty Handbook (FH) 2.8 Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures details the procedures that candidates, academic unit heads, promotion committees, and deans must follow. Collection of documentation for the dossier is the responsibility of the candidate going up for promotion. The dossier

must follow the same organization and use the same headings and sub-headings as those that are listed in FH Appendix 1.

Appointment as Assistant Professor

Appointment as a non-tenure-track assistant professor is based on a candidate's potential to teach effectively, contribute service to the program, school, college, and university, and advance scholarly knowledge. Potential is determined typically through the examination of a curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, an invited interview, and a teaching or research presentation or seminar.

Promotion Eligibility Associate Professor

A non-tenure-track candidate can be considered for promotion to associate professor in his/her sixth year in rank as an assistant professor. There is no maximum time limit.

Promotion of non-tenure-track candidates to associate professor is based on the fulfillment of potential in teaching/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration.

Teaching/supervision performance of high quality is expected of all faculty, and such performance will be evaluated on the basis of current and former student evaluations, peer evaluations, and the demonstration of effective and innovative teaching. Non-tenure-track candidates for promotion must be able to demonstrate superior professional achievement in teaching/supervision and advising. The candidate must provide sufficient documentation to support his/her candidacy for promotion.

Non-tenure-track candidates for promotion must evidence the advancement of scholarly knowledge through scholarship of discovery, which includes publications in pedagogy or the candidate's area of specialization, and scholarship of teaching/pedagogy, which focuses on teaching practice and includes curriculum development and research projects. The "Promotion Criteria" section below details the types of research/ scholarship considered for promotion to be submitted for review. The candidate's research/scholarship program is evaluated by the committee and at least two associate or full professors in peer programs or the candidate's area of specialization.

Service/administration is a category that includes a faculty member's contributions to the program, school, college, university, and profession. Qualification in university and professional service is based on letters obtained from administrators, supervisors, and colleagues in those endeavors and other documentation of activity. For faculty members with administrative roles as part of their workload, those contributions are represented within this category.

Professor

A non-tenure-track candidate can be considered for promotion to professor in his/her sixth year in rank as an associate professor. There is no maximum time limit.

Promotion to professor is based on a record of achievement in teaching/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration. For non-tenure-track candidates, promotion to professor demonstrates superior quality of teaching, contributions to the academic community, and meritorious service to the program, school, college, university, and profession.

The criterion elements for promotion to professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor. However, the requirements within these criteria are more extensive for promotion to professor, and letters will be solicited from at least three full professors in peer programs or the candidate's area of specialization.

Promotion Criteria

The three areas in which a non-tenure-track candidate is evaluated for promotion are teaching/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration. Each area represents an important measure of a faculty member's performance. As merit in individual areas is evaluated in relation to the candidate's official roles and responsibilities, the weight of the individual categories may vary.

The criteria for promotion are described below. These criteria set minimum thresholds for promotion eligibility and the CoPLA promotion committee will use these criteria in making a promotion recommendation to the dean. Faculty who meet these criteria may be considered for promotion, but candidates are encouraged to exceed the minimum standards to make a stronger case for promotion. The lists of general categories for consideration and sources for evaluation in the three areas are not all-inclusive, and candidates are encouraged to highlight all relevant contributions in the dossier.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Teaching/Supervision

Non-tenure-track candidates seeking promotion to associate professor must demonstrate a record of achievement in teaching. The candidate's narrative should characterize his/her teaching philosophy and contributions to the program, school, college, and university.

Teaching faculty should demonstrate superior quality of teaching and sustained contributions in teaching and learning. Evidence of professional development in teaching includes established strong performance in

teaching and student supervision, a wide range of courses developed and taught, curricular and pedagogical improvement and innovation, advanced professional training, participation in and organization of teaching and learning workshops, and mentoring of peers in best practices in teaching. Candidates should identify courses that they created and/or taught and discuss curriculum development, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and advising as well as other types of contributions to teaching/supervision, including the development of pedagogical tools or methods.

Candidates should describe their learning goals and outcomes as well as methods of assessment and evaluation.

Supporting evidence includes the following:

Current course materials appropriate to the candidate's field and focused on student learning outcomes

- Course design and assignments at an appropriate level of student engagement and challenge Sample rubrics

- Examples of feedback to students

Other evidence of student outcomes (awards, graduate school admission,)

- Continued professional development in teaching (workshops, conferences, training,) Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

- Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

- Student Evaluation of Student Supervision/Training (including Clinical Supervision) Formal Recognition of Distinction in Teaching
- External Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness Course Administration/Coordination
- Academic Unit Head's Appraisal of Candidate's

Teaching Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

A candidate will submit his/her end of course evaluations for all of his/her courses and/or supervision activities from the past two years and provide a statistical summary for all of his/her courses and/or supervision activities at his/her current rank.

Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

The academic unit head (or designee) is responsible for assigning three senior faculty members to conduct individual peer appraisals of the non-tenure-track candidate's teaching activities. A candidate must have at least three peer appraisals conducted by senior faculty during his/her time at rank of assistant professor before going up for promotion to associate professor. Evaluation of teaching activities may be done by the academic unit head, program chair, or by other senior faculty members who are recognized as excellent teachers. Individuals outside the academic unit may also be enlisted. Scheduling of observations should be arranged with the candidate in advance.

These peer evaluations should, at a minimum, specifically address and provide relevant examples of the candidate's ability to present course content and/or skills to students, integration of topics, structure of the teaching session, and congruence between course goals and accomplishments.

An important part of peer review is the evaluation of instructional materials prepared by the candidate. General categories for consideration and sources for evaluation:

Strong teaching/supervision record in classroom/online teaching and research supervision o

- Current student evaluations
- Former student evaluations
- Peer evaluations

Developed and introduced innovative pedagogical techniques

- Commentary from peers and students

Syllabi and representative lesson plans/assignments

- Introduced new courses into the curriculum, developed new academic programs or made significant modifications to existing academic programs at the undergraduate or graduate level, or contributed to development of university assessment measures
 - Syllabi, program descriptions, assessment measures, and commentary from peers and program chairs

Threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor:

- Successful candidates will have the majority of evaluative ratings (two-thirds or more) in the good to excellent categories. Candidates must also demonstrate achievements across the categories listed above.

Research/Scholarship

Non-tenure-track candidates must demonstrate the advancement of scholarly knowledge through scholarship of discovery, which includes publications in pedagogy or the candidate's area of specialization, and scholarship of teaching/pedagogy, which focuses on teaching practice and includes curriculum development and research projects.

Scholarship of discovery demonstrates the advancement of scholarly knowledge in academic and professional communities. Where applicable, the candidate should identify how the

research/scholarship is connected and applied to courses and/or thesis supervision. In addition to the demonstration of activity listed below, a characterization of the programmatic quality and overall contribution to pedagogy or the candidate's scholarly field is expected from the candidate's narrative and external references. Where available, formal measures of the candidate's scholarly work (e.g., h index from Google Scholar, ResearchGate Score, journal impact factor, and Social Sciences Citation Index), published reviews of the candidate's scholarly work, and assessments of the quality and reputation of the journals and/or publishers should also be provided by the candidate and external references. Sources for evaluation include copies of articles and essays, tables of contents, award letters, etc.

Scholarship of teaching/pedagogy includes educational research projects disseminated at professional conferences and/or peer-reviewed publications, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, projects funded by external or internal grants to support instructional activities, and production of instructional videos.

General categories of scholarship for consideration:

- Scholarly books

Editor of book series or book collection

- Refereed articles (print and online): these must be published in a journal that requires peer review prior to publication

- Book chapters

Publications with students as coauthors

- Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources
- Funding from outside agencies or foundations for curriculum development, enhancing teaching laboratories or training of students, etc.
- Awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national, or international organizations

Editor or associate/assistant editor of professional journal in field

- Journal editorial board member
- Development of assessment instruments Computer software
- Recordings as primary performer or composer Published musical compositions
- Development of teaching manual, study guide, workbook, etc.
Invited presentations at regional, national, or international conferences
- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences Invited presenter, clinician, conductor, or performer at regional, national, or international venues
- Conference presentations with students as coauthors
- Served as session organizer/chair at regional, national, or international conferences
Membership and activities in professional educational organizations or professional groups
- Non-refereed publications and public scholarship Reviewer of books or journal articles

Threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor:

- Refereed articles or book chapters: **at least two** wherein the candidate is a major With

multiple- authored texts, candidates should represent their levels of contribution and indicate the significance, if any, of their positions in the author lists.

- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences: **at least two** wherein the candidate is a major contributor

A published monograph (full-length book) can substitute for two journal

- Funded large grant application (e.g., an RO1 federal grant) can substitute for one

Candidates with published monographs and/or large grant applications must also have published **at least one** refereed article or book chapter.

- The above scholarship must be published (or submitted, for the grant) during the candidate's time in rank. However, candidates may represent their entire bodies of work as relevant to demonstrating the establishment and sustainment of scholarship of discovery and teaching/pedagogy.

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

Additional scholarly books (monographs, edited essay collections, or textbooks)

- Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources
- Submission of a grant application

Awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national, or international organizations

Service/ Administration

Service activities include but are not limited to the following: committee work for the program, school, college, or university; student advising; faculty mentoring; coordinating programs linking student or faculty expertise to opportunities outside the university; and service to the faculty member's discipline

through involvement in professional organizations and conferences.

Service should reflect continued/consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review. For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities/roles in other committees or evidence of new initiatives on the existing committees.

General categories of service for consideration:

Program

- School College
- University

Professional Organizations (regional, national, or international)

General categories of administration for consideration include but are not limited to the following:

- Program chair Academic unit head
- Center/institute director Assistant/associate dean

Sources of evaluation of administration should include a list of activities and accomplishments while serving in administrative roles, which can be documented through letters, memos, catalog entries, contracts, or other relevant evidence. Candidates should also submit letters from their supervisors outlining and evaluating their performance and contributions to the university.

Threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor and sources for evaluation:

- Membership on at least two committees at the program, school, college, or university levels o Letters/emails of appointment/election
Membership on at least two capstone, thesis, or dissertation committees. Candidates may document chairing an undergraduate or graduate thesis or doctoral committee in the teaching section.
 - List of students and type of committee with year and committee role (i.e., chair or

internal/ external member)

Service involvement in a professional organization for at least three years prior to promotion.

- List of service activities/organizations/years. (Examples include the following: paper reviewer for professional association conference; conference organizer; committee member; conference panel moderator [note, discussant can be listed under scholarship]; leadership position in professional organization)
- Thank you letters/emails for service (specific)
- Published lists of reviewers, committee members, or organizers
- Copies of relevant portions of conference programs Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

Student organization advisor

- Student recruitment/marketing efforts
 - Evidence of meetings or presentations to student groups, developing or coordinating social media campaigns
- Newsletter editor or contributor (for school, college, university, professional, or community organization)
- Community service (volunteer activities, board membership, or service learning activities in courses) Appointment to state or federal advisory committees

Promotion to Professor

Teaching/Supervision

Non-tenure-track candidates seeking promotion to professor must demonstrate a record of achievement in teaching. The candidate's narrative should characterize his/her teaching philosophy and contributions to the program, school, college, and university.

Teaching faculty should demonstrate superior quality of teaching and sustained contributions in teaching and learning. Evidence of professional development and growth in teaching includes established strong performance in teaching/supervision, a wide range of courses developed and taught, curricular and pedagogical improvement and innovation, advanced professional training, participation in and organization of teaching and learning workshops, and mentoring of peers in best practices in teaching. Candidates should

identify courses that they created and/or taught and discuss curriculum development, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and advising as well as other types of contributions to teaching, including the development of pedagogical tools or methods. Candidates should describe their learning goals and outcomes as well as methods of assessment and evaluation.

Supporting evidence includes the following:

Current course materials appropriate to the candidate's field and focused on student learning outcomes

Course design and assignments at an appropriate level of student engagement and challenge

- Sample rubrics
- Examples of feedback to students

Other evidence of student outcomes (awards, graduate school admission,)

- Continued professional development in teaching (workshops, conferences, training,)
- Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

- Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

Student Evaluation of Student Supervision/Training (including Clinical Supervision)

- Formal Recognition of Distinction in

Teaching External Evaluation of

Teaching Effectiveness

- Course Administration/Coordination
- Academic Unit Head's Appraisal of Candidate's

Teaching Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

A candidate will submit his/her end of course evaluations for all of his/her courses and/or supervision activities from the past two years and provide a statistical summary for all of his/her courses and/or supervision activities at his/her current rank.

Peer Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

The academic unit head (or designee) is responsible for assigning three senior faculty members to conduct individual peer appraisals of the non-tenure-track candidate's teaching activities. A candidate must have at least three peer appraisals conducted by senior faculty during his/her time at rank of associate professor before going up for promotion to professor. Evaluation of teaching activities may be done by the academic unit head, program chair, or by other senior faculty members who are recognized as excellent teachers.

Individuals outside the academic unit may also be enlisted. Scheduling of observations should be arranged with the candidate in advance.

These peer evaluations should, at a minimum, specifically address and provide relevant examples of the candidate's ability to present course content and/or skills to students, integration of topics, structure of the teaching session, and congruence between course goals and accomplishments.

An important part of peer review is the evaluation of instructional materials prepared by the candidate. General categories for consideration and sources for evaluation:

- Strong teaching/supervision record in classroom/online teaching and research supervision
 - Current student evaluations
 - Former student evaluations
 - Peer evaluations

- Developed and introduced innovative pedagogical techniques
 - Commentary from peers and students
 - Syllabi and representative lesson plans/assignments

Introduced new courses into the curriculum, developed new academic programs or made significant modifications to existing academic programs at the undergraduate or graduate level, or contributed to development of university assessment measures

- Syllabi, program descriptions, assessment measures, and commentary from peers and program chairs

Threshold criteria for promotion to professor:

- Successful candidates will have the majority of evaluative ratings (two-thirds or more) in the good to excellent Candidates must also demonstrate achievements across the categories listed above. It is expected that associate professors have made significant contributions to their programs and professions at this stage in their careers.

Research/Scholarship

Non-tenure-track candidates must demonstrate the advancement of scholarly knowledge through scholarship of discovery, which includes publications in pedagogy or the candidate's area of specialization, and scholarship of teaching/pedagogy, which focuses on teaching practice and includes curriculum development and research projects.

Scholarship of discovery demonstrates the advancement of scholarly knowledge in academic and professional communities. Where applicable, the candidate should identify how the research/scholarship is connected and applied to courses and/or thesis supervision. In addition to the demonstration of activity listed below, a characterization of the programmatic quality and overall contribution to pedagogy or the candidate's scholarly field is expected from the candidate's narrative and external references. Where available, formal measures of the candidate's scholarly work (e.g., h index from Google Scholar, ResearchGate Score, journal impact factor, and Social Sciences Citation Index), published reviews of the candidate's scholarly work, and assessments of the quality and reputation of the journals and/or publishers should also be provided by the candidate and

external references. Sources for evaluation include copies of articles and essays, tables of contents, award letters, etc.

Scholarship of teaching/pedagogy includes educational research projects disseminated at professional conferences and/or peer-reviewed publications, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, projects funded by external or internal grants to support instructional activities, and production of instructional videos.

General categories of scholarship for consideration:

Scholarly books

- Editor of book series or book collection

Refereed articles (print and online): these must be published in a journal that requires peer review prior to publication

Book chapters

- Publications with students as coauthors
- Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources

Funding from outside agencies or foundations for curriculum development, enhancing teaching laboratories or training of students,

Awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national, or international organizations

- Editor or associate/assistant editor of professional journal in field
- Journal editorial board member

Development of assessment

instruments

- Computer software

Recordings as primary performer or composer

- Published musical compositions

Development of teaching manual, study guide, workbook,

- Invited presentations at regional, national, or international conferences

Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences

- Invited presenter, clinician, conductor, or performer at regional, national, or international venues

- Conference presentations with students as coauthors

Served as session organizer/chair at regional, national, or international conferences

- Membership and activities in professional educational organizations or professional

groups Non-refereed publications and public scholarship

- Reviewer of books or journal articles

Threshold criteria for promotion to professor:

- Refereed articles or book chapters: **at least four** wherein the candidate is a major With multiple- authored texts, candidates should represent their levels of contribution and indicate the significance, if any, of their positions in the author lists.

- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences: **at least three** wherein the candidate is a major

A published monograph (full-length book) can substitute for two journal

- Funded large grant application (e.g., an RO1 federal grant) can substitute for one

Candidates with published monographs and/or large grant applications and/or funding must also have published **at least two** refereed articles or book

- The above scholarship must be published (or submitted, for the grant) during the candidate's time in rank.

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

- Additional scholarly books (monographs, edited essay collections, or textbooks) Funded grants or contract support for research from federal, state, or private sources
- Submission of a grant application

Awards for scholarly activities from university and regional, national, and international organizations

Service/ Administration

Service activities include but are not limited to the following: committee work for the program, school, college, or university; student advising; faculty mentoring; coordinating programs linking student or faculty expertise to opportunities outside the university; and service to the faculty member's discipline through involvement in professional organizations and conferences.

Service should reflect continued/consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review. For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little

responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities/roles in other committees or evidence of new initiatives on the existing committees. For promotion from associate professor to professor, candidates should have service commitments at the university level and in the larger academic community in national or international organizations.

General categories of service for consideration:

- Program School

- College
- University

Professional organizations (regional, national, or international)

- Administration

General categories of administration for consideration include but are not limited to the following:

- Program chair
- Academic unit head Center/institute director
- Assistant/associate dean

Sources of evaluation of administration should include a list of activities and accomplishments while serving in administrative roles, which can be documented through letters, memos, catalog entries, contracts, or other relevant evidence. Candidates should also submit letters from their supervisors outlining and evaluating their performance and contributions to the university.

Threshold criteria for promotion to professor and sources for evaluation:

- Membership on at least three committees at the program, school, college, or university levels o Letters/emails of appointment/election
- Membership on at least three capstone, thesis, or dissertation committees. Candidates may document chairing an undergraduate or graduate thesis or doctoral committee in the teaching section.
 - List of students and type of committee with year and committee role (i.e., chair or internal/ external member)

Service involvement in a professional organization for at least four years prior to promotion with at least one leadership role.

- List of service activities/organizations/years. (Examples include the following: paper reviewer for professional association conference; conference organizer; committee member; conference panel moderator [note, discussant can be listed under

scholarship]; leadership position in professional organization)

- Thank you letters/emails for service (specific)
- Published lists of reviewers, committee members, organizers
- Copies of relevant portions of conference programs Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

Student organization advisor

- Student recruitment/marketing efforts
 - Evidence of meetings or presentations to student groups, developing or coordinating social media campaigns
 - Newsletter editor or contributor (for school, college, university, professional, or community organization)
- Community service (volunteer activities, board membership, or service learning activities in courses)
- Appointment to state or federal advisory committees

Clinical Faculty – Non-Tenure Track

Clinical Faculty – Non-Tenure Track College of Psychology & Liberal Arts

October 2018

Clinical Faculty is an academic appointment made to a member of a profession who is affiliated with a non-academic university unit and engages in practical instruction of professional students.

Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to university programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction and supervision of students in practicum settings. Clinical faculty generally serve as professional staff with added responsibilities of student training, research, and university service.

Clinical Assistant Professor

The rank of Clinical Assistant Professor is associated with the following competencies and expectations:

1. Hold a doctoral degree in the faculty member's field, including appropriate certification or licensure or demonstrated eligibility within one year of appointment, and have at least five years of graduate- level clinical or equivalent professional
2. Demonstrate expertise in the discipline sufficient to provide basic clinical services and supervision.
3. Demonstrate excellence in clinical, including administrative (if applicable), abilities as appropriate to needs of the
4. Advance scholarly knowledge such as through refereed articles and presenting as an invited clinician at regional/national/international
5. Contribute to the department, school, college, university and regional/national/international organizations through service/administration.

Clinical Associate Professor

The rank of Clinical Associate Professor is associated with the following competencies and expectations:

1. Hold a doctoral degree in the faculty member's field, including appropriate certification or licensure, have at least six years of successful clinical experience as a Clinical Assistant Professor.
2. Demonstrate sustained excellence in clinical Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, evaluations that demonstrate:

- Provision of high-quality patient care
 - High level of competence in a clinical specialty
 - Expanded breadth of clinical responsibilities
 - Significant participation in the activities of clinical and/or professional groups, including leading professional workshops
 - Reputation as an outstanding health-care provider
 - Effective development, expansion, or administration of a clinical service
 - Recognition or certification by a professional group
3. Advance scholarly knowledge such as through refereed articles and presenting as an invited clinician at regional/national/international
 4. Contribute to the department, school, college, university and regional/national/international organizations through service/administration.

Clinical Professor

The rank of Clinical Professor is associated with the following competencies and expectations:

1. Hold a doctoral degree in the faculty member's field, including appropriate certification or licensure, have six years of successful clinical experience as a Clinical Associate
2. Demonstrate sustained excellence in clinical abilities. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, evaluations that demonstrate:
 - Provision of high-quality patient care
 - High level of competence in a clinical specialty
 - Expanded breadth of clinical responsibilities
 - Significant participation in the activities of clinical and/or professional groups,

including leading professional workshops

- Reputation as an outstanding health-care provider
- Effective development, expansion or administration of a clinical service
- Recognition or certification by a professional group

3. Advance scholarly knowledge such as through refereed articles and presenting as an invited clinician at regional/national/international

4. Service/administration contributions such as service to the department, school, college, university and regional/national/international

Clinical Faculty Promotion Criteria

These guidelines provide a basis for judgment in evaluating and rewarding the meritorious performance of clinical faculty in Florida Institute of Technology's College of Psychology and Liberal Arts. Promotion is an acknowledgment of a faculty member's achievements in the areas of teaching/supervision, research/ scholarship, and service/administration. Clinical faculty in the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts will be evaluated in these three categories with an emphasis on their contributions in clinical service and student supervision.

Promotion Procedures

Faculty Handbook (FH) 2.8 Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures details the procedures that candidates, academic unit heads, promotion committees, and deans must follow. Collection of documentation for the dossier is the responsibility of the candidate going up for promotion. The dossier must follow the same organization and use the same headings and sub-headings as those that are listed in FH Appendix 1.

Promotion Eligibility

Appointment as Clinical Assistant Professor

Appointment as a clinical assistant professor will be based on a candidate's potential to provide clinical service effectively and to advance scholarly knowledge. Potential will be determined typically through the examination of an academic curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, and

an invited interview.

Clinical Associate Professor

A candidate can be considered for promotion to clinical associate professor in his/her sixth year in rank as a clinical assistant professor. There is no maximum time limit.

Promotion of candidates to clinical associate professor is not automatic; it is based on the fulfillment of potential in effective clinical service/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration.

Clinical service/supervision performance of high quality will be expected of all clinical faculty, and such performance will be judged on the basis of current and former student evaluations. Peer evaluation of clinical service and supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and practicum can supplement student evaluations. In the absence of an adequate, universal metric to evaluate clinical service/supervision performance, the candidate must provide sufficient documentation to support his/her candidacy for promotion. A candidate will submit his/her end-of-course evaluations for all of his/her clinical service and/ or supervision activities for at least the previous two years and/or statistical summaries for the clinical service/supervision units.

Research/scholarship qualifications will be judged on the basis of an active and meaningful program of research. The "Promotion Criteria" section below details the types of research/scholarship considered for promotion and to be submitted for review. The candidate's research/scholarship program will be evaluated by the committee and at least two external reviewers.

Service/administration is a category that includes a clinical faculty member's contributions to the clinical unit, department, school, college, university, and regional/national/international organizations.

Qualification in university and professional service will be based on letters obtained from administrators, supervisors and colleagues in those endeavors and other documentation of activity. Performance in service activities must rise above the norm to be considered meritorious. For clinical faculty members with administrative roles as part of their workload, those contributions are represented within this category.

Clinical Professor

A candidate can be considered for promotion to clinical professor in his/her sixth year in rank as a clinical associate professor. There is no maximum time limit.

Promotion to professor will be based on the establishment of a university-wide and national reputation for excellence in clinical work and related scholarship and significant contributions to the teaching and service mission of the unit.

The criterion elements for promotion to professor will be the same as those for promotion to associate professor. However, the requirements within these criteria will be more extensive for promotion to professor, and letters will be solicited from at least three full professors with strong reputations in the candidate's area(s) of specialization.

Promotion Criteria

The three areas in which a clinical faculty candidate is evaluated for promotion are clinical service/supervision, research/scholarship, and service/administration. Each area represents an important measure of a clinical faculty member's performance. As merit in individual areas is evaluated in relation to the candidate's official roles and responsibilities, the weight of the individual categories may vary.

The criteria for promotion are described below. These criteria set minimum thresholds for promotion eligibility and the CoPLA promotion committee will use these criteria in making a promotion recommendation to the dean. Faculty who meet these criteria may be considered for promotion, but candidates are encouraged to exceed the minimum standards to make a stronger case for promotion. The lists of general categories for consideration and sources for evaluation in the three areas are not all-inclusive, and candidates are encouraged to highlight all relevant contributions in the dossier.

Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

Clinical Service/Supervision

Clinical faculty candidates seeking promotion to clinical associate professor must demonstrate a record of achievement in clinical service and student training and articulate a compelling clinical agenda. The candidate's narrative should characterize his/her training philosophy and contributions to the unit.

General categories for consideration and sources for evaluation:

- Strong clinical service/supervision record in clinics/in vivo training, clinical supervision and research supervision
 - Current student evaluations
 - Former student evaluations
 - Peer evaluations
- Developed and introduced innovative pedagogical techniques
Commentary from peers and students
 - Training plans/clinical service and research projects

Introduced new clinical services, developed new clinical programs or made significant modifications to existing clinical programs at the service

- Clinical protocols, research protocols, clinical service program descriptions, assessment measures and commentary from peers and program chairs/supervisors

Received funding from outside agencies or foundations for clinical service development, enhancing training of students, etc.

- Documentation of awards

Published or made significant contributions to textbooks in his/her field or published articles/essays on pedagogy

- Excerpts from textbooks
- Articles/essays
- Development of teaching manual, study guide, workbook, etc.

Threshold criteria for promotion to clinical associate professor:

It is expected that clinical assistant professors have at least 2/3 of their clinical service and/or supervision in the previous two years rated "good" or higher to be eligible for promotion to clinical associate professor.

Clinical assistant professors will also demonstrate achievements across the categories listed above.

Research/Scholarship

Clinical faculty are expected to contribute to the advancement of scholarly knowledge within their field.

General categories of scholarship for consideration:

- Refereed articles (print and online)

- Book chapters

Presentations/publications with students as coauthors

- Editor of book series or collected

works Scholarly books in field

- Received grants and/or contract support for research from federal, state or private sources

Received awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national or international organizations

Editor or associate/assistant editor of professional journal in field

- Journal editorial board member

Development of assessment

instruments

- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional/national/international

meetings Invited presenter, clinician, at regional/national/international venues

- Non-refereed publications

Reviewer for books or journal articles

- Served as session organizer/chair at regional/national/international society

meetings Expectations for threshold performance during the previous five years:

At least three refereed articles, book chapters or article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional, national or international conferences: wherein the candidate is major contributor. With multiple-authored texts, candidates should represent their levels of contribution and indicate the significance, if any, of their positions in the author

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for

promotion: Scholarly books in field

- Received grants and/or contract support for research from federal, state or private sources

Received awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national or international organizations

- Editorial board member or editor for professional journal in field

Service/ Administration

Clinical faculty members are expected to serve their unit, program, school, college, university and professional organizations. Sources for evaluation will be letters of appointment and recognition and copies of organizations' conference programs/ mailings. Candidates with administrative roles are required to submit letters from their supervisors evaluating their performance and contributions to the university.

Service should reflect continued/consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review.

For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities/roles in clinical program improvement or development.

General categories of service for consideration:

Served as faculty representative (advisor) to student clubs, societies and organizations

- Thesis/dissertation committee membership (non-chair)

Professional society service (e.g., board of directors, planning committees and website/newsletter editor)

- Community service (e.g., board of directors for charitable groups, advisor for schools and involvement in charitable organizations)

Service to the college and university

General categories of administration for consideration:

Clinical service program development

- Pursuit of applied contracts
- Developing strategic

partnerships Strategic

planning and operations

- Client relationship management

Program development internal to FIT (seminars, workshops, etc.)

- Development of policies and procedures

Expectations for threshold performance during the previous five years:

It is expected that assistant professors will have service commitments at the department, college and university levels to be eligible for promotion to associate professor.

Promotion to Clinical Professor

Clinical Service/Supervision

Candidates seeking promotion to clinical professor must demonstrate a record of achievement in clinical service and supervision. The candidate's narrative should characterize his/her training and service philosophy and contributions to the unit.

General categories for consideration and sources for evaluation:

Strong clinical service/supervision record in clinics/in vivo training, clinical supervision and research supervision

- Current student evaluations
- Former student evaluations
- Peer evaluations

Developed and introduced innovative pedagogical techniques

- Commentary from peers and students
- Training plans/clinical service and research projects
- Introduced new clinical services into the program, developed new clinical programs or made significant modifications to existing clinical programs at the service

Received funding from outside agencies or foundations for clinical service development, enhancing training of students, etc.

Clinical protocols, research protocols, clinical service program descriptions, assessment measures and commentary from peers and program chairs/supervisors

- Documentation of awards

Published or made significant contributions to textbooks in his/her field or published

articles/essays on pedagogy

- Excerpts from textbooks
- Articles/essays
- Development of teaching manual, study guide, workbook, etc.
- Expectations for threshold performance:

It is expected that clinical associate professors have at least 2/3 of their clinical service and/or supervision in the previous two years rated "good" or higher to be eligible for promotion to clinical professor. It is also expected that clinical associate professors have made significant contributions to their clinical unit at this stage in their careers.

Research/Scholarship

Clinical faculty are expected to contribute to the advancement of scholarly knowledge within their field. General categories of scholarship for consideration:

- Refereed articles (print and
online) Book chapters
- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at regional/national/international meetings
- Presentations/publications with students as
coauthors Scholarly books in field
- Editor of book series or collected works
Received grants and/or contract support for research from federal, state or private sources
- Received awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national or
international organizations

Editor or associate/assistant editor of professional journal in field

- Journal editorial board member

Development of assessment

instruments

- Invited clinician at regional/national/international

venues Non-refereed publications

Reviewer for books or journal articles

- Served as session organizer/chair at regional/national/international society meetings

It is expected that clinical associate professors will solidify their scholarly programs during their minimum five years in rank. Promotion to clinical professor will emphasize not only documentation of individual categories of evaluation but also an active and vigorous research agenda and output. Hence, in addition to the demonstration of activity listed below, a characterization of the programmatic quality and overall contribution to the scholarly field is expected from external references.

Expectations for threshold performance during the previous five years:

- Refereed articles or book chapters: **at least four** wherein the candidate is major contributor, published in high-quality journals or books as evaluated by the committee and external reviewers. With multiple-authored texts, candidates should represent their levels of contribution and indicate the significance, if any, of their positions in the author
- Article- or abstract-reviewed presentations at national and/or international conferences: **at least three** wherein the candidate is major

A published book can substitute for three journal

Activity in these additional areas may make a stronger case for promotion:

- Received grants and/or contract support for research from federal, state or private

Received awards for scholarly activities from university or regional, national or international organizations.

Service/ Administration

Clinical faculty members are expected to serve their unit, program, school, college, university and professional organizations. Sources for evaluation will be letters of appointment and recognition and copies of organizations' conference programs/mailings. Candidates with administrative roles are required to submit letters from their supervisors evaluating their performance and contributions to the university.

Service should reflect continued/consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review. For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities/roles in clinical program improvement or development.

General categories of service for consideration:

- Served as faculty representative (advisor) to student clubs, societies and organizations Thesis/dissertation committee membership (non-chair)
- Professional society service (e.g., board of directors, planning committees and website/newsletter editor)

Community service (e.g., board of directors for charitable groups, advisor for schools and involvement in charitable organizations)

- Service to the college and university

General categories of administration for consideration:

Clinical service program development

- Pursuit of applied
contracts Developing
strategic partnerships
- Strategic planning and
operations Client
relationship management
- Program development internal to FIT (seminars,
workshops,) Development of policies and procedures

Expectations for threshold performance per year during the previous five years:

It is expected that clinical associate professors will have distinguished themselves in their unit through service and administrative contributions. Service to the larger academic community in national and international organizations is also required to be eligible for promotion to clinical professor.

FH Appendix 5: Promotion And Tenure Guidelines: Nathan M. Bisk College Of Business

August 24, 2018

REV B

Statement of Intent

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation, reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business (CoB).

This document aligns with guidelines stipulated by the Florida Institute of Technology Faculty Handbook, and defines performance, reappointment, promotion, and tenure norms for the CoB. These norms must coincide with the goals and objectives of the CoB, as stated and implied by the College's mission statement.

The Nathan M. Bisk College of Business is an integral academic unit of the Florida Institute of Technology. The college provides well-rounded, high-quality educational experiences to prepare graduates for a variety of careers in the global business environment.

In support of all undergraduate and graduate programs, the college:

- provides foundational knowledge in all areas of business and exposes students to ethical decision- making and leadership challenges;
- continuously improves curricula, being responsive to rapidly changing global workforce demands;
- furthers intellectual growth opportunities for both faculty and students;
- serves society through quality educational offerings that target the needs of working

professionals and traditional college students, encouraging a culturally diverse student experience; and

- builds effective partnerships with university stakeholders to further program excellence and lifelong

Consequently, the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business will recommend the granting of tenure to or promoting only those faculty members whose contributions help the CoB fulfill its mission. Similarly, it would be in the best interests of the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business to deny a recommendation for tenure, promotion, or both to faculty members whose individual achievements do not coincide substantially with the mission and goals of the CoB, regardless of their competency within their field(s).

The following basic precepts inform both tenure and promotion, and in this document, any time the term ‘Dean’ is used, it is understood to mean the Dean, Associate Dean, Academic Unit Head or the appointed representative of the Dean.

- Tenure is a cornerstone of academic life because it ensures freedom of thought and speech.
- The promotion and tenure norms promulgated should be consistent with and support the mission of the CoB; in addition, the norms also should be consistent with recommendations from AACSB about tenure and promotion guidelines, and general performance standards accepted by the Florida Institute of Technology and institutions comparable in rigor, stature, and teaching, research, and service loads.
- The CoB adopts AACSB terminology for categorizing faculty in terms of expectations for intellectual contributions, expected ongoing intellectual development, and a faculty member’s role in achieving the College’s mission. Although AACSB posits four categories of faculty (see AACSB guidelines for details), it is the Scholarly Academic (SA) category which defines typical, tenure- track, career faculty. SA faculty members possess a doctoral degree in the field in which they teach, sustaining currency and relevance through scholarship and related activities.

- A key principle is that tenure be granted only to faculty members who are considered worthy of promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor; existing faculty members will be granted tenure based on guidelines set by the CoB with approval from the appropriate university governing bodies and their respective policies, guidelines, and processes.
- Faculty members desire that norms provide guidelines about what constitutes performance standards, yet not be constrained by a behavioral checklist of required activities or tightly-drawn job descriptions.

Tenure Track Faculty

Supporting Principles for Tenure and Promotion Norms

Several key principles support the norms of the CoB. The principles listed below shall be interpreted as core understandings critical to the growth of the CoB.

1. We place teaching and learning above all other activities, and the primary responsibility of all faculty is to facilitate, enable, and support student
2. Intellectual contributions are an important factor in the CoB's ability to obtain and maintain AACSB accreditation, improve faculty development, inform teaching, and attract, recruit, hire, and retain qualified faculty.
3. We are in the business of providing intellectual growth for students. As a consequence, intellectual growth is important for faculty members.
4. Outside evaluations of scholarship and related intellectual contributions or qualifying developmental activities will be sought. In seeking outside evaluations, a rule of reason should be applied so that the assessments solicited are fair and realistic.
5. Faculty members should submit evidence of the quality of their teaching as well as their scholarship, and with respect to both, provide evidence of career maturation when being evaluated for tenure and promotion.

6. Promotion and tenure necessitate that faculty members produce at a standard that on average surpasses the “meets expectations” threshold across the areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service.
7. Tenure and promotion are rewards for effectiveness and growth in teaching and scholarship. However, administrative contributions will often be considered part of service.
8. The CoB embraces the notion of citizen faculty members, as colleagues, advisors, employees, and community residents. As such, service is an expected component of their position, and will be considered when being evaluated for tenure and promotion.

Teaching Track Faculty

The duties of a Teaching track faculty will be teaching and scholarly work, advising, and service. Faculty in this track can serve on graduate thesis/dissertation committees if they hold the appropriate terminal degree and have expertise in the area of focus.

1. Faculty members in this track would be expected to be experts in their field in addition to being very knowledgeable in advancing pedagogy and in delivering engaging, high-quality courses, and will actively engage in pedagogical development and scholarship.
2. Faculty members in this track would be expected to have higher teaching loads than in the Tenure track, with loads determined by the faculty member’s academic Department /college/ administrative unit and formally included in the Faculty Handbook. This will be a contract-based position.
3. The length and type of contracts in the track will be as follows: 1-year contracts for Instructors, 3-year traditional contracts for Assistant Professors, 4-year traditional contracts for Associate Professors, and 5-year contracts for Full Professors.
4. Titles for faculty in this track would be:
 - Instructor
 - Assistant Teaching Professor

- Associate Teaching Professor
- Teaching Professor

The CoB Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

Governance of the tenure and promotion process is managed in the CoB by the CoB P&T Committee, formed from the regular, full-time corps of faculty (excluding faculty as designated by the University P&T guidelines; e.g., applicants for P&T) and is constituted in the following manner.

- The CoB P&T Committee shall consist of five full-time faculty members with the rank of associate professor or above, and at least three members must be tenured. The college faculty will elect three committee members and the Dean shall appoint the remaining two faculty members. The Dean shall provide a list of eligible College faculty members of the appropriate academic rank
- The Committee shall elect its own chair from its membership and shall establish its own procedures for review of faculty applications, within the constraints of the Florida Tech Faculty Handbook and University P&T guidelines.
- Terms of the committee members are to be aligned with the University P&T procedures and PTR membership, and are set at three years. Members may be renewed through a simple majority vote and/or with approval from the Dean. Members will be appointed on a rotating scheduling so that reappointment of only 1/3 of the members occurs each year.

CoB Performance, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures and Methods

The following procedures and guidelines serve to anchor and steward performance appraisals as well as recommendations for promotion and tenure in the CoB.

1. Faculty members in the CoB will be evaluated on teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
2. Annual Faculty Evaluations are performed by the Dean. Formative feedback is given on effective teaching, quality and impact of scholarship, and engaged service that furthers the mission of the COB.

3. Documentation for evaluation primarily exists in digital repositories of faculty activity. All faculty members are expected to regularly update their For annual evaluations, the appointed college official on or about February 1 will extract a report for the previous academic year. Materials not submitted by this date will not be considered in that year's Annual Faculty Evaluation. For promotion and tenure, a portfolio developed in accordance with the University guidelines for dossiers will be made available to the P&T Committee no later than September 1 or as otherwise stipulated in the University P&T schedule set forth in the procedures and guidelines documents, with University guidelines and schedule superseding CoB timelines.
4. At a minimum, faculty members are expected to maintain AACSB qualifications. The AACSB guidelines for accreditation includes definitions of qualifications as well as quality and impact measures for scholarship.

Domains of Evaluation

I. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Appendix 1)

1. Teaching Evaluation Overview

Effective teaching is a key cornerstone of the work product for CoB faculty, and in keeping with the Mission, Vision, and Values of the CoB, teaching shall be evaluated with a broad consideration of various measures and metrics. Holistically, the aim is to incent, reward, recognize, and promote faculty who take strides to continuously improve their curricula, while being responsive to rapidly changing global workforce demands. It is understood that no single measure of teaching effectiveness can accurately represent a faculty member's output effort and impact on students. While traditional measures will be collected and evaluated, in order to account for special circumstances and efforts given during the integration of new and/or innovative approaches to teaching and learning, metrics will be considered in light of these sometimes risky endeavors that are necessary when attempting new and innovative methods.

On average, the CoB faculty have high teaching evaluation scores; however, in order to

combat rating inflation, and with the understanding that sometimes ‘easy’ classes can receive higher scores than ‘harder’ classes, other evaluative considerations may include, but not be limited to, a review of:

- a. the overall course GPA;
- b. subject difficulty;
- c. level of course;
- d. course and/or audience specialization or inter-disciplinary nature, including measures of diversity, as well as whether the course was graduate, undergraduate, onsite, offsite, online, executive education, and/or targeted at traditional or non-traditional students;
- e. rating, ranking, or scoring against previous semester scores of similar or same course by same and/or other faculty of different sections;
- f. the degree to which ‘new’ methods were included, and what aspects of the course, its delivery, testing, evaluation, etc., were impacted;
- g. student enrollment numbers;
- h. number of student complaints and/or praises (i.e., subject student comments reported on student evaluations);
- i. average faculty teaching scores over time, and with regard to mean CoB scores and standard deviations;
- j. whether the course was singularly or co-taught;
- k. other measures as deemed necessary or appropriate considering the circumstances.

2. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following three areas:

- a. **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** – Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and work to recognize what prior information,

including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Most important, they know how to combine these three kinds of knowledge to create teaching acts that lead to student learning. Shulman has called this combination “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from content knowledge alone or pedagogy alone. Using their pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.

b. Professional Administration of the Class – While effective teaching relies upon disciplinary expertise — and different disciplines often approach teaching differently — teaching is also a profession that requires administrative and professional functions regardless of area. Such functions include, for example, providing appropriate and timely feedback to students, providing clear instructions, providing regular information regarding progress, responding appropriately and in a timely manner to students, making materials available, and making effective use of time allocated for the course. Highly effective teaching is more than class management; it is class management that relies upon an instructor’s ability to perform the duties associated with the job.

c. Student Response to Instruction – Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for the course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to the students. The extent to which the student feels respected and shares a sense of rapport with the instructor correlates with teaching effectiveness.

3. Methods of Evaluation and Sources of Evidence

a. Peer Review of Teaching Materials – In all evaluation processes reviewers should be presented with a representative set of teaching materials such as

syllabi, tests, assignments and projects, and/or class activities. For promotion and tenure, at least two members of the CoB P&T Committee must review teaching materials, exclusive of the CoB Administration. The committee will select the two reviewers and may select non- committee members as a proxy or for the purposes of including subject matter experts or other highly ranked teaching faculty in order to gain sufficient data to formulate an opinion on teaching excellence.

- b. Self-Evaluation of Teaching** – Each faculty member may provide a narrative self- evaluation of teaching addressing the three dimensions of effective
- c. Direct Observation of Teaching** – In order to comply with AACSB quality standards, it is the responsibility of the Dean’s office that all faculty members be regularly and randomly evaluated by direct observations of classroom teaching. Classroom observation, however, will never be used as the sole measure of teaching effectiveness.
- d. Student Assessment of Instruction** – Use of the University-wide student assessment instrument is required of all sections of all courses taught by faculty.

4. Criteria for Annual Evaluation

- a. Exceeds Expectations** – The faculty member:
 - 1. is clearly regarded as a high-quality teacher;
 - 2. regularly updates course materials to ensure they are thorough, clear, and useful to students;
 - 3. demonstrates some evidence of innovation in the classroom;
 - 4. is frequently available to students outside of posted office hours in person or via email;

5. regularly mentors students, including supervision on dissertations or other research

b. Meets Expectations – The faculty member:

1. is regarded as an effective teacher;
2. maintains acceptable teaching materials;
3. meets posted office hours and appointments;
4. sometimes mentor's students, including supervision on dissertations or other research

c. Needs Improvement – This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment slightly below the expected level. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

d. Does Not Meet Expectations – The faculty member:

1. is regarded as a poor teacher;
2. fails to update course syllabi and/or uses outdated material;
3. maintains teaching materials of poor quality;
4. fails to honor office hours;
5. is the subject of frequent student complaints (only complaints verified and found valid through the college's complaint handling process are to be considered when determining faculty quality);
6. rarely, if at all, mentor's students or supervise dissertations or other research

5. Standards for Review Events

a. Promotion to Associate Professor – Must meet expectations or must exceed expectations in 3 of the 5 most recent years. Evidence must demonstrate that any PDP has been successfully completed. The standard applies to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

b. Promotion to Full Professor – Must meet expectations and must exceed expectations in 50% of the intervening years since promotion to tenure or to associate professor. The standard applies to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

6. Post-Tenure (Teaching)

The CoB supports continuing faculty development, the promotion of faculty vitality, and the encouragement of excellence among tenured faculty. This is achieved by recognizing and rewarding faculty performance, offering suggestions to enhance performance, and providing a clear and transparent annual evaluation of faculty members. Demonstration of professional competence, conscientious execution of duties – taking into account distribution of workload as developed by the Dean – and efforts to improve performance with regards to departmental criteria should be considered the basic standard for meeting expectations.

II. Scholarship Activity (Faculty Handbook Appendix 1)

The CoB recognizes three types of acceptable forms of scholarly activity:

- a. Scholarship of discovery** — Scholarship of this type “generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods.” The intent is to impact the theory or knowledge of business.
- b. Scholarship of integration/application** — Scholarship of this type “synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new

technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge.” The intent is to impact the practice of business.

- c. Scholarship of teaching and learning — Scholarship of this type “develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior.” The intent is to impact the teaching and/or pedagogy of business

The CoB adopts AACSB terminology for categorizing faculty in terms of expectations for intellectual contributions and/or intellectual developments and their role(s) in achieving the CoB’s mission. Within the CoB, a faculty member maintains Scholarly Academic (SA) qualifications by regular production of Peer Reviewed Journal Publications (PRJs) and Scholarly Works (SWs), which are collectively referred to as Intellectual Contributions (IC). The CoB defines PRJs as a faculty- authored material in a subject area reasonably considered related to the subject taught by the faculty member and which has appeared in a peer-reviewed, publicly available academic outlet. The CoB defines SWs as scholarly, high-quality, intellectual contributions that do not qualify as PRJs. SWs not fitting the definition of a PRJ may also be considered evidence of intellectual contributions, including but not limited to activities and output such as:

1. submitting and/or receiving a substantial grant from a recognized funding agency;
2. publishing in an academic outlet that can be considered a quality outlet as (previously described);
3. publishing scholarly books or chapters in scholarly books or publishing a textbook;
4. proceedings and/or presentations at an academic or professional conference;
5. serving as a journal editor, senior editor, or associate editor, or special edition editor;
6. authoring significant reports (e.g., from sponsored research, FIT Consulting, or similar sources) that are widely disseminated, that may be considered proprietary but yet have a significant impact;
7. development and delivery of a significant professional product (e.g., software

- development, consulting implementation) derived through external funding;
8. development and presentation of substantive continuing professional education activities or executive education programs;
 9. substantive leadership roles in academic or professional associations;
 10. publishing (and sustaining the publication of) a newsletter or sequence of reports that is subscribed to by the business community; and others.

A faculty member qualifies as SA if one (or more) of the following conditions holds.

- The faculty member has produced three or more PRJs in the last five years; or
- The faculty member has produced two PRJs and at least three SWs in the last five years; or
- The faculty member has published one PRJ and at least six SWs in the last five years; or
- The faculty earned a doctorate within the last five years from an institution that could be considered by AACSB to be qualified for SA.

The following directives guide faculty scholarship review:

1. Window for Evaluation — Five academic year rolling window. Candidates for Full Professor will be evaluated on their full body of work.
2. Quality of Scholarship – an activity that qualifies as an “intellectual contribution,” regardless of the type, must meet the following general criteria: (1) external peer review; (2) methodological rigor; (3) substantive outcomes or implications beyond the scope of the activity itself; and (4) disseminated to a professional audience or scholarly community. These four criteria help to differentiate: 1) the scholarship of teaching and learning from teaching; and, 2) the scholarship of application from service engagement. Peer review can include traditional forms (e.g., journals, conference presentations, edited work, grants), but it can also include a broader community of external scholars through non-traditional peer A candidate may present "interesting things" that do not fit well with the standard definition of scholarship, yet are still believed by the candidate as

legitimate with an appropriate description of how the item is relevant. Given the current publishing milieu and changing expectations, the classification of an intellectual contribution as either PRJ or SW is a “judgment call.” For that reason, faculty should identify those activities which they believe qualify as intellectual contributions “of record” during their annual review process and obtain written acknowledgment from the Dean whether the efforts count as either PRJ’s or SW’s. This allows both administration and faculty to identify early on whether intellectual contributions will have the gravitas to maintain faculty qualifications and can be counted when applying for promotion and tenure. Should a faculty member propose a work as PRJ or SW which does not receive the Dean’s approval as such, the faculty member has recourse to present their case to the CoB P&T Committee which will render an independent opinion on the categorical nature of the work.

3. Faculty Responsibility – It is required of the faculty member to seek outlets for their intellectual contributions (IC) that are considered quality outlets. For purposes of evaluating quality, while the CoB makes no distinction between strategies of inquiry and research methodology (i.e., whether the IC is quantitative, empirical, qualitative, case study-based, or other valid methods of inquiry), ICs are considered to be ‘quality’ as evidenced by the data and narrative provided by the faculty member. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide said evidence, which may include, but is not limited to:

- measures of quantity and quality related to which, how many, and the rating/ranking of the indices in which the outlet is scored, included or ranked (i.e., regional, national, or international indices and their respective rankings, such as the Journal of Citation Reports, Scopus, etc., and associated scores);
- overall or volume acceptance/rejection rates;
- target audience or intended markets (i.e., regional, national, international);
- whether it is/was a full journal article, conference presentation, publication, or preceding;

- longevity of outlet and number of subscriptions, adoptions, or access points;
- the type of journal (i.e., traditional scholarly journal, open access, trade journal, popular press, etc.);
- whether the journal or manuscript in question is/was peer reviewed, blind peer reviewed or double blind reviewed, invited, editorially reviewed, or board reviewed, an open or closed callout, special edition/issue;
- the number of citation counts or key/critical citations in leading national/international bodies of work (e.g., handbooks, national/international standards, etc.), including h- index scores or similar;
- or other measures of rating or rankings as deemed appropriate and representable by the faculty member and Dean.

4. Criteria for Annual Evaluation

a. Exceeds Expectations — The faculty member has produced intellectual contributions that surpass the requirements for SA qualification in either or both quantity and quality.

b. Meets Expectations — The faculty member has produced, on average, over a rolling five-year period, five quality intellectual contributions. Scholarship is not uniform from year-to year; consequently, the evaluative process should consider one's scholarship agenda and the progress made toward achieving the goals of that agenda. Some combination of the following intellectual scholarly works may be judged by the Dean to be the equivalent of a PRJ: paper presentations, book and/or textbook authorship, sponsored research, publication in a trade journal, textbook cases, consulting, and so forth. A first-year faculty member is, at a minimum, expected to have submitted for peer review at least one intellectual contribution. A second-year faculty member is expected to have received an acceptance of one peer-reviewed intellectual contribution and made one additional submission for peer review. Third through fifth-year faculty members are expected to have produced an average of one intellectual contribution

annually across the rolling period.

c. Needs Improvement — This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment slightly below the expected level. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

d. Does Not Meet Expectations — The faculty member fails to meet the requirements for SA qualification in the area of scholarly activity. At all times, traditional, full-time faculty must maintain their SA status.

5. Standards for Review Events

a. Promotion to Associate Professor – For tenure track faculty, the candidate must produce a minimum of 5 quality intellectual contributions of which a minimum of 4 must be high-quality PRJs in respectable outlets as outlined in the previous section detailing the measurement of quality**. For non-tenure track faculty, they must produce a minimum of 3 quality intellectual contributions of which a minimum of 2 must be high-quality PRJs in respectable outlets as outlined in the previous section detailing the measurement of quality**.

b. Promotion to Full Professor – The candidate must clearly meet or exceed expectations.
For tenure track faculty, the candidate must produce a minimum of 10 PRJs; must be high-quality PRJs in respectable outlets as outlined in the previous section detailing the measurement of quality. Documentation of quality of scholarship (e.g., journal reputation, citation metrics, h-index, research and/or funded research/consulting dollars) is required. Evidence of international reputation and exposure is also considered.** For non-tenure track faculty, the candidate must produce a minimum of 5 PRJs;

** meeting ‘minimum’ standards as outlined above does not connote or imply candidate is guaranteed to receive a positive recommendation for promotion and/or tenure.

Evidence of quality and all other efforts, work, and service produced by the applicant will be considered as a whole.

6. Post-Tenure (Research)

Post-tenure can best be envisioned along two time periods within an academic career. For recently tenured Associate Professors, who endeavor to be promoted to Full Professor, progress towards achieving the criteria for promotion is evidence of meeting the expectations for tenured faculty and a satisfactory annual faculty evaluation. For tenured Full Professors and tenured career Associate Professors, a re-weighting of faculty tasks among the triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service may be considered for maximum benefit to the CoB. The Dean, based on the needs of the CoB and the relative strengths of the faculty member, shall propose or revise a set of directional goals provided by the faculty member, which will be considered in the annual faculty evaluation. These directional goals shall be jointly agreed to and approved by the Dean and the faculty member, and they can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the Dean, as deemed appropriate due to changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. Directional goals should include milestones that will be incorporated into annual performance evaluations, and satisfaction of these directional goals shall provide the basis for the annual faculty evaluation.

III. Service (Faculty Handbook Appendix 1)

As professionals, faculty members are expected to provide service to their College, University, community, and their profession. Service is an important dimension of professional life, but it receives less weight for tenure and promotion than creating an effective learning environment

and scholarship. Service contributions cannot be the primary basis for promotion and/or tenure.

Typically, faculty members who seek tenure and or promotion to Associate Professor are not judged heavily on their service contributions. However, faculty who seek promotion to

Professors are expected to provide leadership in the area of service. In addition, faculty members who have been assigned heavy administrative responsibilities or who undertake heavy administrative responsibilities with the approval of the Dean as part of their Plan of Work should be expected to demonstrate effectiveness along this dimension. Faculty members are expected to serve as effective advisors to assigned students.

The following directives guide service review:

- 1. Institutional Service** - The faculty member contributes to the University mission by such activities as service to the college, school, university, or university
- 2. Community Engagement** - This includes, but is not limited to, providing disciplinary expertise to a professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at a local, regional, or national level. It also includes continuing education and other non-credit instruction, lectures, presentations, workshops, grant writing, and other such activities as well as student service-learning involvement activities.
- 3. Special Expertise, Unusual Time, etc.** - This includes service to entities such as academic, non-profit or professional societies, organizations, journals, or work on accreditation documents, service within or to academic units at the University in support of their programs such as administrative duties or other leadership roles, and other similar activities.
- 4. Advising & Other Service to Students** - School service includes advising roles and activities. Effective advising involves being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, and assistance with student academic and career planning.

Specific examples of service activities include but are not limited to the following items.

- a.** Served on university and college governance committees
- b.** Served on university academic and examining committees
- c.** Performed administrative functions within the college

- d. Served as director of college Centers of Excellence
- e. Contributed as a non-remunerated consultant in an area of technical expertise to private or public sector organizations
- f. Provided scholarly lectures or invited talks in non-conference or industry settings
- g. Provided service activities to the community
- h. Represented the college or university in regional, national or international organizations related to university affairs
- i. Contributed to university- or college-related outreach projects
- j. Professional society service
- k. Journal chief editor or area editor
- l. Reviewer on papers for refereed journals
- m. Reviewer for refereed proceedings and conferences
- n. Session chair, discussant or panelist at state/national/international conferences
- o. Member of accreditation visiting teams
- p. External member on graduate or doctoral committees at another university
- q. Officer or active member, or received recognition by a professional or scientific society at the local, regional, national or international level
- r. Organized or taught short courses or seminars in the field of study to the business or industry-specific community

IV. Criteria for Annual Evaluation

- a. **Exceeds Expectations** — Shows high-level of participation at the College, or University level, such as being a member of a major committee or ad hoc committee, chair of a committee, or serving on several committees; ongoing involvement in

community engagement such as College, or University representative to a community organization; assumes ‘more than the normal’ school-level duties such as fulfilling the responsibilities of a faculty member who is ill or performing significant leadership roles such as President of the Faculty Senate or the Chair

of a Faculty Senate committee; initiates and follows through with new school initiatives; meets all College and University responsibilities; is often available for additional student development outside of class, and in addition to those activities required or expected for the fulfillment of assigned ‘teaching duties’ as outlined above.

b. Meets Expectations — Assumes a fair share of school responsibilities; completes work in a timely manner; occasionally is involved in community engagement and/or consulting; occasionally serves on University committees; meets School, College, and University responsibilities.

c. Needs Improvement - This category is awarded to faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment slightly below the expected level. Faculty receiving ratings in this category must be issued work plans for improvement throughout the next academic year.

d. Does Not Meet Expectations — Shows a low level of participation or rarely serves on a School, College, or University committee; little evidence of community or professional engagement.

V. Standards for Review Events

a. Promotion to Associate Professor — Must meet expectations and must exceed expectations in 2 of the 5 years. Evidence must demonstrate that any development plan has been successfully completed.

b. Promotion to Full Professor — Must exceed expectations

VI. Post-Tenure (Service) All tenured and non-tenured teaching faculty members must meet expectations in each year of the applicable period.

FH Appendix 6 Promotion Guidelines: Evans Library

EVANS LIBRARY

FACULTY PROMOTION GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines provide a basis to discern criteria and specific benchmarks for evaluating and rewarding the meritorious performance of faculty librarians at Florida Institute of Technology's Evans Library. At this time, all librarian faculty positions are non-tenure track positions. Promotion is an acknowledgment of professional achievement within the broad field of academic librarianship. Librarians will be evaluated in three categories with an emphasis on librarianship, scholarship, and service. However, it is to be noted, that each faculty librarian has specific and singular tasks unique to the librarian's area of expertise.

II. PROMOTION PROCEDURES

FH 2.7 of Florida Tech's Faculty Handbook, *Guidelines for Faculty Promotion*, states that Colleges develop their own promotion guidelines to supplement the general academic rank requirements outlined in FH 2.1 "Academic Rank". FH 2.1 states that the qualification for any librarian is, "at least a master's degree in library science with primary duties that do not include teaching."

Evans Library Faculty Evaluation Procedures (FH Appendix 7) were approved and made effective February 27, 2015. A library faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion requests review from the Library Faculty Review Committee (LFRC). The LFRC, in turn, will review and evaluate the faculty member's qualifications and performance and make a recommendation to the Dean of Libraries.

III. PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY

Upon initial appointment, librarians are given faculty status, with all associated rights and responsibilities, and are assigned the rank of Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian or Librarian based on their level of experience and expertise.

Assistant Librarian

Assistant Librarian is the beginning rank for faculty librarians with a graduate degree in library or information science, a terminal degree, or in a special field relevant to the position. Potential is determined through a selective hiring process including a review of the curriculum vitae, references, and an on-campus interview and research presentation.

Associate Librarian

An Assistant Librarian can be considered for promotion to Associate Librarian after a minimum of five years in the rank of Assistant Librarian or equivalent rank at another institution. There is no maximum time limit. Promotion will depend on successful achievement in librarianship, scholarship, and service. Three letters of recommendation are required from professional colleagues, professors or university or organizational leaders of equal or higher rank.

Librarian

An Associate Librarian can be considered for promotion to Librarian after a minimum of five years in the rank of Associate Librarian or equivalent rank at another institution. There is no maximum time limit.

Promotion will depend on successful achievement in the same categories as promotion to Associate Librarian; however, the achievements must reflect continued professional growth and the expansion and notoriety of academic development. Five letters of recommendation are required from professional colleagues, professors or university or organizational leaders of equal or higher rank. At least two of the letters must be from external organizations.

IV. PROMOTION CRITERIA

Candidates will be evaluated for promotion in three areas:

- Librarianship Scholarship
- Service

Performance in each area constitutes an overall measure of the faculty member's academic and professional contributions. However, as each candidate has distinctly different roles and

responsibilities, the nature of the contributions in these three areas may vary by individual.

High-quality achievement in academic contributions and professional pursuits must be demonstrable through peer-to-peer, faculty and student evaluations, assessments or outcomes. The candidate is responsible for providing ample documentation, of any format or media, to clearly and effectively support the case for promotion.

As scholarship, the candidate must demonstrate recognized expertise in a defined area of librarianship on a local, state, regional or national level including engagement in professional activities, committees and groups. Continual professional development and scholarship must be apparent through varying degrees of clear contribution to professional growth including awards, recognition or publications.

Service comprises a record of contribution to the library, a faculty member's liaison department, the university, the community or the academic community at large. Faculty members with administrative responsibilities will outline how impactful leadership and service contribute to the success of the university.

The criteria for promotion are described below. These criteria set minimum thresholds for promotion eligibility. The LFRC will use these criteria in making a recommendation to the Dean of Libraries. Faculty who meet these criteria may be considered for promotion, but candidates are encouraged to exceed the minimum standards to make a stronger case for promotion. The criteria listed are not all-inclusive and all relevant contributions should be included in the dossier for consideration. The applicant's thoroughness in preparing and organizing their dossier, as well as in presenting a case for promotion based on the dossier's contents, can be a significant factor in the ultimate success or failure of the application.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN

A. LIBRARIANSHIP

As implied by its name, the day-to-day duties comprising academic librarianship are focused primarily on furthering the academic mission of the university. This broadly includes:

- Supporting the research efforts of faculty members.
- Assisting students in accessing and using library resources relevant to the successful completion of their education.

- Identifying, procuring and developing new library resources to meet the emerging needs of the university community.
- Disseminating information about library resources through either instructional sessions or online media.
- Training members of the university community in skill sets that can further them in their research- related and scholarly endeavors.
- Identifying and implementing new service areas through which the library can expand its support of the university's academic mission.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Librarian will be contingent upon demonstrating a strong and continuous performance across most or all of the areas listed above. Depending upon the particular duties and background of the librarian in question, the manner in which this performance is manifested may be expected to vary.

A successful candidate will meet at least 3 of these objectives:

- Develop a significant procedure or process that improves the efficiency of the library.
- Develop and teach 4 instruction sessions that demonstrably help students or attendees.
- Provide evidence of 4 consequential interactions with students, faculty or staff.
- Develop and institute a significant collection or resource that meets a Florida Tech need.
- Identify and implement needed student- or faculty-specific services.

B. SCHOLARSHIP

Library faculty are actively involved in the intellectual and scholarly growth of their profession and area of expertise. A library faculty member's scholarship will be reviewed in terms of quality, recognition among peers, and significance to the library profession or to the academic community. This broadly includes:

- Creating works that further intellectual and scholarly growth within the field of librarianship or specialty area.

- Improving pedagogy to further the mission of the library and the university.
- Increasing access, understanding and delivery of academic library services and information.
- Pursuing continued education to support the acquisition of new skills germane to the candidate's role and position.
- Strengthening professional librarianship through mentoring, team building and strategic or collaborative retreats.

A successful candidate will meet at least 3 of these objectives:

- Demonstrate subject expertise by participation in at least 2 conference presentations, panel discussions or other leading roles at local, state or national conferences.
- Publication of at least 2 peer-reviewed articles, book chapters or other scholarly output with equal professional impact.
- Expand professional librarianship through participation in at least 3 projects, consortiums, collaborative efforts, professional award committees or nominations.
- Continued pursuit of academic knowledge, either personally or through mentoring colleagues, peers or early-career librarians through growth, development, and training opportunities.
- Illustrate contributions to academic discourse through 3 invitations to present talks, lectures, or seminars outside the Library.

C. SERVICE

Service to Evans Library and Florida Tech is defined as the individual's contribution to the library, the university, and the community. Individuals are expected to participate in the governance and development of the library through service on library and university committees as well as have a seat at community tables as representatives of the Library and Florida Tech.

Exceptional service entails actively working to enhance the Library's role and level of integration within the university as a whole, the surrounding community, and the librarianship profession. Broadly

speaking, this includes:

- Collaborating with other university departments in pursuance of university-wide goals.
- Originating initiatives to further the library's services and reach to the university and community.
- Providing outreach to the surrounding community in a manner that promotes the library and the overall university.
- Actively participating in professional organizations to promulgate superior library services both at Florida Tech and beyond.
- Assuming supervisory responsibilities within the library.

Service should reflect continued or consistent growth and development, progressing each year under review. For example, short-term committee membership or membership on committees that have little responsibility should be offset with added responsibilities or roles in other committees or evidence of new initiatives on the existing committees.

A successful candidate will meet at least 3 of these objectives:

- Depict 3 definable outcomes as a result of committee work on local, state or national professional organizations. The candidate should be prepared to clearly demonstrate the impact of their individual work.
- Coordinate with students through library and university committees to develop 2 meaningful improvements to student success and retention.
- Participate in 3 civic, community or service-based opportunities to increase academic outreach and grow local community.
- Forge long-term partnerships (2 or more years) with local community or academic organizations to contribute to the growth of scholarly and civic conversations.
- Implement leadership initiatives that directly affect student success at the library or university level.

PROMOTION TO LIBRARIAN

Promotion from Associate Librarian to Librarian will be contingent upon mastery of professional skills, techniques, and performance. Demonstrated knowledge in cross-organizational vision must be apparent through professional judgment, a broad perspective of the library and the university, and excellent analytical skills.

The promotion criteria to achieve the rank of Librarian is consistent with the criteria to achieve the rank of Associate Librarian; however, the individual criterion must demonstrate a higher level of achievement and superior contributions to the library, the library profession, the university and the university community at large.

The candidate will undergo external peer review with a minimum requirement of five letters of recommendation. The evaluators must differ from those used when applying for promotion to Associate Librarian, but may be the same as used in prior applications for Librarian status. Each letter should be from an evaluator outside the unit and address the substance of the candidate's accomplishments.

Types of criteria for promotion within the three areas of performance will be similar to those applied for promotion to Associate Librarian. Achievements must be subsequent to achieving Associate Librarian rank. Moreover, the thresholds for expected performance will be greater, as detailed below.

A. LIBRARIANSHIP

A successful candidate will meet at least 4 of these objectives:

- Develop a significant procedure or process that improves the efficiency of the library.
- Develop and teach 5 instruction sessions that demonstrably help students or attendees.
- Provide evidence of 5 consequential interactions with students, faculty or staff.
- Identify and develop multiple significant collections or resources that meet Florida Tech's needs.
- Identify and implement needed student- or faculty-specific services.

B. SCHOLARSHIP

A successful candidate will meet at least 4 of these objectives:

- Demonstrate subject expertise by participation in at least 3 conference presentations, panel discussions or other leading roles at national or international conferences.
- Publication of at least 3 peer-reviewed articles, book chapters or other scholarly output with equal professional impact.
- Expand professional librarianship through participation and dissemination of at least 4 projects, consortiums, collaborative research efforts or professional award nominating committees.
- Continued pursuit of academic knowledge, either personally or through mentoring colleagues, peers or early-career librarians through growth, development, and training opportunities.
- Illustrate contributions to academic discourse through grant proposals or implementations of grant- funded projects.

C. SERVICE

A successful candidate will meet at least 4 of these objectives:

- Depict 3 definable outcomes as a result of leadership within state or national professional organizations. The candidate should be prepared to clearly demonstrate the impact of their personal work.
- Coordinate with university administration to develop 3 meaningful improvements to student success and retention.
- Organize 3 civic, community or service-based opportunities to increase academic outreach within the community.
- Implement an alliance with a local community organization to mutually further educational or civic goals.
- Implement leadership initiatives that directly affect student success at the library or university level.