

# Computer Science Department

## Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation and P&T Guidelines

Previous version approved on 5/4/2023

Current version approved on 10/16/2023

### Table of Contents

	<u>Page #</u>
1. <b>Introduction</b>	2
A. Department Overview	2
B. Philosophy and Intent	2
2. <b>Categories of Faculty Performance</b>	3
A. Teaching	3
1. Expected and Mandatory Teaching Activities	3
2. Significant Teaching Activities	4
3. Teaching, Course, and Student Assessment	4
4. Teaching Quality and Breadth	6
5. Student Success in Teaching Emphasis	6
B. Scholarship and Creative Activity	6
1. Scholarship and Creative Activity Categories	6
2. Examples of Scholarship Products	7
3. Student Success in SA/C Emphasis	8
C. Professional Service	9
1. Mandatory Service Activities	10
2. Regular Service Activities	10
3. Significant Service Activities	11
4. Student Success in Professional Service Emphasis	11
3. <b>Overview of Workload Models</b>	12
4. <b>Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance</b>	14
5. <b>Expectations for Tenure, Post-Tenure, and Promotion</b>	15
6. <b>Faculty Review Process</b>	18
7. <b>Multi-Year Review Schedules</b>	19
8. <b>Revisions to P&amp;T Guidelines</b>	19
9. <b>References</b>	19
10. <b>Approvals</b>	20

# 1. Introduction

Below is a brief overview of the Department of Computer Science and the philosophy and intent of these guidelines. All guidelines must adhere to USG policy and KSU and college guidelines and policies. If any information contained in the college or department promotion and tenure guidelines contradicts the USG policy or the KSU Faculty Handbook, USG policy and the KSU guidelines and policy will supersede the college or department guidelines.

## A. Department Overview

The Department of Computer Science (CS) is a unit of the College of Computing and Software Engineering (CCSE) at Kennesaw State University. The department seeks to be recognized as a collaborative and collegial group of CS scholars who value excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The department seeks to be recognized as active in campus leadership and success in research activities that may involve both undergraduate and graduate students. The department hosts undergraduate and graduate degrees, certificates, and a minor in CS. The department is a partner in the Ph.D. program in Data Science and Analytics.

The department thrives on providing an applied computing education with a good solid foundation in computing principles. Computer Science is a challenging and ever-changing field that requires persistence, flexibility, and adaptability but leads to highly rewarding careers with exciting and challenging opportunities. The BSCS program is fully accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET.

All CS faculty members are expected to be leaders in teaching excellence or quickly developing to become leaders in teaching; Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to be active in their professional scholarship; and all are expected to be active in professional service; all are expected to participate in the student success activities. The department supports tenured/tenure-track research-intensive faculty by balancing their teaching workload in order to support their development as research scholars. Faculty are required to be excellent instructors, to lead with service contributions and service leadership, and to have a mature program of scholarship appropriate to their workload model.

The University recognizes that the role of its faculty has evolved as KSU's graduate and doctorate program offerings continue to grow. To support its faculty, the department offers a wide range of workload models that vary from the 5-5 limited-term faculty model and 4-5 lecturer model to a 2-2 research-leadership model, allowing faculty to develop, excel, and contribute at various stages of their careers. According to CCSE P&T guidelines, S/CA more than 50% (i.e., lower than the 2-2 workload model) is possible via direct cost buy-out through grants and contracts (in consultation with Chair and the approval from Dean).

The department recognizes and values faculty leadership and quality work in all three areas (Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA), and Professional Service) and Student Success and professional development in at least one of the areas. As the relative importance of scholarship grows over the years, the level of expectation will continue to evolve with an increasing emphasis on the quality of the scholarship area. The department also recognizes the importance of providing research infrastructure to support increased expectations.

## B. Philosophy and Intent

These CS guidelines for faculty performance and review provide the overarching and objective framework within which faculty will conduct their activities, how faculty will be evaluated annually, the expectations for faculty promotion and tenure, and how faculty will develop their academic careers within a positive and healthy department culture. The guidelines support a range of faculty workload models with different emphases, allowing a variance for faculty at different stages of their careers.

The guidelines are intended to create a **clear** and objective structure of expectations with **measurable outcomes** for faculty, consistent with the college and university guidelines and requirements. A structure that

rewards the pursuit of excellence and quality in all three areas of accomplishment in which faculty members are evaluated (Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service). The structure values and recognizes leadership in teaching and quality education to students; encourages, supports, and rewards the accomplishment of scholarship products of national and international significance; and encourages and acknowledges service activities needed to enable the department, college, and university to thrive and grow.

The guidelines are intended to create a healthy environment and culture where each faculty member may pursue their professional goals and interact with colleagues in a respectful and professional manner, treating each faculty member as a valued colleague and abiding by a relevant professional code of conduct. The guidelines are also designed to foster an environment that nurtures each faculty member's professional growth in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service, and motivates each faculty member to participate as valued colleagues contributing to a positive and productive culture. This implies the creation of guidelines to motivate faculty toward accomplishing and excelling as is needed to achieve tenure, promotion, and growth.

## 2. Categories of Faculty Performance

Consistent with KSU's and CCSE's guidelines, the basic categories of faculty performance include **Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity**, and **Professional Service**. Performance expectations in each category are highlighted in the following sections.

### A. Teaching

Consistent with KSU's and CCSE's guidelines, CS faculty members are expected to be excellent teachers who regularly mentor and advise students and create engaging and welcoming classroom environments that enhance student learning opportunities. Highly effective teaching and learning are central university, college, and departmental priorities.

Because the CS field is constantly changing, it requires faculty to exercise dynamic efforts to stay current in the field. The expected and mandatory teaching activities are outlined below:

#### 1. Expected and Mandatory Teaching Activities:

- 1) Developing and practicing personal teaching philosophy, consistent with the department's mission.
- 2) Continually developing and revising lecture materials, tests, assignments, labs, projects, and other course materials based on student feedback and topic changes to help students achieve course and career outcomes.
- 3) Practicing continuous improvement activities, utilizing course evaluation mechanisms and instruments consistent with the departmental and university teaching effectiveness policy, with written analysis and responsive adjustments to evaluation data.
- 4) Designing and updating teaching materials/online sites/presentations and online course management sites and keeping them up to date.
- 5) Adopting different teaching methods that are appropriate for the course topics (such as individual instruction, individual and group projects, and pedagogical innovation).
- 6) Teaching effectively using distance learning technologies, when applicable.
- 7) Achieving consistent good performance as evidenced by, e.g., student evaluations.
- 8) Following CCSE teaching expectations. For example, creating and updating syllabi at the beginning of each semester, while adhering to department, college, and university standards, including those necessary for ABET accreditation, such as approved course assessment reports and assessment participation; identifying a set of courses within the department programs to teach in support of the degree programs and students' needs; etc.

**2. Significant Teaching Activities:**

Leadership and significant contributions in teaching include but are not limited to, the following activities.

- 1) Achieving consistent excellent performance as evidenced, in part, by student evaluations, by Faculty Course Assessment Reports (FCARs), and other means.
- 2) Being recognized by both students and colleagues as an effective teacher, as evident by awards and other acknowledgments.
- 3) Leading the development and implementation of new course(s), concentrations, or, program redesign.
- 4) Teaching a new course, in the area of specialization or interest of the faculty.
- 5) Developing new courses as needed to support degree programs and students' needs.
- 6) Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students on directed studies, honor projects, service learning, and special topics courses and/or projects. These activities contribute to achieving student success goals.
- 7) Participating in frequent or mid-term testing and grading, monitoring, and reporting student performance and progress toward graduation and retention goals. These activities contribute to achieving *student success* goals.
- 8) Mentoring high school interns.
- 9) Leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of a new pedagogy paradigm. These activities contribute to achieving *student success* goals.
- 10) Serving as the lead, other than program coordinator or director roles, in a program redesign or developing a new program or course sequence.
- 11) Leadership in mentoring a new colleague in teaching and classroom management.
- 12) Participating in the KSU Study Abroad program.
- 13) Managing and training TAs.

**3. Teaching, Course, and Student Assessment:**

Teaching and course activities, contributions, and effectiveness are assessed using measurable outcomes from teaching and course evaluations with an emphasis on teaching quality and depth for all courses taught during the period of review.

**A. Course Evaluations**

CS courses will be evaluated using mandatory and optional mechanisms. CS faculty members are expected to consider and reflect on the feedback provided by these mechanisms in their annual review document.

**MANDATORY MECHANISMS**

- 1) Use KSU's student survey instrument (i.e., Activity Insight, currently in use) and results for assessing teaching; giving the response rates are credible, reasonable, and feasible. The current KSU student survey instrument uses a rating scale that ranges from 1 to 4.

**Credible Response Rates**

For each individual course, surveys with at least a 25% response rate or at least 5 students responding will be considered to provide reasonable and feasible feedback, data, and statistics regarding teaching and course effectiveness. Surveys with response rates less than 25% with fewer than 5 students will be deemed as non-credible and statistically insignificant. As a result, it is suggested that the feedback, data, and statistics provided from these non-credible surveys shouldn't be used to assess teaching and course effectiveness for the individual course. Faculty shall encourage students to respond, including setting a time frame during class for students to respond if applicable.

*Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science*

- 2) Use the course assessment process and instrument developed by the department (Faculty Course Assessment Report - FCAR) to assess courses' effectiveness and how well the courses comply with ABET and program requirements and learning objectives.

**OTHER OPTIONAL MECHANISMS**

In some cases, KSU's student survey response rates are considerably low, and as a result, the feedback, data, and stats extracted from the survey instrument have credibility concerns. As a result, faculty member is encouraged to utilize an additional instrument of their own design for student feedback and continuous improvement. The instrument should provide measurable outcomes with significant and credible response rates. If the additional instrument is intended for use as part of the faculty member's annual review, the survey and the process of administering the instrument must be approved by the department chair and include the following features:

- 1) The evaluation instrument must be anonymous: the student's identity cannot be determined from the information and presentation of the evaluation instrument.
- 2) All evaluations must be handled outside of the oversight of the faculty member being evaluated. This is to ensure that the faculty member cannot pressure or intimidate student responses (even unintended). The faculty member must not be present in the classroom during the evaluation or have control over the evaluation instrument containing student responses.
- 3) The evaluation instruments must be delivered to the department administrator or chair by a student or proctor.
- 4) The department administrator or chair will provide summaries of the submitted evaluations to the faculty member within one week of the faculty submitting his or her grades. The faculty member will be responsible for making the department aware that the grades were submitted and providing some proof of such (i.e., an email indicating grades were submitted).
- 5) The department will keep the submitted evaluations on file for five (5) years according to the university's P&T review periods.

Other options include (1) peer review; (2) pre- and post-tests to show students' progress toward learning objectives; (3) exit surveys, handled by the department; and (4) CETL-suggested approaches as optional mechanisms in assessing teaching.

**C. Assessment Ratings**

Consistent excellent teaching assessment and ratings will have the following key components (described in sections 2.A.1, 2.A.2, and 2.A.3): *Teaching activities KSU Student Evaluation, Teaching-based Student Success (FCARs), and, optionally, Other Mechanisms*. All the components, as described in the foregoing, will be the basis for the annual evaluation of CS faculty members in **teaching**. The combined evaluation **must take into consideration the proportion of the faculty member's workload model as indicated in the FPA (see Overview of Workload Models in Section 3 below)**. The evaluation will be done according to the following ratings:

**Exemplary (EY) Rating – (Level 5):**

All the expected and mandatory teaching activities (listed in Sections 2.A.1) AND 4 or more significant activities listed in Sections 2.A.2.

**Exceeds Expectations (EE) Rating (Level 4):**

All the expected and mandatory teaching activities (listed in Sections 2.A.1) AND 2 or more significant activities listed in Sections 2.A.2.

**Meets Expectations (ME) Rating (Level 3):**

All the expected and mandatory teaching activities (listed in Sections 2.A.1)

**Needs Improvement (NI) Rating (Level 2):**

Missing 2 or fewer activities from the expected and mandatory teaching activities (listed in Sections 2.A.1)

**Does Not Meet Expectations (NM) Rating (Level 1):**

Missing 3 or more activities from the expected and mandatory teaching activities (listed in Sections 2.A.1)

**4. Teaching Quality and Breadth:**

The CS department values teaching quality and depth in preparing our students for successful careers in computing and/or in graduate and post-graduate studies. As a result, CS faculty members are expected to teach courses in their area(s) of expertise, experience, and strong interest. CS faculty are also expected to provide flexibility in course assignments needed to support CS degree programs and meet the needs of students.

**5. Student Success in Teaching Emphasis:**

In addition to documenting teaching effectiveness in terms of student learning, faculty should provide other measures of teaching effectiveness, such as some, but not necessarily all, of the following: teaching awards, evidence of handling diverse and challenging teaching assignments, securing grants for curriculum development or teaching techniques, accomplishments involving community-engaged pedagogy, peer observations, and contributions to the achievement of departmental teaching-related goals. Faculty who designated teaching as their area of focus for student success should report those student success activities that occur in teaching.

*Examples of Student Success in Teaching*

Student success most often, though not always, occurs within a faculty member's teaching, supervision, and mentoring. Examples of assessable student success practices in this area include faculty who advise or mentor students outside the classroom, employ forms of experiential learning and other high-impact practices in their classrooms, and/or apply professional development activities and initiatives offered by the institution or the USG to their work with students.

**B. Scholarship and Creative Activity**

All CS tenured, and tenure-track faculty members are expected to participate in Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA), the level of expectation varying with the faculty member's workload model and FPA. CS faculty members have traditionally valued a wide variety of scholarly activities that include peer-reviewed publications, book chapters, textbook writing, patent applications, internal grant applications, and external grant applications submitted and reviewed by appropriate agencies.

Key to the appropriate valuation of scholarship products is the peer-review process and the production of a clearly defined and reviewable product. S/CA products should be critically reviewed by professional peers and disseminated beyond KSU.

**1. Scholarship and Creative Activity Categories:**

Scholarly and research products are organized into three general categories as follows.

**Regular Publication and Scholarship Contributions:**

Regular contributions consist of publications with peer review and dissemination at regional, national, and international levels. Professional development efforts will also be considered regular contributions (i.e., attendance of conferences, workshops, training, etc.). Peer-reviewed contributions that are disseminated beyond KSU include patent applications, commercial-grade products, journal articles, and conference papers. The regular contributions should align with the CS department's strategic plan. Refer to Table 1A for examples of regular S/CA contributions.

**Significant Publication and Scholarship Contributions:**

Significant contributions consist of publications with a competitive level of peer review that are disseminated at national and international level competitive venues. The significant contributions should align with the CS department's strategic plan.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to document the significance of the product using available metrics such as published acceptance rate, citation indices, impact factor, and other metrics recognized in the CS domain. Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions in the ARD and Promotion and Tenure binders and narratives. Refer to Table 1B for examples of significant S/CA contributions.

**Proposals and Grants**

CS tenured/tenure-track faculty members, who have more than 10% workload effort dedicated to Scholarship and Creative Activity, are expected to submit and/or receive competitive external grant proposals. For grant applications and externally funded project proposals, the faculty member should be listed as PI, Co-PI, or senior personnel (or similar). If an external grant proposal has multiple PIs, the budget justification should include the distribution of the grant amount amongst the PIs. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document the competitiveness of the grant proposals. Refer to Table 1C for examples of Proposal and Grant products.

**2. Examples of Scholarship Products:**

**Tables 1A, IB, and 1C** below describe examples of regular publication and scholarship activities, significant publication and scholarship activities, and grant activities. Many of these activities [could] occur over multiple years.

<b>Table 1A. CS Department <u>Examples of Regular Publication and Scholarship Products</u></b> <i>(Not every one of the following is required each year)</i>				
<b>Description</b>		<b>Reviewable Product</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
<b>1</b>	Appropriate publications in magazines, where the review is editorial.	Publication	7	External editor or editorial board.
<b>2</b>	Abstracts, Short Papers, Posters, and Workshop Papers.	Publication	7	External peer review.
<b>3</b>	Book chapters or edited books.	Publication	10	External review: Publisher and reviewers
<b>4</b>	ACM and IEEE conference and journal products with acceptance rates of 35% or above.	Publication	12 (1 <sup>st</sup> ), 9 (2 <sup>nd+</sup> ) <sup>A-1</sup>	External peer review.
<b>5</b>	Other conferences and journal products with acceptance rates ranging from 35%-55%. These venues may be regional, national, or international.	Publication	10-12 (1 <sup>st</sup> ), 7-9 (2 <sup>nd+</sup> ) <sup>A-1</sup>	External peer review.
<b>6</b>	Patent Application	Application	10	External Review: Patent office
<b>7</b>	Development of a prototype of a commercial-grade product or the development of a free open source	Prototype	10	Internal Review, KSU Legal Affairs, # downloads
<b>8</b>	Development of commercial-grade product	Commercial product with joint KSU ownership	20-25	Investor, funding agency, adoption rate, or end-user feedback

<sup>A-1</sup> If the leading author(s) is/are a student of a faculty member, the faculty member will be considered the first author

<b>Table 1B. CS Department <u>Examples</u> of <u>Significant</u> Publications and Scholarship Products</b> (Not every one of the following is required each year)				
<b>Description</b>		<b>Reviewable Product</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
<b>1</b>	ACM and IEEE conference and journal products with acceptance rates below 35%.	Publication	20 (1 <sup>st</sup> ), 15 (2 <sup>nd+</sup> ) <sup>B-1</sup>	External peer review
<b>2</b>	Other conferences and journal products with acceptance rates below 35%. These venues may be national or international.	Publication	15-20 (1 <sup>st</sup> ), 10-15 (2 <sup>nd+</sup> ) <sup>B-1</sup>	External peer review
<b>3</b>	Textbook publications	Publication	20-25	External review: Publisher & reviewers
<b>4</b>	Patents	Patent	30	External Review: Patent office

<sup>B-1</sup> If the leading author(s) is/are a student of a faculty member, the faculty member will be considered the first author

<b>Table 1C. CS Department Proposal and Grant Products</b> (These items are significant products and required for workload models in Table 3)				
<b>Description</b> <i>* PI includes Co-PI and Senior Personnel.</i>		<b>Reviewable Product</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
<b>1</b>	External Proposal: 1. Evidence of competitiveness	Grant application	10	KSU grants office or Funding Agency
<b>2</b>	Funded Small grants (or KSU grant), contracts, or projects: 1. Total amount: \$25K-\$50K per year per PI*	Award letter	20	Internal peer review panel or Funding agency
<b>3</b>	Funded Medium grants, contracts, or projects: 1. Total amount: \$50K-\$150K per year per PI*	Award letter	30	Funding Agency
<b>4</b>	Funded Large grants, contracts, or projects: 1. Total amount: \$150K or higher per year per PI*	Award letter	40	Funding Agency

### 3. Student Success in SC/A Emphasis:

Faculty members who have designated scholarship and creative activity as their area of focus for student success should report those student success activities that occur in their scholarship and creative activity in their FPA.

#### *Examples of Student Success in Scholarship and Creative Activity*

At Kennesaw State University, student success can take place through a faculty member's scholarship and creative activity. Faculty members who promote undergraduate and graduate research, especially through the dissemination of artifacts at academic conferences, in publications, or in artistic performances; and/or faculty who themselves research on student development and achievement are examples of assessable student success practices in scholarship and creative activity.



**Assessment Rating:**

Consistent excellent research assessment and ratings will have the following key components (described in section 2.B.1 above): *Regular Publication and Scholarship Contributions, Significant Publication and Scholarship Contributions, and Proposals and Grants*. All the components, as described in the foregoing, will be the basis for the annual evaluation of CS faculty members in research. The combined evaluation must take into consideration the proportion of the faculty member's workload model as indicated in the FPA (see the Overview of Workload Models in Section 3 below). The evaluation will be done according to the following ratings:

**Exemplary (EY) Rating – (Level 5):**

The performance (measured as the sum of points of Reviewable Products listed in Tables 1A, 1B, and/or 1C) must exceed the research effort percentage of the corresponding workload model by an additional 20 points or more;

AND

One Reviewable Product from both Tables 1B and 1C (items 2 or 3 or 4).

**Exceeds Expectations (EE) Rating (Level 4):**

The performance (measured as the total points of Reviewable Products listed in Tables 1A, 1B, and 1C) must exceed the research effort percentage of the corresponding workload model by an additional 10 points or more.

AND

One Reviewable Product from both Tables 1B and 1C.

**Meets Expectations (ME) Rating (Level 3):**

The performance (measured as the total points of Reviewable Products listed in Tables 1A, 1B, and 1C) must satisfy the research effort percentage of the corresponding workload model.

**Needs Improvement (NI) Rating (Level 2):**

The performance (measured as the total points of Reviewable Products listed in Tables 1A, 1B, and 1C) is 10 points or fewer below the research effort percentage of the corresponding workload model.

**Does Not Meet Expectations (NM) Rating (Level 1):**

The performance (measured as the total points of Reviewable Products listed in Tables 1A, 1B, and 1C) is more than 10 points below the research effort percentage of the corresponding workload model.

**C. Professional Service**

All faculty members are expected to participate in service activities, with the level of expectation varying from the faculty member's workload model and FPA. Service activities can support the department, college, university, discipline, or community. For the annual review document (ARD), the faculty members will need to describe their service contributions in detail, not just list the various service activities.

Service activities are recognized as important contributions, particularly those that support the work and functioning of the department and college. Service activities specific to the department are highly valued. CS faculty members are encouraged to balance their service activities between the department, college, and university, starting with the department. Some department service leadership roles have taught reassignment, and the service activity needs to be factored into the service workload. Service activities need to be aligned with the strategic goals of the department.

*Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science*

Service activities and their associated weights are organized into three general categories: (1) Mandatory, (2) Regular, and (3) Significant. The list of service activities under the *mandatory* category is service activities required by every faculty member with a service requirement that constitutes 5% of the faculty members' overall workload. The remaining service workload (i.e., 5%) of the faculty member's overall workload will be selected from the *regular* and/or *significant* service categories. Not all regular and/or significant service activities are required. The associated load or percentage for each service activity is based on the significance, value, impact, and time of the particular service. Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions for each additional service item included in their service load.

**1. Mandatory Service Activities:****Table 2.A Mandatory Service Activities:** *(All service activities in this category are required for ALL faculty)*

<b>Mandatory Service Activities</b>	
1	Be engaged in issues regarding curriculum (i.e., informal discussions, providing feedback, etc.).
2	Attend and participate in department meetings and discussions.
3	Attend and participate in college meetings and discussions.
4	Attend a minimum of two university or college graduation ceremonies per academic year.
5	Participate in at least two department, or college high-impact practice student events annually. These events include but are not limited to C-Day, Hackathons, Analytics Day, Internship Events, Ideathon, Community Day, Orientation sessions, Open Houses, Community Day, and various student social gatherings.

**2. Regular Service Activities:****Table 2.B Regular Service Activities:** *(Additional service activities can be selected from this category)*

<b>Regular Service Activities</b>	
1	Serving on a department, college, or university committee.
2	Participating in an additional student service activity that supports the department or college (i.e., student orientation, promotional events, preview day, open houses, C-Day, CCSE Annual Cookout, etc.).
3	Serving on an Ad-hoc committee for the department, college, or university.
4	Serving as a reviewer. Reviewing papers for a conference or journal.
5	Serving as conference Session Chair.
6	Serving on national and international professional organizations or committees (i.e., ACM, IEEE, etc.).
7	Serving on conference program committee.
8	Participating in program accreditation, external to KSU (i.e., ABET review team, SACS review, etc.).
9	Participating in a civic or community event (i.e., K-12 events, etc.).
10	Serving in a civic or community organization representing KSU (i.e., Cobb County Chamber of commerce, Cobb County EXCEL leadership academy, etc.).
11	Giving a CS seminar talk, or other venue talk (non-peer reviewed)
12	Serving as a course coordinator
13	Serving thesis or dissertation committee.
14	Professional development efforts related to the discipline (i.e., attendance of conferences, workshops, training, webinars, etc.)

**3. Significant Service Activities:****Table 2.C Significant Service Activities:** *(Additional service activities can be selected from this category)*

<b>Significant Service Activities</b>	
<b>1</b>	Serving as chair of a department or college committee.
<b>2</b>	Serving on an NSF (or equivalent) grant reviewing panel or serving on a review panel or committee.
<b>3</b>	Serving in a department leadership role that doesn't receive course releases or re-assigned time.
<b>4</b>	Serving as chair of a university-level committee.
<b>5</b>	Serving as a chair of an Ad-hoc committee for the department or college.
<b>6</b>	Serving as a chair of an Ad-hoc committee for the university.
<b>7</b>	Serving on conference organizing committees (i.e., General Chair, Program Chair, Proceedings Chair, Tutorial/Workshop Chair, Treasurer, Publicity Chair/Webmaster, etc.)
<b>8</b>	Serving as a faculty sponsor for a local or regional student organization. (i.e., WIT advisor, ACM/IEEE Student Chapter Advisor, etc.)
<b>9</b>	Serving as the keynote or guest speaker for a conference or event.
<b>10</b>	Chairing thesis or dissertation committee.
<b>11</b>	Leadership in mentoring a new colleague with S/CA.
<b>12</b>	Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students on research projects.
<b>13</b>	Serving on editorial boards or as editor (or associate editor) of proceedings or journals.
<b>14</b>	Serving as a leader for a civic or community organization representing KSU.

**4. Student Success in Professional Service Emphasis:** *(KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.3.C)*

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

- 1) an explanation of the scholarly work involved in the service role,
- 2) copies of minutes,
- 3) number of hours met,
- 4) copies of products developed,
- 5) measures of the impact or outcome of the service role, and/or
- 6) an explanation of the unique contribution of leadership roles or recognition by others of contributions.

Those in administrative roles should demonstrate the quality and significance of their leadership and administration, especially how effectively they foster the requisite fiscal, physical, interpersonal, intercultural, international, and intellectual environment (e.g., improving the quality and significance of scholarship or service in their unit). In sum, administrative faculty act as leaders by assisting colleagues in their unit to achieve and surpass University, college, and departmental goals in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service.

Faculty members who have designated professional service as their area of focus for student success should report those student success activities that occur in their professional service.

*Examples of Student Success in Professional Service*

Student success can occur through a faculty member's work in professional service. Faculty who direct study abroad programs or other experiential learning activities, who coordinate internships, service-

learning, and other community-engaged activities, and who serve on various committees dedicated to student success are examples of assessable student success practices in professional service.

### **Assessment Ratings:**

Consistent excellent service assessment and ratings will have the following key components (described in section 2.C above): *Mandatory Service Activities, Regular Service Activities, and Significant Service Activities*. All the components, as described in the foregoing, will be the basis for the annual evaluation of CS faculty members in **service**. The combined evaluation must take into consideration the proportion of the faculty member's workload model as indicated in the FPA (see the Overview of Workload Models in Section 3 below). The evaluation will be done according to the following ratings:

#### **Exemplary (EY) Rating – (Level 5):**

- All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A)

AND

- 5 or more activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C, including at least 2 from Table 2.C.

#### **Exceeds Expectations (EE) Rating (Level 4):**

- All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A)

AND

- 5 or more activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C.

#### **Meets Expectations (ME) Rating (Level 3):**

- All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A)

AND

- 2 or more activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C.

#### **Needs Improvement (NI) Rating (Level 2):**

- All the mandatory service activities (listed in Table 2.A), but fewer than 2 activities from Table 2.B and Table 2.C.

#### **Does Not Meet Expectations (NM) Rating (Level 1):**

- Missing 2 or more activities from Table 2.A.

## **3. Overview of Workload Models**

The university faculty handbook provides a common model and vocabulary to describe the varied work that faculty members carry out, as well as an agreed framework for discussions of that work. The model establishes some core standards and expectations to be established through the shared governance process, including the following:

- 1) A typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year.
- 2) All faculty members must participate in professional service activities essential to the life of the institution per their rank.
- 3) Each department establishes, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught.
- 4) Each department establishes, in writing, teaching load equivalencies for scheduled laboratory courses where 1 lab contact hour is counted as 0.5 credit of a workload hour.
- 5) Each department establishes, in writing, teaching load equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research), be formally negotiated and incorporated into the faculty assessment process.

*Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science*

- 6) The model does not dictate, or even favor, any particular mix of activities. That mix is for individual faculty members and their Chairs to agree upon (with their Dean's approval) based on institutional needs and KSU's shared governance process and as agreed to in the FPA.
- 7) Expectations for each workload model are contingent upon adequate resource allocation to enable faculty members to achieve these expectations.

**Workload Models:** Each department establishes, in writing, flexible review guidelines as to expectations of faculty members in the following faculty performance areas:

- 1) Teaching
- 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity
- 3) Professional Service

The department review guidelines are mostly discipline-specific and are approved by Deans and the Provost/VPAA as consistent with the college and university standards. The department guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for Promotion and Tenure decisions.

Table 3 below describes the CS department faculty workload models and respective rank-based expectations in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service.

<b>Table 3: CS Department Faculty Workload Models and Expectations</b>				
<b>Workload Model</b>	<b>Emphasis &amp; Rating<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Teaching Expectations</b>	<b>Service Expectations</b>	<b>Scholarship &amp; Creative Activity Expectations</b>
<b><u>Teaching-Intensive<sup>1</sup></u> 5-5</b>	<b><u>Teaching:</u></b> Limited-Term	100% of Effort		
<b><u>Teaching-Intensive<sup>1</sup></u> 4-5</b>	<b><u>Teaching:</u></b> Lecturer & Senior Lecturer	90% of Effort	10% of Effort	
<b><u>Teaching-Intensive<sup>1</sup></u> 4-4</b>	<b><u>Teaching:</u></b> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty & Clinical	80% of Effort	10% of Effort	10% of Effort
<b><u>Balanced-Workload</u> 3-3</b> Graduate Faculty status required	<b><u>Balanced Scholarship:</u></b> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	60% of Effort	10% of Effort	30% of Effort 1. One <b>regular</b> publication product per year 2. Product 1 in Table 1C

<sup>1</sup> Allow faculty members with heavier teaching loads (workload models with teaching emphasis) an opportunity to provide more quality teaching and more time for productive research work. The department administration should try to minimize teaching preps by assigning multiple sections of the same course with courses in the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.

<sup>2</sup> The corresponding overall ratings guidelines for the Teaching Emphasis, Balanced Emphasis, and Scholarship Emphasis workload models can be found in Section 5.

<p><b><u>Scholarship-Intensive</u></b> 2-3 Graduate Faculty status and funding activity required.</p>	<p><b><u>Scholarship:</u></b> Tenure Track &amp; Tenured Faculty</p>	50% of Effort	10% of Effort	<p>40% of Effort 1. One <b>significant</b> publication product per year 2. Small grant (Product 2 in Table 1C)</p>
<p><b><u>Research- Leadership</u></b> 2-2 Graduate Faculty status and external funding activity required.</p>	<p><b><u>Scholarship:</u></b> Tenure Track &amp; Tenured Faculty</p>	40% of Effort	10% of Effort	<p>50% of Effort 1. One <b>significant</b> publication product per year 2. Medium grant (Product 3 in Table 1C)</p>

## 4. Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

The CS department employs tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, lecturers, limited-term faculty, and part-time faculty. The department has multiple workload models available, differing in the significance of contributions in each area of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA), and Professional Service. These workload models allow faculty careers to unfold naturally and holistically over the course of an academic lifetime, with changing focus or emphasis on time and energy:

1. Teaching focus and emphasis
2. Scholarship and research focus and emphasis
3. Professional service that fosters contributions to the university and external communities
4. Student success and professional development in at least one of the areas

**Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA):** Each individual faculty member shall divide his/her professional efforts among the three faculty performance areas noted. That division of effort will be reflected in an FPA between the individual faculty member and the University (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12). Negotiation of individual FPAs allows for diversity across colleges and departments and, within departments, among individual faculty members. Colleges and departments, in consultation with faculty stakeholders, determine which FPA combinations best suit their college and departmental objectives. FPAs may change from year to year and even from semester to semester as needs and opportunities change. Consistent with the University's culture of shared governance, the details of an individual FPA are worked out in consultation between the chair and the faculty member and are subject to final approval by the dean. If the faculty member and the chair cannot reach an agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

**Annual Review Document (ARD):** The annual assessment of a faculty member's contributions to the department, college, and University will be based on his or her performance in reference to the criteria listed in the most recent year's Faculty Performance Agreement(s). The basis of this assessment is an annual review document (ARD) that is compiled (documented) by the faculty member to demonstrate his or her progress toward the criteria in the FPA. This document will convey accurate information and the criteria by which the faculty member is to be assessed, counseled, and judged. The review document must address the quantity, quality, and significance of the contributions in each category.

Through the FPA, a faculty member may also negotiate variations on these workload models, requiring the approval of both the Department Chair and Dean. Table 3 (Section 3) outlines the various workload models. The official computing sciences accrediting body (ABET) requires that ALL faculty have time for scholarship and professional development needed to remain current in the field.

Expectations vary by rank, workload model, and FPA agreements. Faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions in the ARD and FPA and Promotion and Tenure portfolio. In the ARD,

**each category or area** of faculty performance (i.e., Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, Professional Service, and Student Success in at least one of the areas.) will be assessed using the assessment ratings described in sections 2.A, 2.B, and 2.C.

In the ARD, the following categories of ratings will be used to assess **overall** faculty performance for the year:

- 5 – Exemplary (EY)
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations (EX)
- 3 – Meets Expectations (ME)
- 2 – Needs Improvement (NI)
- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations (NM)

There are three areas of faculty performance and, as a result, a faculty member can receive any combination of ratings for his or her performance for the year. This P&T document provides a framework or guidelines for objectively determining the overall rating of faculty performance, given the particular combination of ratings and the emphasis of the workload model. Note that the “emphasis” of the workload model encompasses or insinuates the relative weight or load for each of the categories of faculty performance. *(The ‘combination’ is referred to in Sections 2.A, 2.B, 2.C as the ‘overall average’ of all three areas based on the FPA workload distribution.)*

The annual review documents are reviewed and assessed by the chair and the dean, following the guidelines stated in this document.

## **5. Expectations for Tenure, Post-Tenure, and Promotion**

The general expectations for tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and faculty performance for tenure track faculty in professorial ranks.

### **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 (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 4.1.9), termination or layoff of tenured personnel due to program modification (see BoR Policy Manual 8.3.7.9), financial exigencies, or after an unsuccessful performance improvement plan (PIP). 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 an Associate Professor and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University.

Tenure requires prior or simultaneous promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. New tenure track faculty may be initially appointed to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without the award of tenure. All tenure track faculty are expected to produce scholarships in at least one performance area. This scholarship must be consistent with departmental, college, and University guidelines. Only under exceptional circumstances will a candidate be recommended for tenure without at least one form of scholarship as articulated in approved promotion and tenure guidelines. In awarding tenure, the University recognizes the long-range value of the faculty members to the institution and ensures them the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the proper operation of the University.

The philosophy, expectations, and workload models in this document apply to departmental expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. Faculty members who are applying for promotion are expected to be already performing above their level of current rank expectations and at the level of the rank to which they apply. The P&T committee and the chair shall use the following recommended rubric to assign ratings for individual areas while evaluating both P&T documents and/or ARD documents. The P&T committee and the Chair can assign other ratings to individual areas with sufficient justifications, according to the five (5) categories of ratings in Section 4.

**B. Promotion - Interpretation and Adaptation of the University's General Criteria – by Rank**

Faculty members planning to seek promotion and/or tenure should keep in mind the criteria below for promotion in the CS department. The following describes the expectations of faculty at different ranks and workload models. Faculty need to note that at least 5 publications at a significant contribution level (Table 1B) and funded external research (Table 1C) is required for promotion. The CS department uses the following equivalent terms, as defined in Section 2 of this document, compared to KSU's Faculty Handbook (<https://handbooks.kennesaw.edu/>): Regular equals Satisfactory (in the areas of Scholarship and Creative Activity and Professional Service), and Significant equals Noteworthy (in all three areas).

**1. Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Teaching
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Professional Service.

**2. Promotion of Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer**

- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Teaching
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Professional Service.
- Demonstrate leadership in one of the two categories (Teaching or Professional Service)

**3. Promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure**

- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Teaching.
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Scholarship and Creative Activity, including funded grant(s).
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Regular and/or Significant Professional Service.

**4. Promotion of Associate Professor to Full Professor and Award of Tenure**

- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Teaching.
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Scholarship and Creative Activity, including funded grant(s) beyond the first promotion.
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Regular and/or Significant Professional Service.
- Demonstrate leadership in one of the three categories (Teaching, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, or Professional Service)

**5. Promotion of Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor**

- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Teaching
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Regular and/or Significant Scholarship and Creative Activity.
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Professional Service.

**6. Promotion of Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Full Professor**

- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Teaching
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Regular and/or Significant Scholarship and Creative Activity.
- Achieve Meeting ratings or better in the area of Significant Professional Service.
- Demonstrate leadership in one of the three categories (Teaching, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, or Professional Service)

**1. Pre-Tenure Review**

Pre-tenure review assesses the progress of the candidate toward tenure and promotion. A pre-tenure review is required for tenure-track faculty. A third-year optional review can help lecturers and clinical faculty prepare for a promotion review to the next rank. The review process is described in KSU Faculty [Handbook 3.12B](#).



### **C. Post-Tenure Review (PTR) [KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.5.C and 3.12]**

All tenured faculty members must undergo post-tenure review in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 3.12.B.4 of the KSU Faculty Handbook. The same section lists eligibility for expedited post-tenure review and monetary PTR rewards.

In April 1996, the Board of the Board of Regents (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5.4 and USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.6) developed a policy statement requiring that all institutions conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members every five years.

In 2021, the Board of Regents modified its post-tenure review policy to include a five-point scale to evaluate each of the three areas during annual reviews, which, at KSU has also been adopted for post-tenure review; a performance improvement plan for faculty who score a 1 or a 2 during their post-tenure review; and a corrective post-tenure review leading to a performance improvement plan for faculty who score a 1 or a 2 in any performance area during two consecutive annual reviews (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5.4, BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7).

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 a retrospective and prospective examination of performance, considering 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.

The primary evidence to be considered by review committees/administrators for post-tenure review consists of the five most recent annual evaluations and a current curriculum vitae (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12 for the review process and portfolio instructions). Post-tenure review also considers the broader peer and administrator perspectives provided by members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and by administrative levels of review.

Post-tenure review will result in an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of a faculty member's performance in the context of individual roles and responsibilities. The overall outcome of the performance will be assessed on a five-point scale:

- 5 – Exemplary
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations

#### **Successful Post-Tenure Review**

A successful post-tenure review results from a faculty member who receives a 3 or higher on their overall post-tenure review score.

In cases where the faculty member receives a score of 3 or higher, no formal faculty improvement 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.

If a faculty member receives a 4 or 5 on a traditional five-year post-tenure review, they will be entitled to a one-time monetary award. Faculty will then be eligible for the same award in five years (and no sooner than five years) at their next post-tenure review. Faculty members who undergo a corrective or elective post-tenure review, on the other hand, are not eligible for this one-time award.

#### **Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review**

A faculty member who receives a 1 or 2 in the context of a post-tenure review is one whose post-tenure review is deemed unsuccessful. In this case, a formal performance improvement plan (PIP) must be written. (See KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12.)

## **6. Faculty Review Process**

Administrative and teaching faculty performance is evaluated via two basic and interrelated processes: annual reviews and multi-year reviews. An annual review is an evaluation of the faculty member's performance over one year but within the context of multi-year reviews. The multi-year reviews, involving multiple reviewers, are a more comprehensive examination of a faculty member's contribution to the department, college, and University.

### **Annual Reviews**

The annual assessment of a faculty member's contributions to the University will be based on performance in reference to the criteria 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 progress toward the criteria in the FPA. This document will convey accurate information and the criteria by which the faculty member is to be assessed, counseled, and judged. The professional performance at KSU must address the quantity, quality, and significance of the contributions.

#### **Format (ARD and FPA)**

The FPA must be updated annually in conjunction with the annual review. Both the annual review and the FPA are integral to the next annual review process. The ARD and the FPA together provide a retrospective and prospective synopsis of a faculty member's performance. They provide the basis for all levels of reviewers to assess the contributions of the faculty members properly.

The ARD addresses items in the past year's FPA. The exact format and layout of the ARD and the FPA will be determined by the faculty member's department. The College P&T Committee, the department chair, the dean, and the Provost must approve these formats. Because the ARD and the FPA are integral to Promotion and Tenure decisions, those documents must reflect the Promotion and Tenure guidelines.

#### **Evaluation of Categories**

Chairs will evaluate faculty members in each of the three performance categories--teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service—based upon the following five-point rubric: (*BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4*)

- Level 5. Exemplary
- Level 4. Exceeds Expectations
- Level 3. Meets Expectations
- Level 2. Needs Improvement
- Level 1. Does Not Meet Expectations

In addition, chairs will evaluate faculty efforts to promote student success in *at least one* of the three areas. Although these rubrics will be (have been) developed in greater detail at the college and departmental level, they should be developed in alignment with the template below. *The details of the CS departmental*

*Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science*

faculty performance evaluation, in compliance with these rubrics and ratings, are described in the forgoing Sections 2.A, 2.B and 2.C. The following table gives a general framework within which the CS chair will determine the rating/score for each faculty member using the fully described details.

Score	Category	Description	Comments
5	Exemplary	Faculty members far exceeded the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	
4	Exceeds Expectations	Faculty members exceeded the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	
3	Meets Expectations	Faculty members met the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	
2	Needs Improvement	Faculty members' efforts and performance fell below department and/or college expectations in the performance area and did not meet the department expectations even at a minimal level. Extensive improvements are needed.	This rating in any area necessitates a PRP for tenured and tenure track faculty
1	Does Not Meet Expectations	Faculty member neglected their responsibilities in the performance area.	This rating in any area necessitates a PRP for tenured and tenure track faculty

*According to USG policy, "Institutions must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities must be factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage as noted in the 5-point scale." (BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)*

*The overall evaluation will weigh the rating in each area by the workload percentage in that area. The overall evaluation will then be rounded to the nearest whole number; however, the overall evaluation can be a maximum of 4 (cannot be 5) if there is a 1 in any area.*

**As per the University and College guidelines and the faculty handbook**, the faculty must address the issue of quality and significance of their contributions in the ARD and FPA. The burden of demonstration is on the faculty members, with the determination of the rating for each category made by the department chair. Also, there is not a direct one-to-one relationship or correlation between the annual review (ARD) overall ratings and the expectation and quality levels for promotion and tenure.

## 7. Multi-Year Review Schedules

As per the KSU Faculty Handbook (<https://handbooks.kennesaw.edu/https://handbooks.kennesaw.edu/>).

## 8. Revisions to P&T Guidelines

The CS Department Faculty Council (DFC) shall annually review the P&T guidelines during the Fall semester and make recommendations to the CS Chair and CS Faculty regarding needed revisions. Revisions to the guidelines shall be voted on by the CS faculty members and thereafter approved through the College and University as outlined in the University Faculty Handbook.

## 9. References

- Kennesaw State University Faculty Handbook (<https://handbooks.kennesaw.edu/>)
- College of Computing and Software Engineering P&T Document (<https://ccse.kennesaw.edu/faculty-resources/shared-governance%20.php>)

### Approval Form for Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A copy of this form, completed, must be attached as a cover sheet to the department guidelines included in portfolios for Pre-Tenure, Review, Promotion, and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review.

I confirm that the attached guidelines, dated 10 / 16 / 2023, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Computer Science in accordance with department bylaws:

DocuSigned by:  
  
C58D694F3FA84F2... \_\_\_\_\_ October 17, 2023  
 Name (printed or typed) /Department P&T Chair Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

DocuSigned by:  
  
E5840411E13C445... \_\_\_\_\_ October 17, 2023  
 Name (printed or typed) Signature/ Date


College P&T Committee Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

DocuSigned by:  
  
42BA9C4928944CF... \_\_\_\_\_ October 17, 2023  
 Name (printed or typed) Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

DocuSigned by:  
  
B04458D098CE4E8... \_\_\_\_\_ October 17, 2023  
 Name (printed or typed) Signature/ Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Ivan Pulinkala \_\_\_\_\_ November 15, 2023  
 Name (printed or typed)  Signature/ Date  
02FA0CC7B24D4B3...

**Certificate Of Completion**

Envelope Id: B57ECE0BF9F54A64BED2312558156B47	Status: Completed
Subject: Complete with DocuSign: CS_PT_Guidelines_final_Oct_2023.pdf	
Should this go to Agiloft?:	
Source Envelope:	
Document Pages: 20	Signatures: 1
Certificate Pages: 5	Initials: 2
AutoNav: Enabled	Envelope Originator: Leslie Downs ldowns@kennesaw.edu
Envelope Stamping: Enabled	IP Address: 130.218.12.38
Time Zone: (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)	


**Record Tracking**

Status: Original	Holder: Leslie Downs	Location: DocuSign
11/10/2023 11:23:23 AM	ldowns@kennesaw.edu	

**Signer Events**

Carmen Skaggs  
 cskaggs4@kennesaw.edu  
 Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs  
 Kennesaw State University  
 Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)

**Signature**




Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style  
 Using IP Address: 130.218.12.38

**Timestamp**

Sent: 11/10/2023 11:27:23 AM  
 Viewed: 11/10/2023 1:17:23 PM  
 Signed: 11/10/2023 1:17:39 PM

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:**  
 Accepted: 4/27/2020 12:44:36 PM  
 ID: b3e5295c-f92f-4fc5-bce9-bcc2afabc6aa

Pam Cole  
 pcole@kennesaw.edu  
 Interim Dean  
 Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)



Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style  
 Using IP Address: 130.218.12.38

Sent: 11/10/2023 1:17:40 PM  
 Viewed: 11/15/2023 4:48:41 PM  
 Signed: 11/15/2023 4:48:53 PM

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:**  
 Accepted: 11/15/2023 4:48:41 PM  
 ID: 079cd915-a85e-4d30-b385-7e57a1c595df

Ivan Pulinkala  
 ipulinka@kennesaw.edu  
 Provost/SVPAA  
 Kennesaw State University  
 Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)



DocuSigned by:  
 Ivan Pulinkala  
 02FA0CC7B24D4B3...

Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style  
 Using IP Address: 130.218.6.160  
 Signed using mobile

Sent: 11/15/2023 4:48:54 PM  
 Viewed: 11/15/2023 4:49:13 PM  
 Signed: 11/15/2023 4:49:36 PM

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:**  
 Accepted: 3/27/2019 4:28:48 PM  
 ID: 18dbcf9a-e404-4ba5-ac6b-d1516a1a5021

In Person Signer Events	Signature	Timestamp
Editor Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp
Agent Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp
Intermediary Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp
Certified Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Carbon Copy Events	Status	Timestamp
Leslie Downs ldowns@kennesaw.edu Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)	COPIED	Sent: 11/15/2023 4:49:37 PM
<b>Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:</b>		
Not Offered via DocuSign		

Witness Events	Signature	Timestamp
----------------	-----------	-----------

Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp
---------------	-----------	-----------

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	11/10/2023 11:27:23 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:49:13 PM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:49:36 PM
Completed	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:49:37 PM

Payment Events	Status	Timestamps
----------------	--------	------------

**Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure**

## **ELECTRONIC RECORD AND SIGNATURE DISCLOSURE**

From time to time, Kennesaw State University (we, us or Company) may be required by law to provide to you certain written notices or disclosures. Described below are the terms and conditions for providing to you such notices and disclosures electronically through the DocuSign system. Please read the information below carefully and thoroughly, and if you can access this information electronically to your satisfaction and agree to this Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure (ERSD), please confirm your agreement by selecting the check-box next to 'I agree to use electronic records and signatures' before clicking 'CONTINUE' within the DocuSign system.

### **Getting paper copies**

At any time, you may request from us a paper copy of any record provided or made available electronically to you by us. You will have the ability to download and print documents we send to you through the DocuSign system during and immediately after the signing session and, if you elect to create a DocuSign account, you may access the documents for a limited period of time (usually 30 days) after such documents are first sent to you. After such time, if you wish for us to send you paper copies of any such documents from our office to you, you will be charged a \$1.00 per-page fee. You may request delivery of such paper copies from us by following the procedure described below.

### **Withdrawing your consent**

If you decide to receive notices and disclosures from us electronically, you may at any time change your mind and tell us that thereafter you want to receive required notices and disclosures only in paper format. How you must inform us of your decision to receive future notices and disclosure in paper format and withdraw your consent to receive notices and disclosures electronically is described below.

### **Consequences of changing your mind**

If you elect to receive required notices and disclosures only in paper format, it will slow the speed at which we can complete certain steps in transactions with you and delivering services to you because we will need first to send the required notices or disclosures to you in paper format, and then wait until we receive back from you your acknowledgment of your receipt of such paper notices or disclosures. Further, you will no longer be able to use the DocuSign system to receive required notices and consents electronically from us or to sign electronically documents from us.

### **All notices and disclosures will be sent to you electronically**

Unless you tell us otherwise in accordance with the procedures described herein, we will provide electronically to you through the DocuSign system all required notices, disclosures, authorizations, acknowledgements, and other documents that are required to be provided or made available to you during the course of our relationship with you. To reduce the chance of you inadvertently not receiving any notice or disclosure, we prefer to provide all of the required notices and disclosures to you by the same method and to the same address that you have given us. Thus, you can receive all the disclosures and notices electronically or in paper format through the paper mail delivery system. If you do not agree with this process, please let us know as described below. Please also see the paragraph immediately above that describes the consequences of your electing not to receive delivery of the notices and disclosures electronically from us.

### **How to contact Kennesaw State University:**

You may contact us to let us know of your changes as to how we may contact you electronically, to request paper copies of certain information from us, and to withdraw your prior consent to receive notices and disclosures electronically as follows:

To contact us by email send messages to: [asklegal@kennesaw.edu](mailto:asklegal@kennesaw.edu)

### **To advise Kennesaw State University of your new email address**

To let us know of a change in your email address where we should send notices and disclosures electronically to you, you must send an email message to us at [service@kennesaw.edu](mailto:service@kennesaw.edu) and in the body of such request you must state: your previous email address, your new email address. We do not require any other information from you to change your email address.

If you created a DocuSign account, you may update it with your new email address through your account preferences.

### **To request paper copies from Kennesaw State University**

To request delivery from us of paper copies of the notices and disclosures previously provided by us to you electronically, you must send us an email to [service@kennesaw.edu](mailto:service@kennesaw.edu) and in the body of such request you must state your email address, full name, mailing address, and telephone number. You will be billed for any per-page fees, plus shipping and handling, at the time incurred.

### **To withdraw your consent with Kennesaw State University**

To inform us that you no longer wish to receive future notices and disclosures in electronic format you may:



- i. decline to sign a document from within your signing session, and on the subsequent page, select the check-box indicating you wish to withdraw your consent, or you may;
- ii. send us an email to [asklegal@kennesaw.edu](mailto:asklegal@kennesaw.edu) and in the body of such request you must state your email, full name, mailing address, and telephone number. We do not need any other information from you to withdraw consent.. The consequences of your withdrawing consent for online documents will be that transactions may take a longer time to process..

### **Required hardware and software**

The minimum system requirements for using the DocuSign system may change over time. The current system requirements are found here: <https://support.docusign.com/guides/signer-guide-signing-system-requirements>.

### **Acknowledging your access and consent to receive and sign documents electronically**

To confirm to us that you can access this information electronically, which will be similar to other electronic notices and disclosures that we will provide to you, please confirm that you have read this ERSD, and (i) that you are able to print on paper or electronically save this ERSD for your future reference and access; or (ii) that you are able to email this ERSD to an email address where you will be able to print on paper or save it for your future reference and access. Further, if you consent to receiving notices and disclosures exclusively in electronic format as described herein, then select the check-box next to ‘I agree to use electronic records and signatures’ before clicking ‘CONTINUE’ within the DocuSign system.

By selecting the check-box next to ‘I agree to use electronic records and signatures’, you confirm that:

- You can access and read this Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure; and
- You can print on paper this Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure, or save or send this Electronic Record and Disclosure to a location where you can print it, for future reference and access; and
- Until or unless you notify Kennesaw State University as described above, you consent to receive exclusively through electronic means all notices, disclosures, authorizations, acknowledgements, and other documents that are required to be provided or made available to you by Kennesaw State University during the course of your relationship with Kennesaw State University.