

Computer Science Department

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation and P&T Guidelines

Previous version approved: 1/18/17. Current version approved on 5/27/2020

Table of Contents

	<u>Page #</u>
1. Introduction	2
A. Department Overview	2
B. Philosophy and Intent	2
2. Categories of Faculty Performance	3
A. Teaching	3
1. Mandatory Teaching Activities	3
2. Significant Teaching Activities	4
3. Teaching and Course Assessment	4
4. Teaching Quality and Breadth	6
5. Class Size and Workload	6
B. Scholarship and Creative Activity	6
1. Scholarship and Creative Activity Categories	7
2. Examples of Scholarship Products	7
C. Professional Service	9
1. Mandatory Service Activities	9
2. Regular Service Activities	10
3. Significant Service Activities	10
3. Overview of Workload Models	11
4. Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance	13
5. Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review	14
6. Faculty Review Process	15
7. Multi-Year Review Schedules	15
8. Revisions to P&T Guidelines	15
9. References	15
10. Approvals	15

1. Introduction

Below is a brief overview of the Department of Computer Science and the philosophy and intent of these 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 successful 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 Analytics and Data Science.

The department thrives to provide an applied computing education with a good solid foundation in computing principles. Computer Science is a difficult 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 ABET, the Accreditation Board for Engineers and Technology.

All CS faculty members are expected to be leaders in teaching excellence or quickly developing to become leaders in teaching; all are expected to be active in their professional scholarship; and all are expected to be active in professional service. The department supports tenure-track research-intensive faculty by reducing their teaching workload in order to support their development as excellent instructors and scholars. Tenured and Full Professors 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 a 4-5 lecturer model to a 1-2 research-intensive model, allowing faculty to develop, excel, and contribute at various stages of their careers.

The department recognizes and values faculty leadership and quality work in all three areas, Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA), and Professional Service. 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 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 emphasis, allowing 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); values

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

and rewards 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 rewards 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 activities and interact with colleagues in a respectful and professional manner, treating each faculty member as a valued colleague and abiding by relevant professional code of conduct. The guidelines are designed to also 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 and incentives 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.

Due to the CS field constantly changing, it requires dynamic efforts in staying current in the field. The expected and mandatory teaching activities are outlined below:

1. **Mandatory Teaching Activities:** *(All activities in this category are required of ALL faculty)*

- 1) Achieving consistent good performance as evidenced by student evaluations.
- 2) 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.
- 3) Designing and updating online sites/presentations and online course management sites.
- 4) Developing and practicing personal teaching philosophy, consistent with the department's mission.
- 5) 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.
- 6) Continually developing and revising lecture materials, tests, assignments, labs, projects and other course materials based on student feedback and topic changes.
- 7) Adopting different teaching methods that are appropriate for the course topics (such as individual instruction, individual and group projects, and pedagogical innovation).
- 8) Teaching effectively using distance learning technologies, when applicable.
- 9) Identifying a set of courses within the department programs to teach in support of the degree programs and students' needs. (See **Teaching Quality & Breadth** below).

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

2. Significant Teaching Activities: Leadership and significant contributions in teaching include, but not limited to, the following:

- 1) Achieving consistent excellent performance as evidenced, in part by student evaluations, by FCARs, and other means.
- 2) Being recognized by both students and colleagues as a very good teacher.
- 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 program students, service learning, and special projects.
- 7) Mentoring high school interns on directed studies, and special topics.
- 8) Leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of a new pedagogy paradigm.
- 9) Serving as the lead, other than program coordinator or director roles, in a program redesign or developing a new program or course sequence.
- 10) Leadership in mentoring a new colleague in teaching and classroom management.
- 11) Teaching a short course abroad.
- 12) Teaching of large class sections.

3. Teaching and Course Assessment: Teaching and course activities, contributions, and effectiveness are assessed using measurable outcomes from teaching and course evaluations with 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., Explorance Blue, 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.

Survey Questions Used for Evaluation

The following questions from the current survey instrument shall be used by the CS department in accessing teaching effectiveness: (1) *The instructor was effective in helping me learn,* (2) *Evaluation method was clearly established and explained,* (3) *Exams and assignments are graded fairly,* (4) *The instructor clearly established objectives,* (5) *The instructor appears well prepared and organized,* (6) *The instructor treats students with respect,* (7) *The instructor enhanced interest in topic,* (8) *The instructor encouraged in-depth thinking,* (9) *The instructor challenged me in the course.*

Credible Response Rates

For each individual course, surveys with response rates greater than 25% with 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 25% or less 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

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

respond, including setting a time frame during class for students to respond.

- 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.

OPTIONAL MECHANISMS

- 1) 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, a 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 process in administering the instrument must 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 copies 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 the grades were submitted and in providing some proof of such (i.e., 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.
- 2) CS faculty members can also consider using: (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

B. Assessment Ratings

Teaching and course activities, contributions, and effectiveness will be rated in four general categories described below: (1) Exceeding Expectations (EX), (2) Meeting Expectations (ME), or (3) Not Meeting Expectations (NM).

Exceeding Expectations (EX) Rating:

Consistent excellent teaching performance as evidenced by student evaluations with credible response rates and measurable outcomes (average overall rating between 3.5 and 4, on a scale of 1 to 4)

Meeting Expectations (ME) Ratings:

ME rating is receiving student evaluations with credible response rates that are

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

consistently at the average assessment range for the particular course. The Meeting Expectations (ME) average overall rating should range between 2.0 and 3.4.

Not Meeting (NM) Expectations Rating:

An unsatisfactory rating occurs when a faculty member does not achieve a meeting expectations rating or better (average overall rating between 1.0 and 1.9)

- 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.
- 1) Faculty will review the list of courses that are planned to be offered during the up-and-coming year(s) as part of the FPA process.
 - 2) The list of courses becomes one input into the scheduling process; faculty will be able to indicate their priority choices from the list of courses being offered by the programs. Faculty will be able to review and provide feedback on the draft schedule.
 - 3) Faculty input and list of preferred courses may be overridden by curriculum needs and priorities in a given semester.
 - 4) All **CS faculty members with graduate status** are required to identify a list of a minimum of six (6) primary courses, including at least 2 required graduate courses and 2 required undergraduate courses. For the graduate level courses, the faculty should have evidence of expertise in the subject matter of the courses. For the undergraduate courses, the faculty should have evidence of expertise and/or a demonstrated interest in the subject matter of the courses.
 - 5) All **CS faculty members without graduate status** are required to identify a list of six (6) primary courses, consisting of 4 upper-division courses, 2 of which must be required courses. The faculty member should have evidence of expertise and/or a demonstrated interest in the subject matter of the courses.

5. Class Size and Workload

The CS department establishes, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught. The undergraduate class size is typically 40, whereas graduate class size is typically 25, unless otherwise stated, and subject to change based on the need of department. The minimum class size for undergraduate classes is 14 while it is 9 for the graduate classes. The department chair has flexibility in establishing class size to meet student demand with consultation from the Department Faculty Council (DFC) and teaching faculty. Department Chair will ensure Faculty equity in class sizes. All efforts will be made to have total student number in a year close to the average class size times the number of course load.

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, and grant writing that is submitted and reviewed by appropriate agencies.

Key to the appropriate valuation of scholarship product 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. A department level Research Task Force Committee will be appointed to maintain a consolidated list of suitable and vetted conference and journal outlets in which faculty members have published or could publish. This list will be updated throughout the year. Outlets

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

for conferences and journals will be removed from the list if standards drop below an acceptable level.

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 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 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 30% or more workload effort dedicated to Scholarship and Creative Activity, are expected to submit 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, 1B 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.

Table 1A. CS Department Examples of Regular Publication and Scholarship Products				
<i>(Not every one of the following is required each year)</i>				
	Description	Reviewable Product	Load or Percentage	Reviewer
1	Appropriate publications in magazines, where the review is editorial.	Publication	7%	External editor or editorial board.
2	Abstracts, Short Papers, Posters and Workshop Papers.	Publication	7%	External peer review.

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

3	Book chapter or edited books.	Publication	10%	External review: Publisher and reviewers
4	ACM and IEEE conference and journal products with acceptance rates of 35% or above (refer to list).	Publication	12% (1 st), 9% (2 ^{nd+}) ^{1A1}	External peer review.
5	Other conferences and journal products with acceptance rates ranging 35%-55% (refer to list). These venues may be regional, national or international.	Publication	10-12% (1 st), 7-9% (2 ^{nd+}) ^{1A-1}	External peer review.
6	Patent Application	Application	5%	External Review: Patent office
7	Development of a prototype of a commercial grade product or the development of a free open-source	Prototype	5%	Internal Review, KSU Legal Affairs, # downloads
8	Development of commercial grade product	Commercial product with joint KSU ownership	10%	Investor, funding agency, adoption rate, or end-user feedback

^{1A-1} If the leading author(s) is/are a student of a faculty member, the faculty member will be considered the first author.

Table 1B. CS Department Examples of Significant Publications and Scholarship Products

(Not every one of the following is required each year)

	Description	Reviewable Product	Load or Percentage	Reviewer
1	ACM and IEEE conference and journal products with acceptance rates below 35% (refer to list).	Publication	20% (1 st), 15% (2 ^{nd+}) ^{1B-1}	External peer review.
2	Other conferences and journal products with acceptance rates below 35% (refer to list). These venues may be national or international.	Publication	15-20% (1 st), 10-15% (2 ^{nd+}) ^{1B-1}	External peer review.
3	Textbook publications	Publication	15%	External review: Publisher & reviewers
4	Patents	Patent	15%	External Review: Patent office

^{1B-1} If the leading author(s) is/are a student of a faculty member, the faculty member will be considered the first author.

Table 1C. CS Department Proposal and Grant Products

(These items are required for particular workload models in Table 3)

	Description	Reviewable Product	Load or Percentage	Reviewer
1	External Proposal 1. Evidence of competitiveness 2. \$65K or more per year per PI	Grant application	10%	KSU grants office or Funding Agency

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

2	Funded Small grants, contracts or projects 1. The total amount - \$25K-\$50K per year per PI 2. Internal grants, excluding the CCSE grants	Award letter	10%	Internal peer review panel Funding agency
3	Funded Medium grants, contracts or projects The total amount- \$50K-\$150K per year per PI	Award letter	20%	Funding Agency
4	Funded Large grants, contracts or projects The total amount- \$150K or higher per year per PI	Award letter	30%	Funding Agency

C. Professional Service

All faculty members are expected to participate in service activities, with the level of expectation varying with 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 member 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 teaching 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.

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 are 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%, 10%) of the faculty member's overall workload is to be selected from the *regular* and/or *significant* service categories. Not all of the 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 for their service load.

1. **Mandatory Service Activities:** (*All service activities in this category are required for ALL faculty and constitutes 5% of the overall workload*)

Table 2A. CS Department Mandatory Service Activities	
Mandatory Service Activities:	Load or Percentage
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 one graduation event per academic year (Fall or Spring). A summer graduation ceremony is required if teaching in the summer. 5) Participate in one student service activity that supports the department or college (i.e. student orientation, preview day, C-Day, CCSE Annual Cookout, IEEE/ACM chapter events, etc.)	5% of the overall workload model for all listed activities

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

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

Table 2B. CS Department Examples of Regular Service Contributions <i>(Not every one of the following is required each year)</i>		
Regular Service Activities:		Load or Percentage
1	Attending an additional graduation event.	1% per ceremony
2	Serving on a department, college or university committee.	3% per committee per year
3	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.).	1% per activity
4	Serving on an Ad-hoc committee for the department, college or university.	1.5% per committee per semester
5	Serving as a reviewer. Reviewing papers for a conference or journal.	2.5% per conference or journal
6	Serving as conference Session Chair.	2% per conference
7	Serving on national and international professional organizations or committees (i.e. ACM, IEEE, etc.).	2% per organization or committee
8	Serving on conference program committee.	2% per conference
9	Participating in program accreditation, external to KSU (i.e. ABET review team, SACS review, etc.).	2% per semester
10	Participating in a civic or community event (i.e. K-12 events, etc.).	1% per event
11	Serving in a civic or community organization representing KSU (i.e. Cobb County Chamber of commerce, Cobb County EXCEL leadership academy, etc.).	1% per organization per year
12	Giving a CS seminar talk or other venue talk (non-peer reviewed)	1.5% per talk
13	Serving as a course coordinator	2% per course per year
14	Mentoring high school interns on research projects.	1.5% per student per year
15	Serving thesis or dissertation committee.	1.5% per committee per defense
16	Professional development efforts related to the discipline (i.e. attendance of conferences, workshops, training, webinars, etc.)	2-3% per conference

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

Table 2C. CS Department Examples of Significant Service Contributions <i>(Not every one of the following is required each year)</i>		
Significant Service Activities:		Load or Percentage
1	Serving as chair of a department or college committee.	additional 1% per committee per year
2	Serving on an NSF (or equivalent) grant reviewing panel or serving on a review panel or committee.	5% per review panel
3	Serving in a department leadership role that doesn't receive course releases or re-assigned time.	2% per assignment per year
4	Serving as chair of a university level committee.	additional 1% per committee per year
5	Serving as a chair of an Ad-hoc committee for the department or college.	additional 1% per committee per semester/year
6	Serving as a chair of an Ad-hoc committee for the university.	additional 1% per committee per semester/year

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

7	Serving on conference organizing committees (i.e. General Chair, Program Chair, Proceedings Chair, Tutorial/Workshop Chair, Treasurer, Publicity Chair/Webmaster, etc.)	2% per conference
8	Serving as a faculty sponsor for a local or regional student organization. (i.e. WIT advisor, ACM/IEEE Student Chapter Advisor, etc.)	2% per organization
9	Serving as the keynote or guest speaker for a conference or event.	5% per occurrence
10	Chairing thesis or dissertation committee.	additional 1% per committee per defense
11	Leadership in mentoring a new colleague with S/CA.	2.5% per colleague per year
12	Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students on research projects.	2% per project or Study per year
13	Serving on editorial boards or as editor (or associate editor) of proceedings or journals.	5% per journal or proceeding or board per year
14	Serving as a leader for a civic or community organization representing KSU (i.e. Cobb County Chamber of commerce, Cobb County EXCEL leadership academy, etc.).	additional 1% per organization per year

3. Overview of Workload Models

The university faculty handbook provides a common model and vocabulary to describe the varied work which faculty members do 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 equivalences for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research), be formally negotiated and incorporated into the faculty assessment process.
- 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) 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

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

understood to be the primary basis for Promotion and Tenure decisions. Table 3 describes the CS department faculty workload models and respective rank-based expectations in Teaching, Service, and Scholarship.

Table 3: CS Department Faculty Workload Models and Rank-Based Expectations				
Workload Model	Emphasis & Rating²	Teaching Expectations	Service Expectations	Scholarship & Creative Activity Expectations
<u>Teaching-Intensive¹</u> 5-5	<u>Teaching:</u> Limited-Term	100% of Effort		
<u>Teaching-Intensive¹</u> 4-5	<u>Teaching:</u> Lecturer & Senior Lecturer	90% of Effort	10% of Effort	
<u>Teaching-Intensive¹</u> 4-4	<u>Teaching:</u> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	80% of Effort	15% of Effort	5% of Effort
<u>Teaching-Intensive¹</u> 3-4	<u>Teaching:</u> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	70% of Effort	10% of Effort	20% of Effort One regular publication product per year
<u>Balanced-Workload</u> 3-3 Graduate Faculty status required	<u>Balanced Scholarship:</u> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	60% of Effort	10% of Effort	30% of Effort 1. One regular publication product per year 2. Evidence of competitive grants' submissions
<u>Scholarship-Intensive</u> 2-3 Graduate Faculty status <i>and</i> funding activity required.	<u>Scholarship:</u> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	50% of Effort	10% of Effort	40% of Effort 1. One significant publication product per year 2. Evidence of competitive grants' submissions 3. Small grants
<u>Research- Leadership</u> 2-2 Graduate Faculty status <i>and</i> external funding activity required.	<u>Scholarship:</u> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	40% of Effort	10% of Effort	50% of Effort 1. One significant publication product per year 2. Evidence of competitive grants' 3. Medium grants
<u>Research- Intensive</u> 1-2 Graduate Faculty status <i>and</i> external funding activity required.	<u>Scholarship:</u> Tenure Track & Tenured Faculty	30% of Effort	10% of Effort	60% of Effort 1. One significant publication product per year 2. Evidence of competitive grants' submissions 3. Large grants

¹ 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 make an effort to minimize teaching preps by assigning multiple sections of the same course with courses in the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.

² The corresponding overall ratings guidelines for the Teaching Emphasis, Balanced Emphasis, and Scholarship Emphasis workload models can be found in Sections 5.

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 of time and energy:

1. Teaching focus and emphasis
2. Scholarship and research focus and emphasis
3. An emphasis that balances teaching and scholarship

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 a 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 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) (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 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**, and **Professional Service**) will be assessed using the recommended rubric of ratings in Section 5.

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

1. Exceeds expectations (EX)
2. Meets expectations (ME)
3. 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 in 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 insinuate the relative weight or load for each of the categories of faculty performance.

Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science

The annual reviews ratings are issued by the department Chair with Dean's oversight. The department chair shall develop a rubric with consultation with DFC for performance evaluation for the overall rating. For transparency and fairness, the chair shall distribute the rubric to faculty members.

5. Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

The philosophy, expectations and workload models in this document apply for departmental expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review. Faculty members who are applying for promotion are expected to already be performing above their level of current expectations (Table 3) and at the rank to which they apply.

Faculty member going up for promotion are advised that they must already be performing at the next rank. Also, there is no direct one-to-one relationship or correlation between the annual reviews (ARD) overall ratings and expectation and quality levels for promotion and tenure. The annual reviews ratings are issued by the department Chair with Dean's oversight. The promotion and tenure evaluation and decision(s) are issued by various committees and individuals. The P&T committee and the chair shall use following recommended rubric to assign rating for individual areas while evaluating both P&T documents and/or ARD documents. The P&T committee and the Chair can assign other rating to individual areas with sufficient justifications.

1. Exceeds expectations (EX) is going far and beyond the Meets expectations (ME) rating
2. Meets expectations (ME) (achieves 90%-100%)
3. Does not meet (NM) expectations (achieves below 90%)

A. 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 rank and workload models. Faculty need to note that at least 5 publications at significant contribution level (Table 1B) and funded research (Table 1C) are required before applying for promotion. The CS department uses the following equivalent terms compared to Kennesaw State University's Faculty Handbook - <https://handbooks.kennesaw.edu/>: **Regular** equals *Satisfactory* and **Significant** equals *Noteworthy*.

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 *Regular and/or Significant Professional Service*.

2. 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*.

3. 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)

*Guidelines for Faculty Performance and Evaluation, Department of Computer Science***4. Post-Tenure Review**

The CS department places importance on the requirement that all faculty members who have received tenure in the department continue to be active and productive members of the faculty throughout their careers. The process of post-tenure review, which is undergone by all KSU faculty members at five-year intervals after receiving tenure, is described in the KSU Faculty Handbook.

6. Faculty Review Process

As per university and college guidelines and the faculty handbook with the following exception: 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 reviews (ARD) overall ratings and the expectation and quality levels for promotion and tenure.

7. Multi-Year Review Schedules

As per university faculty handbook - <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>
- Report of Summary Data for Student Ratings of Instructor Effectiveness: Fall 2015 to Fall 2016, January 12, 2017, Thomas Pusateri, KSU CETL

10. Approvals:**Approved By: (Sign and Date)**

DocuSigned by:
 May 21, 2020

C58D694F3FA84F2...
Victor Clincy, CS Dept Faculty Committee Chair **Date**

DocuSigned by:
 May 21, 2020

028A87E4965A4EE...
Coskun Cetinkaya, CS Department Chair **Date**

DocuSigned by:
 May 26, 2020

3CC6DE9650C4466...
Jon Preston, CCSE College Dean **Date**

DocuSigned by:
 May 27, 2020

11EA3F49C7FD4B9...
Kathy Schwaig, Provost of Kennesaw State University **Date**