

Section Five

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

(2008-2009 new version)

I. Introduction	5.1
II. Overview of Faculty Responsibilities	5.2
III. Basic Categories of Faculty Performance	5.3
A. Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students.....	5.3
B. Research and Creative Activity	5.4
C. Professional Service.....	5.5
D. Administration and Leadership	5.5
IV. Evaluation of the Quality and Significance of Faculty Scholarly Accomplishments	5.6
A. Definitions of Scholarly Activity and Scholarship	5.6
1. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring of Students	5.6
2. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Research and Creative Activity	5.7
3. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Professional Service	5.7
4. Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Administration and Leadership	5.7
B. Quality and Significance	5.7
1. Clarity and Relevance of Goals	5.8
2. Mastery of Existing Knowledge	5.8
3. Effectiveness of Communication	5.8
4. Significance of Results	5.8
5. Consistently Ethical Behavior	5.8
V. General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review	5.8
A. Tenure	5.8
1. Pre-Tenure Review	5.9
2. Tenure Review.....	5.9
B. Promotion for the Professional Ranks.....	5.10
C. Post-Tenure Review	5.11

VI. General Expectations for Faculty Performance in Different Ranks	5.14
A. Tenure-Track Faculty	5.14
1. Instructors	5.14
2. Assistant Professor	5.15
3. Associate Professors.....	5.15
4. Professors	5.15
B. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty	5.15
1. General Expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	5.15
2. Administrative Faculty	5.17
VII. Faculty Review Process	5.17
A. Format of Annual Review/FPA	5.17
B. Multi-Year Reviews	5.19
1. Committee Structure	5.19
2. Tenure and Promotion Review.....	5.19
3. Third-Year (Pre-Tenure) Review.....	5.20
4. Review of Deans	5.21
5. Tenure-Track Administrators above the Level of Dean.....	5.21
6. Post-Tenure Review.....	5.22
7. Queries about Process.....	5.22
8. Portfolio Guidelines and Contents.....	5.22
VIII. Multi-Year Review Schedules	5.25
IX. References	5.27

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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. Given that department tenure and promotion guidelines are most discipline-specific and are approved by deans and the Provost as consistent with college and University standards, department guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for tenure and promotion decisions. Therefore at all levels of review (Department T&P Committee, Department Chair, Dean, Provost, and College T&P Committee) the rationale for T&P decisions shall be stated in a letter to the candidate with specific and detailed reference to the department T&P guidelines in justifying the decisions that have been made. Appropriate references must also be made to the college and university guidelines. Any revisions made to departmental guidelines shall bear the date of approval/adoption. Revisions to departmental guidelines become effective 12 months following their adoption. However, individual faculty may choose to use revised guidelines immediately upon their adoption.

Performance evaluation of a faculty member is required at KSU. Reviews and evaluations occur regularly in the following ways in accordance with the governing policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures established by Kennesaw State University and its colleges and departments.

- Detailed annual review of faculty performance
- Third-year review of progress toward tenure for those with professorial rank
- Review for tenure by the sixth year for those with professorial rank
- Third-year review of progress toward promotion for instructors
- Review for promotion by the sixth year for instructors
- Review for tenure by the ninth year for instructors who have been promoted to assistant professor
- Post-tenure reviews every five years
- Reviews for elective promotion in the professorial rank (optional)
- Required reviews of lecturers/senior lecturers and review of lecturers for promotion to senior lecturers (optional)

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).

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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 full-time permanent faculty in the department or college, as appropriate, the department chair (for the department guidelines), the college T&P committee, the dean, and the provost.

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 (See Section 3.). 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, supervision and mentoring of students, research and creative activity, 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, supervision and mentoring of students and professional service. Some research projects may involve both research and creative activity and professional service and pedagogical research may involve both research and creative activity and teaching, supervision and mentoring of students. 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.

In addition, it is important to note that effectiveness in any performance area requires a basic foundation of prerequisite degrees and credentials as well as currency in one's field. At KSU, such credentials and currency are known as professional development and all faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development opportunities both on and off campus. Faculty should address in their portfolio narratives how their continuing development activities influence, support, and/or shape their activities in their performance area(s) of emphasis.

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

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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; 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 in all of the faculty member's performance areas
- identify the performance area(s) that will include scholarship expectations and describe those expectations.

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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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, supervision and mentoring of students, 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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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, supervision and mentoring of students, research/creative activity, and professional service.

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

While the professional activities of faculty vary, every faculty member is expected to demonstrate scholarly activity in all performance areas. Furthermore, tenure-track faculty members must produce scholarship in at least one of their performance area(s) of emphasis. The performance area(s) with scholarship expectations must be agreed upon by the faculty member and the faculty member's supervisor. In other words, although faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly activity in all the performance areas identified in their FPA, they are not expected to produce scholarship in all areas. Evaluation of all scholarly accomplishments and scholarship will be based on evidence of the quality and significance of the work. KSU's scholarly and scholarship expectations support the Board of Regents policy (803.17), Work in Schools (<http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section4/4.03.02>).

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. This tangible product is disseminated in appropriate professional venues relating to the performance area. In the process of dissemination, the product becomes open to critique and evaluation. Scholarship may be in any of Boyer's categories of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, teaching, or engagement (service). 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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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 demonstrates 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.;
- 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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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 expressed 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, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

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. All tenure-track faculty are expected to produce scholarship in at least one performance area. This scholarship must be consistent with departmental, college, and university guidelines, and it must clearly document quality and significance to review parties beyond the department. Only under exceptional circumstances will a candidate be recommended for tenure without at least one form of scholarship as articulated in approved tenure and promotion guidelines. 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

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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.

Based on BOR policy (803.09), in exceptional cases, the president may approve an outstanding distinguished senior faculty member for the award of tenure upon the faculty member's initial appointment under the following circumstances: appointed as associate or full professor, was tenured at a prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national reputation to KSU. *In most cases the President will consult the Tenure & Promotion Committee and Chair of the department hosting the faculty member before awarding tenure.* If the person is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the award of tenure must be approved by the BOR.

V.A.1. Pre-Tenure Review

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 (department T&P committee, department chair (college committee for department chairs), 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.

V.A.2. Tenure 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

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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 provost. 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, 4 and 5 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, 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 VIA.) 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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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, instructors must be reviewed and recommended for promotion to assistant professor in their sixth full academic year of service at KSU or be given a terminal employment contract in their seventh year. Instructors who do not have the terminal degree are not eligible for an early elective review for promotion to assistant professor. Faculty members serving in tenure-track positions 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 be approved after a positive decision on tenure has been made by the KSU president. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (4.03.01) requires a minimum of four full academic years of service at KSU (including the year of review) to be eligible for promotion to rank of associate professor and five full academic years of service at KSU (including the year of review) to be eligible for promotion to the rank of professor. Since the earliest date faculty members without credit toward tenure are eligible for tenure is the fifth year at KSU, only faculty members with credit toward tenure can apply for promotion to associate professor during the fourth year. It should be noted here that there is no maximum time by which a faculty must be promoted to the next level.

V.C. Post-Tenure Review

In April 1996 the Board of Regents developed a policy statement requiring that all institutions to conduct post tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members, beginning five years after the faculty member's most recent promotion or personnel action.

The primary purpose of post-tenure review is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of all tenured faculty members, thereby strengthening the quality and significance of faculty work. Post-tenure review serves to highlight constructive and positive opportunities for all tenured faculty to realize their full potential of contributions to Kennesaw State University and the University System of Georgia. It also serves to identify deficiencies in performance and provide a structure for addressing such concerns.

Post-tenure review is not a reconsideration of the faculty member's tenure status. Instead, it is a comprehensive five-year performance review that occurs after an individual is tenured. This post-tenure performance review is more comprehensive and concerns a longer time perspective (at least five years) than the annual performance reviews; post-tenure review feedback also comes from multiple peer and administrative perspectives, rather than from the perspective of one administrative head as is the case in annual reviews.

Post-tenure review provides both retrospective and prospective examination of performance, taking into account that a faculty member probably will have different emphases and assignments at different points in his or her career. It is directed toward career development and a multi-year perspective of accomplishments and plans for professional development.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

The primary documentation submitted by faculty for post-tenure review is the five most recent annual evaluations and a current curriculum vitae. Faculty with three or more positive annual evaluations (achieving/meeting or exceeding expectations) will be considered as candidates for reward and recognition by their College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty who have three or more unsatisfactory annual evaluations (not achieving/not meeting expectations) will be considered as candidates for remediation.

Post-tenure review will result in a detailed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of a faculty member's performance in the context of his/her individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the assessment will be categorized as either: 1) Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance, or 2) Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance. Basic guidelines for differentiating between achieving expectations and not achieving expectations in post-tenure performance are as follows:

Achieving/Meeting Expectations

- Achieving/meeting or exceeding expectations in teaching, service and scholarship has been sustained in annual performance reviews with three or more positive annual reviews over the last five years.

Not Achieving/Not Meeting Expectations

- Achieving/meeting expectations in teaching, service and scholarship has not been sustained in annual performance reviews over the past five years; specifically there are three or more unsatisfactory annual reviews.

In cases where the faculty member is found to be "achieving expectations in post-tenure performance," no formal faculty development plan is required. The results of the post-tenure review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development activity would focus on further enhancing the faculty member's performance.

In cases where a faculty member is identified in the post-tenure review as "not achieving expectations in post-tenure performance," a formal faculty development plan must be developed and written. The formal faculty development plan should address how deficiencies cited in the post-tenure review will be corrected. In developing a mutually acceptable plan, administrators may wish to renegotiate the faculty member's workload assignments such that some expectations are lessened or dropped in favor of increased expectations in other areas. In all cases, face-to-face meetings and discussions among the principals are required to ensure thorough exploration of all options and clear communication of the understandings reached.

A formal plan for faculty development should: a) define specific goals or outcomes that are to be achieved; b) outline the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes; c) identify appropriate sources of faculty development, whether they be located on campus, on other campuses of the University System, at the system level, or in other locations; d) set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and e) indicate appropriate criteria by which progress will be monitored.

The following parties should be involved in the creation of a formal faculty development plan, monitoring the faculty member's progress in completing the plan, and signing off on the plan's completion: 1) the affected faculty member 2) his/her administrative unit head; 3) the administrative officer one level

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

above the faculty member's administrative unit; and 4) an optional fourth colleague —the affected faculty member may ask one of the members of the College T&P Committee to serve as this fourth principal. The affected faculty member will be free to seek other mentors as needed for the successful completion of the plan.

The administrative unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above are jointly responsible for arranging appropriate funding for the development plan, if required. However, development plans will typically expect faculty to remedy deficiencies within existing resources and the normal level of support available for faculty development and for achieving faculty expectations. Furthermore, faculty with unsatisfactory performance reviews should not expect to receive paid leaves to pursue further study or research for the purpose of remediating deficiencies.

The maximum time allowed to complete a faculty development plan will be three years. The three-year period will normally start in the spring of the academic year in which the post-tenure review was conducted and in which the faculty development plan is formulated. Depending upon the circumstances, remediation could occur in less time. An assessment of progress made on the faculty development plan will be incorporated into the individual's annual performance review each year. A written progress report on the plan will be prepared as a supplement to the annual performance evaluation and be reviewed by the next level administrator. Satisfactory completion of the faculty development plan must be documented in writing and approved by the signatories of the plan, and copied to the provost.

If after three years, the tenured faculty member has not completed satisfactorily his/her formal faculty development plan, one of several consequences could occur as determined by the parties involved in the creation of the plan: 1) university colleagues would continue to work with the individual toward the completion of the plan, but the individual's salary would be frozen until the plan was finished satisfactorily; 2) a reassignment might be considered if it appears that the individual will not successfully complete the original plan; or 3) academic administrators could initiate other personnel actions. In any of these cases, an unsatisfactory ruling and its consequences should be fully documented for the faculty member, department chair, dean, and provost.

KSU's policy on post-tenure review affects all faculty who are tenured who have primarily teaching responsibilities at Kennesaw State University. Based on BOR policy, administrators who have tenure and who may also have some teaching responsibilities are not subject to post-tenure review as long as their duties are administrative in nature (see Section VII.B.6.). A tenured faculty member will be expected to have a required post-tenure review, beginning five years after the award of tenure and at five-year intervals thereafter, unless one of several intervening circumstances occur. Such intervening circumstances may substitute for, defer, or waive the next scheduled post-tenure review as follows:

1. A successful review for promotion in professorial rank is considered comprehensive and comparable to post-tenure review; the promotion will restart the individual's five-year "clock" for the next post-tenure review.
2. A successful selection and appointment to a different KSU position as a result of a competitive national search and screening process is considered comprehensive and comparable to post-tenure review; the appointment will restart the individual's five-year clock for the next post-tenure review. (New appointments resulting from administrative reassignment or of an acting/interim nature will not restart the five-year clock.).

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

3. As is presently the case in eligibility for tenure or promotion consideration, a leave of absence taken during one or more terms of the nine-month academic year would exclude that year from being counted on the five-year clock for post-tenure review, deferring the next scheduled review accordingly by a year.
4. The provost may waive a scheduled post-tenure review for a faculty member whose written notification of retirement is formally accepted and is effective within the two-year period immediately following the next scheduled post-tenure review.
5. The five-year clock for post-tenure review will be restarted in the year in which an individual has completed successfully a formal faculty development plan.

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 be promoted to assistant professor by KSU’s president effective the next

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

semester after receiving notification of the terminal degree and official transcript assuming positive recommendations from the department chair, dean, and provost. 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 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 and creative activity, teaching, supervision and mentoring, 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. Initial appointments to the full professorial rank should have a terminal degree in the appropriate discipline or the equivalent in training, ability, or experience (BOR policy 8.03.0102).

VI.B. Non Tenure-Track Faculty

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

All lecturers are reviewed annually for contract renewal, as these positions are not tenure track and are not intended to become so. Based on BOR policy (803.1002), not more than 10% of the total number of full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and senior lecturers may be lecturers and/or senior lecturers. Lecturers have as their primary responsibility teaching, supervising, and mentoring and therefore are expected to be highly effective in these areas. Unless otherwise set forth in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA), there are no expectations for

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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 FPA.

Lecturers shall be employed only for the term specified in their written contract. Future employment, if any, shall result solely from a separate offer and acceptance requisite to execution of a new and distinct contract. KSU's election to not renew a Lecturer will be given to the affected individual according to the following schedule:

- a. no advance notice is necessary before the date of termination of an initial one-year contract;
- b. in writing at least three months before the date of termination of a second one-year contract, no later than February 15;
- c. in writing at least six months before the date of termination of three or more years of service to the institution, no later than Nov. 15;

Reappointment of lecturers, senior lecturers, and promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer are dependent not only on their performance in instruction and service, but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of the College and its units.

Annual reviews should be conducted for Lecturers according to the following schedule. For Lecturers in their first year, the Department Chair conducts a mid-year review in January for the period of mid-August to December. For Lecturers in their second year, the annual review is conducted in January for the period of January of the first year to December of the second year. For Lecturers with three or more years of service to KSU, annual reviews are conducted in October for the period of October of the previous year to September of the current year (the period will be January of the second year to September of the third year for 3rd year Lecturers.)

A Lecturer has the option after five years of consecutive service to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer during the sixth year to begin in the seventh year of service. The criteria for promotion to senior lecturer are evidence of strong teaching ability inside and outside of the classroom environment and value to the university in the area of teaching and student learning. During this review, strengths and weaknesses in performance are noted, and a promotion decision is made.

The same committee structure that is used for promotion for tenure-track faculty will be used.

Lecturers and senior lecturers will submit portfolios for performance review beyond the department chair every six years. In addition, there will be an initial portfolio submission during the third year of employment. This third year performance review will provide feedback for the optional promotion to senior lecturer in the sixth year. A successful review for promotion to senior lecturer in the sixth year restarts the six year performance review cycle. During the third year review, strengths and weaknesses in performance will be identified. The same committee structure that is used for third year review of tenure-track faculty will be used for the third and six year performance reviews of lecturers and senior lecturers.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Lecturers must prepare a portfolio for promotion consideration and for periodic performance review. A lecturer's portfolio will follow the same guidelines and contents as that of tenure-track faculty who are reviewed for tenure and promotion. A lecturer or senior lecturer's portfolio will consist of only binder 1 as stipulated in section VII.B.8. (Portfolio Guidelines and Contents) with the addition of samples of teaching evaluations that demonstrate the quality and impact of one's teaching and student learning. (Department guidelines should give specifics regarding student evaluations to be submitted.)

A lecturer's portfolio will be evaluated based on a pattern of quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in two performance areas: 1) teaching, supervising, and mentoring of students and 2) professional service (related to teaching assignments).

Annual reviews and/or portfolio feedback indicating poor performance with little to no improvement over time according to department and college tenure and promotion guidelines provide the basis for nonrenewal of lecturers and senior lecturers. Similar to the annual review and tenure and promotion process for tenure-track faculty, lecturers and senior lecturers have the option to respond in writing within 10 calendar days after receiving reviews of their performance. Response letters are directed to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision.

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. Faculty Review 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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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 T&P Committee, the department, chair, the dean, and the provost.

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 from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to submit a written response to the entire package and to subsequent responses by the next level or levels of review. Response letters are directed to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. 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.

The detailed annual review and evaluation of faculty performance adheres to the following schedule:

Annual Review for Faculty in Their First Year

In August, the Department Chair meets with first year faculty to develop an FPA, which must include the period of mid-August to December. In January, the Department Chair conducts a mid-year review based on the faculty member's activity (provided in the ARD) in relation to the FPA goals for mid-August to December. The mid-year review is completed before the deadline for first-year nonrenewal decisions in February. During the mid-year review, development/updates to the FPA for the period of January to September occur.

Annual Review for Faculty in Their Second Year

In October, the Department Chair conducts a one-year review based on the faculty member's activity (provided in the ARD) in relation to the FPA goals for January to September. The one-year review is completed before the deadline for second-year nonrenewal decisions in November. During the one-year review, development/updates to the FPA for the period of October to December (of the following year) occur.

Annual Review for Faculty Beyond the Second Year

In January of each year, the Department Chair conducts an annual review of faculty member's activity (provided in the ARD) in relation to the FPA goals for the previous calendar year. (The review period for 3rd year faculty is one year and two months (October to December).

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

VII.B. Multi-Year Reviews

VII.B.1. Committee Structure

Department committees are elected by the 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. A candidate under review for PTR can serve on the department T&P committee, since the candidate's portfolio starts at the college level.

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.4 and 5 below for deans and above.)

In special cases requiring deviations from the established structure, permission must be obtained in advance from the provost. 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 4 and 5 for Deans and VPs)

The review of tenure and promotion documents begins with the department T&P 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 T&P committee, proceeds to a committee of department chairs from the college, 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 provost. At the request of the candidate under review or in the event of a discrepant decision or at the request of any of these levels (department, chair, committee of department chairs, dean), the portfolio goes to the college T&P committee which serves as the appeals committee for tenure and promotion cases. The college committee may request written clarification from previous levels of review and will have access to all portfolios in the current year in that college to see examples of successful portfolios in that year.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

After the review and decision of the college committee (when such a review is necessary), the portfolio proceeds to the provost for a decision. In cases where the portfolio did not go to the college review committee, the provost may choose to send it to the appropriate college review committee for review and recommendation. In cases where the provost is inclined to not support the previous levels of review, the provost will send the portfolio to the college review committee. Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternative schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia. The provost makes a recommendation, and the portfolio then goes to the president, who makes a final recommendation. If, after the provost 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.

If a candidate is under review for promotion and post tenure review simultaneously, the portfolio is reviewed by the department tenure and promotion committee and the department chair only for the promotion review. The portfolio is then reviewed by the dean for promotion and post tenure review. The portfolio is subsequently sent to the provost for a promotion consideration. If the provost is inclined not to support a recommendation of previous levels for promotion, if previous levels of review are discrepant for promotion, or if previous reviews are consistently negative for promotion, the provost sends the portfolio to the college committee for a promotion and post tenure review. The provost then provides a promotion review and finally the president provides a promotion decision. If the president provides a negative promotion review and the portfolio has not been reviewed by the college committee for post tenure review, this committee will meet and provide this review during spring semester.

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 to be placed in the portfolio (copy to the candidate, copy to lower levels of review, and copy to the Provost) which includes the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion and articulates the strengths and weaknesses that contributed to the decision. Within 10 calendar days from the review decision at each level, the faculty member has the right to respond to a committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternative schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia.

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

The review of third-year portfolios begins with the department T&P committee, proceeding in turn to the department chair and the dean. The department chair is reviewed by the department review committee, followed by the college T&P committee, and then the dean.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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.

Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternative schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia.

VII.B.4. Review of Deans

Review of deans begins with the department T&P committee, proceeds to the college T&P committee, followed by a committee of department chairs from the college. The review of assistant/ associate deans and college-level directors of centers and institutes begins with the department T&P committee, proceeds to a college T&P committee, followed by a review by the dean. For the dean, assistant/associate deans, and college-level directors, documents are then reviewed by the provost and president. If there is a request for another review by either the candidate under review or in the event of a discrepant decision or at the request of any of the levels, the portfolio can proceed to a committee of deans who serve as the additional level of review for tenure-track administrators above the level of dean.

Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternative schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia.

VII.B.5. Tenure-Track Administrators above the Level of Dean

Review of tenure-track administrators above the level of dean (e.g., vice presidents, associate vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, and university-level directors of centers and institutes) begins the department T&P committee, followed by the dean of the candidate's college. The portfolio then proceeds to a special university-wide committee composed of the current chairs of the college T&P committees and two deans to be elected by the deans (the dean of the candidate's home department cannot serve on this committee). The portfolio proceeds to the provost (for assistant/associate VPs and university-level directors of centers and institutes), and then to the president. If there is a request for another review by either the candidate under review, the department review committee, the college dean, the special university-wide committee, the provost (in the case of the assistant/associate VPs and university-level directors), the president, or in the event of a discrepant decision, the portfolio can proceed to a committee of deans who have not previously reviewed the portfolio.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternative schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia.

VII.B.6. Post-Tenure Review

The review of post-tenure portfolios for faculty begins with the college review committee and then proceeds to the dean. The dean then makes a summary decision. If there is a request for a second review by either the candidate under review, the college review committee, or dean, the portfolio can proceed to a committee of current chairs of the department review committees in the college. Faculty members should submit only Binder 1 materials (see VII.B.8a) for post tenure review.

Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternative schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia.

Based on BOR policy (803.07), administrators who have tenure and who may also have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their duties are administrative in nature. When an administrator returns full-time to the faculty, he/she will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and evaluated in the fifth year following return to the faculty and at subsequent five year intervals.

Note. The Academic Affairs webpage has a listing of college-level administrators and university-level administrators.

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 T&P 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. Potential ethical indiscretions during the tenure and promotion process should be directed to the provost .

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

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

scheduled date in the fall semester. The portfolio consists of two three-ring binders: Binder 1 and Binder 2 (except for post-tenure review, which requires only Binder 1) with the major sections tabbed and clearly labeled. The candidate's name and the type of review should be clearly labeled on the spine and front cover of each binder.

The specific material required for include in the portfolio can be found in the next two sections. Beyond the required material, all faculty members submitting portfolios for review should make their own decisions on what other information to include, especially those materials relating to accomplishments at prior institutions and accomplishments since their last tenure and/or promotion review at KSU. Although material from other institutions may be considered, the quality of recent past accomplishments at KSU are major considerations for review decisions. All materials that demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty member's work should be included in the portfolio and review committees should consider all of the materials included in the portfolio to make their recommendation.

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

Vitas should be formatted to clearly demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty members accomplishments, especially to those beyond the department. An example of a vitae template can be found on the Academic Affairs webpage.

- Annual Review Materials (including ARDs and FPAs)
 - Faculty up for tenure and/or promotion should include all annual review materials since their last pre-tenure/tenure and/or promotion review
- Faculty up for pretenure should include all annual review materials since their start date at KSU
- Former annual review documentation (from before Fall, 2006) written by the faculty member, which includes a philosophy of teaching, belongs in Binder 2.
- 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

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

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.

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

VIII. Multi-Year Review Schedules

The schedule of reviews for 2008-09 will be done in the following order:

Tenure and Promotion Reviews

August 18	Submit Portfolio to Department Office
August 18- September 5	Department T&P Committee review (see NOTE)
September 8- September 26	Department Chair review (see NOTE) (Department Chair review can begin earlier, but no Chair decision should be made before the end of the optional faculty response deadline to the Department review, and the Department review's response back to the faculty)
September 29	Portfolio is Transferred to the Dean's Office by the Department Chair
September 29- October 24	College Dean's review (see NOTE)
October 27	Portfolio is transferred to Provost's Office (except portfolios with discrepant reviews or requests for additional review go directly to College committee)
October 27- November 14	Provost Review and Referral to College Committee as needed
October 27-December 8	College review as needed (see NOTE)
January- February	Provost and President recommendations (see NOTE)
Late February	Submission to Board of Regents for their Records

Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

For Third-Year (Pre-Tenure), or Pre-Promotion Reviews

September 8	Submit Portfolio to Department Office
September 8-September 26	Department T&P Committee Review (see note)
September 29-October 17	Department Chair Review (see note) (Department Chair review can begin earlier, but no Chair decision should be made before the end of the optional faculty response deadline to the Department review, and the Department review's response back to the faculty)
October 20	Portfolio is Transferred to Dean's Office by Department Chair
October 20-November 14	College Dean Review (see note)

For Post-Tenure Review

October 6	Teaching Faculty Submit Portfolio to Dean's Office
October 6-November 7	College PTR Committee Reviews Teaching Faculty (see note)
November 10-December 8	College Dean Reviews Teaching Faculty (see note)

NOTE: Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the candidate has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's decision and justifications by submitting a written letter to the reviewing committee or administrator and copied to the next level of review. The committee or administrator will respond in writing to the candidate and copy the next level of review. This response may include the reversal of the original decision. The portfolio of a faculty member who has submitted one or more response letters will proceed through the review process by an alternate schedule, as determined by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This alternate schedule will provide time for reviews and responses while assuring that reviews and responses will be completed in time to meet the reporting requirements of the University System of Georgia.

IX. 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.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E.L. (1996). The Scholarship of Engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, 1(1): 21.
- Kennesaw State University. (2005) *View 21: Refining the public university experience for the 21st 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 teaching and learning* (pp. 51-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

