

**Proposed Revision of  
Section Five of the Faculty Handbook**

**Review and Evaluation of  
Faculty Performance**

**Kennesaw State University**

**Taskforce on Review & Evaluation of  
Faculty Performance at KSU  
August, 2005**

**Approved:  
Kennesaw State University Senate  
5 December 2005**

**Final revision: Approved in Senate April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SECTION FIVE: REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

I.	Introduction	Page	4
II.	Overview of Faculty Responsibilities	Page	5
III.	Basic Categories of Faculty Performance	Page	6
	A. Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students	Page	6
	B. Research and Creative Activity	Page	7
	C. Professional Service	Page	8
	D. Administration and Leadership	Page	9
IV.	Evaluation of the Quality and Significance of Faculty Scholarly Accomplishments	Page	9
	A. Definitions of Scholarly Activity and Scholarship	Page	9
	1. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students	Page	10
	2. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Research and Creative Activity	Page	10
	3. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Professional Service	Page	10
	4. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Administration and Leadership	Page	11
	B. Quality and Significance	Page	11
	1. Clarity and Relevance of Goals	Page	11

2. Mastery of Existing Knowledge	Page	11
3. Effectiveness of Communication	Page	11
4. Significance of Results	Page	12
5. Consistently Ethical Behavior	Page	12
V. General Expectations for Tenure and Promotion	Page	12
A. Tenure	Page	12
B. Promotion for the Professional Ranks	Page	15
VI. General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks		
	Page	15
A. Tenure-Track Faculty	Page	15
1. Instructors	Page	15
2. Assistant Professors	Page	16
3. Associate Professors	Page	16
4. Professors	Page	16
B. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty	Page	17
1. General Expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers		
	Page	17
2. Administrative Faculty	Page	17
VII. Tenure and Promotion Process	Page	17
A. Format of Annual Review/FPA	Page	18
B. Multi-Year Reviews	Page	18
1. Committee Structure	Page	18
2. Tenure and Promotion Review	Page	19

3. Third-Year (Pre-Tenure) Review	Page 20
4. Post-Tenure Review	Page 20
5. Deans	Page 20
6. Tenure-Track Administrators above Level of Dean	Page 21
7. Queries about Process	Page 21
8. Portfolio Guidelines and Contents	Page 21
VIII. References	Page 23

## I. Introduction

The mission statement which appears in the first section of the Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook fully captures the character and priorities of KSU as a major public university within the University System of Georgia. Attracting a diverse student body with a wide range of educational goals, KSU has strong connections to the communities it serves and is highly valued as a resource for educational, economic, social, and cultural advancement.

In order to advance the institution, faculty performance at KSU must be aligned with the University's mission. While all faculty members in the academic colleges and departments work collectively to advance this mission, the roles and responsibilities of individual faculty can vary widely across the University. Each college and its respective departments may focus on particular aspects of the mission in ways which distinguish their contributions from other colleges and departments. However, the missions of all academic units must be aligned and consistent with the overall University mission.

This faculty performance model requires effective and collaborative strategic planning at all levels. When a college focuses on particular aspects of the University mission, departments within that college must align the work of their faculty to advance the college mission. The relative emphasis of faculty professional activity in the areas of performance and evaluation at KSU must match the particular focus of their academic unit and be consistent with the mission of the University. This model encourages flexible faculty roles across the University, recognizes the rich diversity of faculty talent, and advances the University's mission by maximizing the strengths and talents of individual academic units and their faculty (Brand, 2000).

These University guidelines set forth policies, criteria, and procedures by which individual faculty members' contributions to the University shall be documented and equitably evaluated. They define terms and levels of review and set the basic structure for all performance review. This section of the KSU Faculty Handbook does not cover the entire breadth of evaluative measures available to colleges and departments. However, in this Section, the words "shall," "must," and "will" (and equivalent terms) signify a binding, mandatory requirement that must be followed by colleges and departments, as to substance and procedure, as appropriate. Conversely, the words "may," "can," "might, or "should" (and equivalents) signify a permissive suggestion not binding on colleges or departments. Colleges and departments will establish tailored written guidelines, not inconsistent with the Faculty Handbook, that specify evaluative criteria appropriate to their disciplines, describe the focus of their units within the larger mission and the core values of the KSU, and delineate which activities will receive emphasis in annual performance reviews, in tenure and promotion decisions, and in post-tenure performance evaluation of faculty in their units. Each department and college will develop a process for establishing guidelines. Both the process and the resulting guidelines must also be approved by the College Review Committee, the Dean, and the VPAA.

## **II. Overview of Faculty Responsibilities**

As described below, the four basic performance areas in which faculty may be evaluated at KSU are teaching, supervising, and mentoring of students; research and creative activity; professional service; and administration and leadership. For the purpose of clarification, administrative faculty are those for whom 50% or more of their workload is administrative in function. Teaching faculty are all others with faculty rank and status. Depending upon college and departmental guidelines, faculty members need not show achievement in all four areas; in fact, it is expected that most faculty members will not. However, outside of administrative and non-tenure track faculty, most teaching faculty will be evaluated based upon contributions in teaching, research, and professional service. All faculty members are encouraged to develop strong connections between performance areas and engage in activities that impact more than one area simultaneously. For example, a service learning project may reflect both teaching and professional service. Some research projects may involve both research and professional service and pedagogical research may involve both research and teaching. Whatever the individual's relative emphasis in the performance areas, all faculty members are expected to participate in service activities essential to the life of the institution.

The differing proportions of emphasis given to each performance area for a given faculty member will depend upon written agreements between the faculty member, department chair, and dean, in alignment with the college and departmental guidelines. The role(s) upon which each faculty member will be evaluated will be outlined in his or her Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). This agreement will be developed in consultation with the faculty member's supervisor(s), who will have the responsibility to negotiate, assign, and coordinate the distribution of the various activities of individual faculty to assure that

the collective work of the department, college, and University is accomplished. The overriding factor in determining the activities of each faculty member must be the needs of that faculty member's college, department, and its academic programs. The FPA lists the faculty member's goals and priorities for a period agreed upon by the faculty member and his or her supervisor(s) to fit current and anticipated circumstances. The FPA should:

- clarify the general responsibilities and relative emphasis of the individual in teaching, supervising, and mentoring; research and creative activity; professional service; and administration and leadership;
- articulate the manner in which the faculty member's activities relate to the departmental and college mission and goals; and
- identify the expectations for scholarly activity and scholarship in the faculty member's areas of emphasis.

As a faculty member matures and develops, and as the focus of colleges and departments evolve, an FPA may change. New agreements may reflect changes in the assignments that engage the faculty member or in the individual's relative emphasis in one or more performance area. It may, in fact, be necessary to change an FPA during the course of a given year due to unexpected circumstances, such as changes in departmental staffing, new research opportunities, etc. If this occurs, the faculty member, in consultation with his or her supervisors, will draw up a new FPA that will be signed by all parties. Both this new and the old FPA will be used in the evaluation of the faculty member at the conclusion of the year and in subsequent tenure and promotion decisions.

### **III. Basic Categories of Faculty Performance**

The four basic categories of faculty performance at KSU are teaching, supervising, and mentoring; research and creative activity; professional service; and administration and leadership. The Faculty Performance Agreement delineates the relative emphasis of an individual faculty member's activities in these four areas. Although some faculty may choose to engage in professional activities in all performance areas, faculty members are not necessarily required to do so. The typical faculty member will focus his or her work in the specific areas that reflect their knowledge and expertise in advancing the University's mission. In all cases evaluation of faculty performance will be based on evidence of the quality and significance (see Section IV) of the individual faculty member's scholarly accomplishments in his or her respective areas of emphasis.

#### **III.A. Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students**

This category of faculty performance refers to a wide variety of instructional activities that engage faculty peers and others to facilitate student learning. By definition, scholarly teachers (see Section IV) demonstrate mastery of the current knowledge and methodology of their discipline(s). Teaching effectiveness at KSU shall be assessed and evaluated not only from the perspective of the teacher's pedagogical intentions but also from the perspective of student learning. Such assessment may employ multiple methods,

including a variety of classroom techniques (Angelo & Cross, 1993). Instruments to assess student perceptions of their own learning should not be the sole means but may be used in conjunction with other, more objective instruments.

Recognizing that excessive, burdensome assessment requirements can impede both teaching and learning, KSU expects collegial decision-making among faculty, departments, and upper-level administration, as well as continual monitoring of the demands of this assessment on faculty time and energy.

Faculty members are encouraged to disseminate their best teaching practices to appropriate audiences and to subject their work to critical review.

Depending on the faculty member's situational context, evaluation of teaching and curricular contributions shall not be limited to classroom activities but will also focus on the quality and significance of a faculty member's contributions to larger communities; for example, through activities such as curricular development, program assessment, student mentoring and supervision, public lectures and workshops, and academic advising.

In addition to documenting teaching effectiveness in terms of student learning, faculty may provide other measures of teaching effectiveness, such as teaching awards, evidence of handling diverse and challenging teaching assignments, securing grants for curriculum development or teaching techniques, and contributions to the achievement of departmental teaching-related goals.

### **III.B. Research and Creative Activity**

Research and creative activity at KSU is broadly defined in the institution's mission statement as a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge, understanding, application, problem solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy in the communities served by the University. These professional activities become recognized accomplishments when the work is formally shared with others and is subject to review. Documentation and evaluation of accomplishments in research and creative activity shall focus on the quality and significance of the work. Merely listing individual tasks and projects does not address quality and significance.

College and departmental guidelines must identify the specific criteria for determining quality and significance of research and creative activity appropriate to that college's and department's disciplines and scholarly contexts. Accomplishments shall be judged in the context of their use of current knowledge and their impact on peers and others.

In certain fields such as writing, literature, performing arts, fine arts, architecture, graphic design, cinema, and broadcast media or related fields, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in more traditional areas of research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to determine the quality and significance of the faculty member's accomplishments.

Criteria such as originality, scope, richness, depth of creative expression, and recognition by peers may be used to evaluate quality and significance. It should be recognized that in music and drama, performance, including conducting and directing, design, choreography, etc. are evidence of a candidate's creativity.

Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, cross-institutional, or international research programs are highly valued. Documenting collaborative research might involve addressing both individual contributions (e.g., quality of work, completion of assigned responsibilities) and contributions to the successful participation of others (e.g., skills in teamwork, group problem-solving). KSU recognizes publishing in pedagogical journals or making educationally focused presentations at disciplinary and interdisciplinary gatherings that advance the scholarship of teaching and curricular innovation or practice.

### **III.C. Professional Service**

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member's academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks which benefit the University, the community, or the profession. For example, faculty members might draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of scholarly service to the governance and professionally related service activities of the University. Service is a vital part of faculty governance and University functioning, and evidence of the quality and significance of institutional service can support tenure and promotion. Governance and professionally related service create an environment that supports scholarly excellence and the achievement of the University's mission.

Some scholarly service activities rely on a faculty members' academic or professional expertise to serve communities and organizations outside the University. For example, a faculty member might engage in professionally related service to a community agency. Likewise some scholarly service activities might rely on a faculty member's academic or professional expertise to serve their discipline or an interdisciplinary field.

In all types of professional service, documentation and evaluation of scholarly service shall focus on quality and significance rather than on a plain recitation of tasks and projects. Documentation of the products or outcomes of professional service should be provided by the faculty member and considered as evidence for the evaluation of his or her accomplishments. Documentation should be sufficient to outline a faculty member's agreed-upon responsibilities and to support an evaluation of effectiveness.

Faculty will be expected to explain and document the quality and significance of their service roles. The faculty member should provide measures of his or her role such as:

- an explanation of the scholarly work involved in the service role,
- copies of minutes, number of hours met,
- copies of products developed,
- measures of the impact or outcome of the service role,

- an explanation of the unique contribution of leadership roles or recognition by others of contributions.

### **III.D. Administration and Leadership**

The category of administration and leadership covers those scholarly and non-scholarly activities that some faculty and most administrators carry out. Such activities include faculty development, fundraising, fiscal management, personnel management, public relations, and other activities that are not traditionally captured in one of the other three performance areas. This area applies primarily to administrative faculty, but it is available to teaching faculty who spend a significant part of their time on administrative tasks (e.g., program directors or grant oversight). Faculty evaluated in this area must clearly articulate their goals and document the quality and significance of their activities and achievements in the same manner as in any of the other areas.

Faculty in administrative and leadership positions are often not directly engaged in teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service in the same way as other faculty. As such, these faculty members should demonstrate the quality and significance of their leadership and administration, especially how effectively they foster the requisite fiscal, physical, interpersonal, and intellectual environment for achievement -- in these areas. For example, leadership of teaching could include how the administrator assisted unit colleagues to achieve more scholarly and effective teaching. In research, an administrator might document leadership by showing how the administrator aided unit colleagues in their efforts to improve the quality and significance of their research. In service, leadership could be demonstrated by showing how the administrator encouraged and assisted unit colleagues to engage in more scholarly and effective service. In sum, administrative faculty act as leaders by assisting colleagues in their unit to achieve and surpass University, college, and departmental goals in teaching, research/creative activity, and professional service.

## **IV. Evaluation of the Quality and Significance of Faculty Scholarly Accomplishments**

While the professional activities of faculty vary, all faculty members are expected to demonstrate scholarly accomplishments in all of their areas of emphasis. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to produce scholarship in the performance area(s) in which they place the most emphasis. In other words, faculty members are not expected to produce scholarship in all of their performance areas, only those in which they are most engaged. Evaluation of all scholarly accomplishments and scholarship will be based on evidence of the quality and significance of the work.

### **IV.A. Definitions of Scholarly Activity and Scholarship**

Because of the connotations of the word “scholarship” in KSU’s previous tenure and promotion guidelines, it is important to distinguish how the words “scholarly” and “scholarship” apply here.

Scholarly is an umbrella term used to apply to faculty work in all performance areas. Scholarly is an adjective used to describe the processes that faculty should use within each area. In this context, scholarly refers to a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, revised and rethought. On the other hand, scholarship is a noun used to describe tangible outcomes of the scholarly processes. What follows is a description of how faculty work in each performance area might be scholarly and could result in scholarship.

**IV.A.1. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Teaching, Supervising, & Mentoring:**

Scholarly teachers plan their class activities in such a way that they seek outcome data regarding student learning. Faculty members typically revise their courses from semester to semester; the scholarly faculty member makes these revisions deliberately and systematically assesses the effect of the revisions on students' learning. The following semester, the scholarly faculty member makes more revisions based on the previous semester's outcomes if such revisions are warranted. This process can result in scholarship when the faculty member makes these processes and outcomes public and subject to appropriate review.

**IV.A.2. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Research and Creative Activity:**

Scholarly researchers and artists approach their research and creative activity in a systematic and intentional manner. They have a clear agenda and plan for their work in this area. Faculty who do scholarly work in this arena engage in programmatic research and creativity as opposed to random, haphazard forays into research and creative activity that have less chance of building a substantial body of work. Researchers and creative artists transform their work into scholarship, through the usual process of peer review and publication, showcasing, or presentation.

**IV.A.3. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Professional Service:**

Faculty members who perform scholarly professional service use their knowledge and expertise in a service opportunity to the University, the community, or their profession. Good documentation of scholarly service describes the role of the faculty member in each service activity, how he or she used their expertise in the role, and clearly demonstrate the outcome or impact of the service activity. Reports of service lack a scholarly dimension when they merely list committee assignments, provide no evidence of the nature of activities or results, provide evidence of outcomes but no evidence of the individual's role, have no review by others, or provide no evidence of how the service work is consistent with professional development or goals. Although all professional service may not be scholarly, faculty should document the quality and significance of all service activities.

Scholarly service can move toward scholarship as it meets some or all of the following criteria:

- (a) the service is documented as intellectual work;
- (b) there is evidence of significance and impact from multiple sources;
- (c) there is evidence of individual contributions;
- (d) there is evidence of leadership;
- (e) there is dissemination through peer-reviewed publications or presentations;
- (f) there is dissemination to peers, clients, publics, patients, etc.; and
- (g) there is peer review of the professional service.

#### **IV.A.4. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Administration and Leadership.**

Faculty members who are in administrative positions often provide oversight to initiatives that strengthen and enhance the mission of their unit. Building innovative programs, policies, and procedures can require scholarly investigations (e.g., research or literature reviews) and can lead to outcomes and products that are shared at professional meetings or in professional publications. For example, a department chair might develop a mentoring program in his or her department that is shared in professional meetings or publications and becomes nationally recognized.

#### **IV.B. Quality and Significance**

Quality and significance are the primary criteria for evaluating faculty performance. Quality and significance of scholarly work are over-arching, integrative concepts that apply equally to all areas of faculty performance. A consistently high quality of scholarly work, and its promise for future exemplary scholarly work, is more important than the quantity of the work done. The criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly accomplishments include the following:

##### **IV.B.1. Clarity and Relevance of Goals.**

Faculty members should clearly define the goals of scholarly work in their respective areas of emphasis and the relevance of their scholarly work to their Faculty Performance Agreement. Clarity of purpose and relevance of goals provide a critical context for documenting and evaluating scholarly work.

##### **IV.B.2. Mastery of Existing Knowledge.**

Faculty members must be well-prepared and knowledgeable about developments in the relevant context of their scholarly activity. The ability to educate others, conduct meaningful research, produce creative works, and provide high quality assistance through professional service depends upon mastering existing knowledge and background information. Faculty members should use appropriate techniques, methods, and resources in their scholarly work.

##### **IV.B.3. Effectiveness of Communication.**

Faculty members should communicate effectively with their audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review.

#### **IV.B.4. Significance of Results.**

Faculty members should demonstrate the extent to which they achieve their express goals and to which their scholarly accomplishment(s) may have had significant professional impact. Customarily in the academy, such significance might be confirmed by various credible sources (e.g., academic peers, community participants, or other experts), as well as by published documents such as reviews, citations, acknowledgments, or professional correspondence regarding one's work.

#### **IV.B.5. Consistently Ethical Behavior.**

Faculty members should conduct their work with honesty, integrity, and objectivity. They should foster a respectful relationship with students, community participants, colleagues, and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Faculty members should uphold recognized standards for academic integrity.

## **V. General Expectations for Tenure and Promotion**

### **V.A. Tenure**

Academic tenure is an employment status at the University that assures a tenured faculty member of continuous appointment from contract year to contract year, except under conditions of dismissal for cause or financial exigencies. The awarding of tenure is a highly important decision through which the University incurs a major commitment to the individual faculty member well into the future. Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure. It should only be granted to those faculty members whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of their current rank and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University. In awarding tenure, the University recognizes the long-range value of the faculty member to the institution and ensures them the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the proper operation of the University.

The review for tenure involves a retrospective analysis of how well the individual has met the needs and expectations of the University during the probationary period. Perhaps the greatest value of that retrospective analysis is in how well it informs the judgment of colleagues about the individual's prospects for future contributions and achievements as a KSU faculty colleague. The fundamental issue underlying the tenure decision is whether, in the judgment of teaching and administrative faculty colleagues, the faculty member will continue to meet institutional needs and expectations in the future.

Due to its long-term implications, the granting of tenure constitutes a significant decision and, therefore, requires a thorough review process that includes the judgments and recommendations of the faculty member's teaching and administrative faculty colleagues. The entire process has two major parts: the pre-tenure review and the tenure review. The

timing of these two parts depends upon several factors that are determined at the initial employment in the professorial ranks, which will be explained below. It is important to note that the number used to designate the year of review for tenure (and used similarly for promotion) indicates the year that the review process takes place. Because this review process starts at the beginning of the academic year, only the documentation of the fully completed years of service up until that point will be reviewed. Thus, a pre-tenure review in the third year considers only two years of service, and a tenure review in the sixth year considers only five years of service.

The first of the two parts of the tenure review process is a pre-tenure review that takes place in the third year of a tenure-track faculty member's employment in the professorial ranks (faculty initially hired as instructors should see Section VI for guidelines applicable to them). The purpose of this initial review is to assist faculty members in determining whether they are making appropriate progress toward tenure and to assess the individual's current readiness to be tenured. The pre-tenure review does not constitute a tenure decision, but rather, provides feedback to the faculty member as to his or her strengths and weaknesses. At each level of the review (departments T&P committee, department chair, college T&P committee, and dean), a summary letter will be produced that describes in detail how the faculty member is progressing toward meeting or not meeting the expectations for tenure. The letter will also include specific suggestions for maintaining and enhancing further preparations for a successful tenure decision in the future. These third-year review letters and the descriptive assessments they contain become part of the individual's portfolio for the later review.

The second major part of the process is the review at the end of the probationary period that leads to a tenure decision. The length of the probationary period over which this review is to occur depends upon several factors. For faculty who enter KSU at the assistant professor rank or above, the probationary period is five to six years, with a mandatory review for tenure being conducted in the sixth year, if tenure has not already been given. However, faculty may be granted years of credit toward tenure for work experience prior to coming to KSU. This credit will be noted in writing before the faculty member is employed and can range from one to three years, with the latter figure being reserved for rare cases of exceptional service elsewhere, such as administrative work. Any, all, or none of the granted credit can be applied toward tenure, at the discretion of the individual faculty member. If applied toward tenure, this credit plus the number of years of service at KSU must match the minimum probationary period of five years, and the tenure portfolio will include evidence from this credited time and must include evidence of relevant work experience prior to employment at KSU. Regardless of the number of years of credit toward tenure, all faculty must be reviewed (either pre-tenure or tenure) no later than the beginning of their third year. The amount of the probationary period spent at KSU must be continuous unless the interruption is for a leave of absence or for part-time service, which must not, in either case, exceed two years.

Full-time faculty who are initially employed as instructors and who are promoted later to assistant professors must be reviewed for tenure no later than their sixth year after

promotion to assistant professor or in their ninth year of full-time permanent employment at KSU, if that date comes earlier. If an instructor is recommended for promotion during the sixth year of employment, two years of probationary credit will be granted to permit a mandatory review for tenure in the ninth year.

Tenure-track eligibility for a faculty member will be stated in a letter offering employment from the Vice President for Academic Affairs. An administrative faculty member who is appointed without academic rank or with a part-time rank is not on track for tenure. Part-time or adjunct faculty, temporary or visiting faculty, and lecturers or senior lecturers are not eligible for and do not accrue any credit toward tenure. Service as a temporary or visiting faculty member or as a lecturer or senior lecturer at KSU does not earn credit toward the probationary period if the individual is hired later into a regular permanent faculty status, unless granted in writing at the time of appointment.

Academic deans and department chairs are appointed as tenure-track teaching faculty members. Tenure does not reside in an administrative position, however, and deans and chairs are subject to a similar (see Sections VII.B.2, 5, and 6 for differences) tenure-track review process as all other tenure-track faculty. Once tenured as a faculty member, an individual does not lose tenured status as a function of changing positions, responsibilities, or departments at the University.

Tenure-track faculty who are not recommended for tenure during their required sixth or ninth year reviews automatically receive a terminal one-year contract and formal notice that they will not receive another employment contract after their seventh or tenth years, respectively.

A non-tenured or non-tenure track administrative or teaching faculty member who is employed through an annual term contract is not assured of continuing employment at KSU once his or her contract expires with due notice of non-renewal. Such individuals are employed from contract to contract and only for the term specified in the contract. Subsequent or future appointment results solely from a separate offer and execution of a new and distinct contract. The offer of a new contract under these circumstances is the prerogative of Kennesaw State University and the Board of Regents, provided that sufficient advance notice is given informing the individual of the institution's intent to exercise its option of not renewing the current employment contract.

#### **V.B. Promotion for the Professorial Ranks**

The professorial ranks (see Section V.B.2.a) are typically linked to the different stages of career development and accomplishment for University faculty. Faculty members at the different stages of an academic career tend to have different levels of experience, expertise, accomplishment, effectiveness, and productivity. They also tend to have different opportunities for contribution, leadership, and mentorship. Consequently, KSU's general expectations for faculty performance and for promotion in rank differ from one experience level and rank to the next in keeping with the typical patterns of career development for University faculty.

Experience is correlated with professorial rank, but years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for a promotion in rank. When a faculty member's experience, accomplishments, and career development evolve to the point where expectations applicable to the beginning level of the next highest rank are being met, the faculty member can make a strong case for promotion. A decision of promotion will result from a thorough review of a faculty member's accomplishments and contributions to the University by KSU teaching and administrative faculty colleagues. This review is accomplished in consideration of one's situational context and in relation to one's stage of academic career development.

At KSU, faculty must be recommended for tenure before being considered for promotion in all professorial ranks. Faculty can be concurrently reviewed for both promotion and tenure, but the awarding of promotion can only come after tenure has been recommended. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia requires a minimum of five full academic years of service at KSU (including the year of review) to be eligible for promotion to the next rank. There is no maximum time by which a faculty member must be promoted to the next level.

## **VI. General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks**

### **VI.A. Tenure-Track Faculty**

#### **VI.A.1. Instructors.**

Unlike faculty at the assistant, associate, or professor ranks, instructors are typically hired primarily to address heavy teaching demands at the University. As such, their emphasis in the areas of faculty performance is not as flexible as other faculty.

Regular full-time faculty who are not eligible for appointment at one of the professorial ranks, typically because they do not hold an earned doctorate or other acceptable terminal academic credential, are appointed as instructors. For purposes of this document, the phrase "terminal degree" refers to an earned doctorate or other acceptable, terminal academic credential (e.g., M.F.A.). Depending upon the responsibilities of their position, some instructors are hired either with no expectations to complete the terminal degree or with expectations to complete the terminal degree. The relative emphasis of faculty activity in the performance areas differs across instructors depending upon the University's expectations for completion of the terminal degree.

##### **VI.A.1.a. Instructors Not Expected to Pursue a Terminal Degree:**

Such individuals are expected to be highly effective in teaching, supervising, and mentoring. They are also expected to make contributions in research and creative activity and/or professional service. The distribution of workload expectations shall be negotiated

annually between the faculty member, his or her department chair, and his or her dean and set forth in a Faculty Performance Agreement.

**VI.A.1.b. Instructors Expected to Complete a Terminal Degree:**

The relative emphasis of scholarly work in the performance areas as negotiated with the chair and dean may consider completion of the terminal degree as a priority. Upon completion of the degree and subsequent promotion to Assistant Professor the workload expectations shall be re-negotiated, consistent with the goals of the department and college.

**VI.A.1.c. Instructors Who Voluntarily Complete a Terminal Degree:**

On occasion, instructors who are hired without expectations to complete an earned doctoral degree or other acceptable terminal academic credential in the field, will voluntarily pursue advanced study on their own time. Instructors who voluntarily complete a terminal degree, even though it is not part of their expectations at KSU, will automatically be included in the next available round of recommended promotions to assistant professor which are sent to the Board of Regents each spring for review and approval. At this time the workload expectations for these faculty members will be re-evaluated by the chair and the dean and may be renegotiated.

**VI.A.2. Assistant Professor:**

Assistant professors ordinarily hold the highest earned degree in their fields of specialization. Rare exception to this requirement may be made when there is evidence of outstanding achievements and professional recognition in the candidate's field of expertise. In most fields, the doctorate will be expected.

Adapting to the expectations of the academy and of KSU and getting established in one's scholarly work are typically the primary concerns of an assistant professor. A typical pattern of effective and productive scholarly work for the assistant professor is one which begins modestly in the early years, perhaps with a limited or local significance, and expands in depth, focus, significance, recognition, and productivity in later years.

**VI.A.3. Associate Professor:**

Associate Professors make contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly work. High quality and significance (see Section IV.B) are the essential criteria for evaluation. The specialty areas, expertise, and professional identities of associate professors should become more advanced, more clearly defined, and more widely recognized as their academic careers progress. Typically, as the faculty member's roles and contributions grow towards significance, leadership and initiative, the faculty member establishes a strong record of accomplishments with broader impact and recognition within and beyond the University.

**VI.A.4. Professor:**

Professors are experienced and senior members of the faculty members who have become highly accomplished in their scholarly activities. They are faculty whose careers have

advanced to mature and high levels of effectiveness and productivity. Professors have strong records of contribution to and leadership in their respective areas of emphasis. A professor is typically characterized as a leader, mentor, scholar, expert, and/or distinguished colleague. Professors make significant contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly work, whether demonstrated through the scholarly work of research, teaching, or professional service. Professors have a documented record of distinguished accomplishments using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarly work (see section IV.B). These accomplishments will merit regional, national, or international attention and recognition. Professors continue to grow and develop in their respective areas of emphasis.

## **VI.B. Non Tenure-Track Faculty**

### **VI.B.1. General Expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers:**

In most cases faculty hired as lecturers or senior lecturers have as their primary responsibility teaching, supervising, and mentoring and are therefore expected to be highly effective in these areas.

Unless otherwise set forth in a Faculty Performance Agreement, there are no expectations for scholarship and their service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g., attendance at relevant department meetings and participation on appropriate department committees). In many cases their responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load of these individuals offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty load at KSU. Because of this, lecturers and senior lecturers are expected to demonstrate exceptional teaching ability in order to qualify for reappointment at KSU.

In some cases the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and unique. In such cases the responsibilities should be delineated in the Faculty Performance Agreement

### **VI.B.2. Administrative Faculty**

Administrative faculty have administrative matters as their primary area of responsibility. These faculty have academic rank and are normally located within the Division of Academic Affairs.

## **VII. Tenure and Promotion Process**

Faculty performance is evaluated through two basic, interrelated processes: annual reviews and multi-year reviews. Annual reviews give an evaluation of the faculty member's performance over one year within the context of the multi-year reviews. The

multi-year reviews, involving multiple reviewers, are a more comprehensive examination of a faculty member's role in and contribution to the department, college, and University.

## **VII.A. Format of Annual Review/FPA**

The annual assessment of a faculty member's contributions to the University will be based upon his or her performance in regard to the items listed in the most recent year's Faculty Performance Agreement(s) (FPA). The basis of this assessment is an annual review document (ARD) that is compiled by the faculty member to demonstrate his or her progress toward the FPA items. This document will convey accurate information by which the faculty member is to be evaluated, counseled, and judged in her or his professional performance at KSU and must address contributions not only in terms of quantity but also in terms of quality and significance.

Since annual reviews form the basis for the distribution of merit pay raises, they need to be completed in a timely manner according to Board of Regents policies and schedules. The annual updating of the FPA needs to occur at the same time as the annual review, as the FPA is integral to the next annual review process. Together, the ARD and the FPA form a retrospective and prospective snapshot of a faculty member's performance that aid all levels of reviewers in properly assessing the contributions of the faculty member.

Since the ARD addresses items in the past year's FPA, the document must contain this FPA. The exact format and layout of the ARD and the FPA that a faculty member uses will be determined by his or her department. However, since the ARD and the FPA are integral to T&P decisions and must be consistent with the T&P criteria, these formats must be approved by the College Review Committee, the dean, and the VPAA.

The first-level reviewer will comment upon the entire ARD, with the format of the comments determined by the format of the ARD. The ARD and any comments must be printed out and signed by the faculty member and the reviewer. The entire package then is forwarded to the next administrative level for review. Within 10 calendar days, the faculty member has the right to make a written response to the entire package and to subsequent responses by the next level or levels of review. Such responses become integral to the ARD in its movement to all subsequent levels of review.

ARDs, FPAs, and any additional comments, such as response letters, must be submitted with document material for all T&P reviews, including pre-tenure reviews.

## **VII.B. Multi-Year Reviews**

### **VII.B.1. Committee Structure:**

Department committees are elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department. Department committees have a minimum of three tenured faculty members; when there are not three tenured faculty in a department, the department will elect

tenured faculty from outside the department to serve on the review committee. Individuals whose documents are under review do not serve on the review committee.

For the purposes of tenure and review, the members of the college review committee are two tenured faculty members from each department. Members of the college committee are elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department. Any college that has only one department will elect three tenured faculty members to serve on its college review committee. No person can participate in more than one stage of the review process.

Departmental representatives to the college review committee serve two-year staggered terms. When a department does not have two tenured faculty members who are eligible to serve, it will elect tenured faculty from outside the department. Faculty whose documents are under review may not serve on their departmental or college review committee. (See Sections VII.B.5 and 6 below for deans and above.)

In special cases requiring deviations from the established structure, permission must be obtained in advance from the VPAA. Once permission has been obtained the changes will be communicated to all affected parties.

Votes of review committees are by secret ballot. All deliberations and decisions of reviews are confidential and may not be discussed with the candidates or with others outside the review committee's membership. All reviewers should remember that e-mail is not a confidential medium; therefore, committee minutes, notes, drafts of review letters, or final letters may not be circulated by e-mail.

#### **VII.B.2. Tenure and Promotion Review (see Sections 5 and 6 for deans, VPAA)**

The review of tenure and promotion documents begins with the departmental review committee. Documents are then reviewed in turn by the department chair and the college dean. Tenure and promotion of chairs begins at the level of the department review committee and then proceeds to the dean with the remainder of the process to follow as ordinary cases of tenure and promotion.

Tenure and promotion portfolios with no discrepant decisions among required levels of review proceed from the dean to the VPAA. At the request of the candidate under review or in the event of a discrepant decision at any of these levels (department, chair, dean), the portfolio goes to the college review committee which serves as the appeals committee for tenure and promotion cases. The college committee may request written clarification from previous levels of review.

After the review and decision of the college committee (when such a review is necessary), the portfolio proceeds to the VPAA for a decision. In cases where the portfolio did not go to the College Review Committee, the VPAA may choose to send it to the appropriate College Review Committee for review and recommendation. The VPAA's recommendation then goes to the president, who makes a final recommendation

to the Board of Regents. If, after the VPAA review, a candidate for tenure or promotion believes that the process of review has been violated, he or she may request review under the provisions of the KSU Grievance Policy.

At each level, review committees and administrators must make a positive or negative decision on the question of tenure and/or promotion and must write a letter (copy to the candidate and copy to be placed in the portfolio) which includes the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion and articulates the strengths and weaknesses that contributed to the decision.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion may respond to decisions at each level in a letter within 10 calendar days from receiving the review decision. Response letters are directed to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review.

### **VII.B.3. Third-Year Review (Pre-Tenure Review)**

The review of third-year portfolios begins with the department review committee, proceeding in turn to the department chair and the dean.

At each level, review committees and administrators consider the progress of the candidate toward tenure or, in the case of instructors, toward promotion. A letter is written at each level of review outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate with respect to this question. A copy of each review letter is sent to the candidate and a copy is placed in the portfolio.

The candidate under review may respond to decisions at each level in a letter within 10 calendar days. Response letters are directed to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review.

### **VII.B.4. Post-Tenure Review**

The review of post-tenure portfolios begins with the college review committee and then proceeds to the dean. The dean makes a summary decision unless the faculty member under review requests that his or her portfolio be reviewed by the VPAA. Faculty members should submit only Binder 1 materials (see Section **H** below).

### **VII.B.5. Deans**

Review of deans begins with the college review committee, proceeds to a committee of the department chairs from the college, and then to the VPAA. The review of Assistant or Associate Deans and Directors of Centers and Institutes will follow the same procedure as for Deans. For Directors of Centers and Institutes the college that will be involved in the review is based on the department of Director's faculty appointment.

#### **VII.B.6. Tenure-Track Administrators above the Level of Dean**

Review of tenure-track administrators above the level of dean begins with a special University-wide committee composed of two tenured faculty members elected by the administrator's academic department, the current chairs of the college review committees, and two deans to be elected by the deans. The portfolio then proceeds to the president.

#### **VII.B.7. Queries about Process**

Proposed revisions to the process are directed to the chair of the Faculty Review Oversight Committee. Committee membership consists of the chairs of college review committees from the previous year. Disputes about the T&P procedures, including structure and content (conflict of interest or conflicting guidelines for example), will be directed to the chair of the oversight committee for investigation and resolution.

#### **VII.B.8. Portfolio Guidelines and Contents**

All faculty members who are considered for tenure, promotion, third-year progress, or post-tenure review must prepare a portfolio for consideration by all involved in the formal review process. To initiate the review process, the faculty member submits his or her portfolio to the department office by the scheduled date in the fall semester. The portfolio consists of two three-ring binders (except for post-tenure review, which requires only Binder 1) with the major sections tabbed and clearly labeled. Binder 1 must be a one-inch binder and Binder 2 can be no larger than 3 inches. The candidate's name and the type of review should be clearly labeled on the spine and front cover of each binder.

##### **VII.B.8.a. Contents of Binder 1**

Binder 1 must contain the following indexed sections:

- Cover page (standard form available on Academic Affairs web pages)
- Summary sheet (standard form available on Academic Affairs web pages)
- Narrative (no more than twelve pages, double-spaced, 12-point type, with one-inch margins)

The narrative describes the quality and significance of the faculty member's contributions during the period under review in the following areas as appropriate:

- Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students
- Research and Creative Activity
- Professional Service
- Administration and Leadership

Sample narratives are available on the Academic Affairs web page.

- Vita
- Annual Review Materials (including ARDs and FPAs)
- Departmental guidelines (Administrative Faculty should include the guidelines from the department of their faculty appointment)

- Pre-tenure review letters (for tenure and for promotion from instructor to assistant professor)
- Response letters from previous levels of review

#### **VII.B.8.b. Contents of Binder 2**

Binder 2 must contain the following indexed sections, as consistent with the faculty member's FPA:

- ***Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students***  
This section contains illustrative evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's teaching, supervision and mentoring. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Peer review letters
  - Course syllabi
  - Course materials
  - Evidence of student learning
  - Student evaluations
  - Student survey results
  - Evidence of advising activities
  - Evidence of faculty development
- ***Research and Creative Activities***  
This section contains evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's research and creative activity. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Excerpts from conference programs/proceedings
  - Conference presentation evaluations
  - Title pages and abstracts from professional journals
  - Title pages and tables of contents from books
  - Evidence of grant solicitation
  - Book, chapter and article reviews
  - Copies of exhibit and performance programs
  - Photographs of commissioned or exhibited art works
- ***Professional Service***  
This section contains evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's professional service. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Committee assignment documentation
  - Copies of meeting minutes
  - Copies of products developed
  - Recognition by others of contributions
  - Evidence of statewide, regional, national or international professional service

- ***Administration and Leadership***

This section contains evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's administration and leadership. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Documentation indicating leadership assignments
- Evidence of program evaluation
- Supervisor, peer and employee evaluations
- Copies of products developed

Beyond the material provided in each indexed section, the faculty member may wish to include a one-page summary (in each relevant section) of activity not readily supported by documentation.

## **VIII. References**

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brand, M. (Nov/Dec 2000). Changing roles in research universities. *Change*, 32(6), 42-46.

Kennesaw State University. (2005) View 21: Refining the public university experience for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

Portland State University. (1996). Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty for tenure, promotion, and merit increases. Retrieved February 4, 2005, from <http://oaa.pdx.edu/PromotionAndTenureGuidelines>.

Richlin, L. (2001). *Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching*. Downloaded February 10, 2003, from Southeast Missouri State University, Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning website: <http://cstl.semo.edu/teacherscholar/richlinscholarlyteaching.doc>. Also available in: Kremer, C. (ed.) (2001). *Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of te*

1 *aching and learning* (pp51-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.