Kennesaw State University
Academic Affairs

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 / 20 / 2023, were approved by the faculty of the School of Data Science and Analytics in accordance with School bylaws:

Marla M. Bell   October 30, 2023
_____
Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair   Signature/ Date

School Director Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Dr Sherrill Hayes   October 30, 2023
_____
Name (printed or typed)   Signature/ Date

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

Patrick Bobbie   November 1, 2023
_____
Name (printed or typed)   Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Sumanth Yenduri   October 30, 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

Kennesaw State University

College of Computing and Software Engineering

School of Data Science and Analytics

Guidelines for Faculty Performance, Promotion, and Tenure

October 20, 2023

Table of Contents

I.   Introduction

The School of Data Science and Analytics is a unit within the College of Computing and Software Engineering (CCSE) at Kennesaw State University. The school is a collaborative, collegial, and diverse group of scholars who value excellence in teaching, mentorship, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service. Faculty strive to be active in campus leadership and interdisciplinary research. The school is successful in research activities involving undergraduate and graduate students.

Faculty members' performance is evaluated annually and through periodic multi-year reviews: third-year review/third-year pre-tenure review, review for promotion, review for promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review (PTR).

University guidelines concerning performance and evaluation for promotion and tenure are provided in the Section VII linked KSU Faculty Handbook. The guidelines published here are intended to supplement and elaborate on university and college guidelines as applied to faculty in the School of Data Science and Analytics (SDSA). This document provides school-specific guidelines that will be used as the primary basis for evaluating faculty in their annual reviews, as well as determining promotion and/or tenure (P&T) decisions. A faculty member should consult the KSU Faculty Handbook, the CCSE P&T Guidelines (Section VII links) and this document as they establish goals and prepare portfolios for the annual and/or promotion and tenure reviews. Lists provided in this document are not exhaustive, but instead provide a limited number of examples. It is not expected that all faculty members will do all activities listed, but activities should be appropriate for each faculty member's rank. All continuous activities in the three basic categories of performance by faculty must consist of scholarly reflection which as defined in Section 3.4 of the Faculty Handbook is a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic, and planned, measured and evaluated, and revised and rethought. Because department promotion and tenure (P&T) guidelines are discipline-specific and are approved by deans and the Provost as consistent with college and University standards, those guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review recommendations and decisions. Therefore, at all levels of review the rationale for these decisions will be stated in a letter to the candidate with specific and detailed reference to the department review guidelines used to justify the recommendations and decisions that have been made.

II.   Faculty Performance Areas and Student Success

The three basic categories of faculty performance are: 1) Teaching, 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA), and 3) Professional Service (PS). Faculty performance expectations by rank for tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track lecturers and senior lecturers are discussed in Section 3.5 and 3.10 of the Faculty Handbook, respectively. This section provides guidance with respect to school-specific activities in each performance area. Additionally, this section discusses student success in SDSA.

In all performance areas, SDSA values the quality and significance of work. Reviewers in the review process may not be subject matter experts, so it is incumbent upon a faculty member to discuss, evaluate, and document the quality and significance of their accomplishments in each performance area for proper evaluation. As indicated in the Faculty Handbook (Section 3.3.B.), *merely citing or enumerating individual tasks, courses taught, projects, and accomplishments does*

not address quality and significance. This section provides examples of quality and significance markers in each performance area.

Section 3.4 of the Faculty Handbook defines *scholarly* as *a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic, and planned, measured and evaluated, and revised and rethought* while *scholarship is defined as tangible, disseminated, and peer reviewed products that arise from faculty activities in any performance area.* Every faculty member is expected to demonstrate scholarly activity in all performance areas. Faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are expected to produce *scholarship* in either Teaching or S/CA. Merely resubmitting the same unsuccessful journal article, conference talk and/or proceeding, conference session, funding application, etc. without scholarly reflection and revision is not sufficient to meet the criterion for Promotion and/or Tenure. Scholarship of PS alone is not sufficient to meet the criterion for Promotion and/or Tenure. Examples of scholarship include, but are not limited to:
- Dissemination of results in publications from peer-reviewed scientific or professional journals.
- Peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences, consortia, or seminars.
- Award of externally funded grants (regardless of role).
- Textbooks, educational web-based products, computer software, and similar published materials are considered scholarship if they have been externally reviewed.

Specific expectations and ratings for annual evaluations are in Section IV while specific expectations for promotion and/or tenure are in Section V.

A. Teaching

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, *Highly effective teaching and learning are the central institutional priorities of Kennesaw State University.* Thus, teaching and mentoring effectiveness are considered fundamental and essential for continued faculty employment, tenure, and promotion in rank. Faculty are expected to approach their teaching in a *scholarly manner* using **data** to improve teaching and mentoring, student success, and student learning.

Basic Expectations and Responsibilities for teaching at KSU are in Section 2.4 of the Faculty Handbook. CCSE expectations for teaching are in Section II.A of the CCSE Guidelines. states for college-specific teaching expectations.

Teaching activities within SDSA may include, but are not limited to:
- Developing new programs, courses, curricula, certificates, etc.
- Teaching across a variety of instructional modalities (such as face-to-face, instructional laboratory, seminar, directed study, online, hybrid, study abroad, etc.)
- Employ forms of experiential learning and other high impact practices
- Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students in research
- Improving the professionalism/innovation of existing course pedagogical approaches in areas, such as lecture materials/activities, assessment methods, study guides, worksheets, manuals, and similar materials. Actions are validated by appropriate feedback and performance.
- Incorporating new pedagogical methods into classes, such as group activities, computational or software exercises, teaching with technology, etc.

- Fostering student success activities to enhance performance and progression, including advising and career mentorship.
- Encouraging and supporting undergraduate and/or graduate students in research.
- Serving and/or chairing dissertation committees.
- Participating in faculty development to stay current in the teaching field, to increase student success, etc.

To assess *quality and significance* of teaching effectiveness, faculty members will use student feedback surveys administered by the university and at least one additional measure. Faculty should specifically address any modifications or improvements that were made (or why none were made), based on the findings of the assessment. Section 2.5 of the Faculty Handbook lists many examples of measures to assess *teaching effectiveness*. Examples of such additional sources of assessment of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation feedback of classroom instruction performance and/or course materials by an experienced faculty member.
- Assessment of student learning based on data. One such approach is the CCSE Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR).
- Samples of course materials (syllabi, a schedule outlining content, instructional materials, learning objectives, activities, formal and informal assessments, project guidelines, redacted student work samples, etc.)
- Explanation of a situational context's impact on pedagogy (e.g., special courses, such as data intensive lab/project courses and/or large lecture courses or online courses).
- Letters and/or reflections from students, graduates, alumni or SDSA/KSU entities (e.g., KSU Career Services Center) commenting on how teaching or mentoring influenced academic growth. Clearly indicate if a letter was solicited or unsolicited.
- Explanation of work with other SDSA or KSU entities (e.g., Student Success Initiative, Learning Support, Learning Community Program, Career Center/Experiential Learning, Inclusion and Equity) and the impact on teaching or student learning.
- Student participation in school activities and conferences, such as Analytics Day, SAS SESUG Annual Conference, etc.
- Externally validated supplemental assessment instruments administered by the faculty member or peer. An externally validated instrument is one that has been endorsed by a peer or other outside party. Examples of supplemental assessment instruments include student questionnaires that gather learning focused feedback, pre- and post-content assessments, and concept inventories.
- Teaching, mentoring and/or advising awards.
- Scholarship of teaching (publications on innovative teaching strategies).
- Developing grants for external and internal teaching-related awards.
- Document incorporation of new approaches to instruction learned at a conference or workshop and their impact on teaching or student learning.

B. Scholarship and Creative Activity
Faculty members in SDSA have academic backgrounds from a wide range of academic disciplines. Many faculty from the school routinely participate in collaborative, interdisciplinary,

and multidisciplinary research projects, some involving multiple investigators, institutions, and/or centers. Section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook states, *Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, cross-institutional, international, or community-engaged research programs are highly valued.* Being part of a research team is a common and encouraged role for the school's faculty, in some cases, collaborative and team science may be an individuals' primary scholarship. Collaborative work of this nature furthers the research output and recognition of the university. Collaborative, interdisciplinary research can have implications for authorship, individual credit, the rate at which research findings are disseminated, and even dissemination locations (e.g., more specialized journal for target audience, but lower impact factor). This type of work is valued in the promotion and tenure process, even though the SDSA faculty member who works on the project may not be the lead (or even senior) author on the publication or a PI/co-PI on the grant. As will be reiterated throughout these guidelines, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to explain their role in and the quality and significance of collaborative scholarship, so that anyone reviewing can clearly understand without the need to be a disciplinary expert.

It is important that faculty establish a coherent or common theme in their S/CA work, especially in interdisciplinary work. This theme may be either in a subject matter of another discipline where the faculty member has expertise (e.g., education, social science, genetics, etc.) or the theme may be in a specific statistical topic (e.g., methods, neural networks, quality control, data mining, etc.) where the candidate uses their expertise in collaboration with multiple other disciplines.

Scholarship activity for SDSA in S/CA may include, but is not limited to:
- Establishing an active, focused, sustainable research program.
- Primary data collection (including recruitment and sampling, data tools dissemination, data collection, review of incoming data for quality purposes, and longitudinal follow ups and reminders)
- Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students in research projects and/or related activities resulting in dissemination of results.
- Establishing collaborative research relationships within the school, college, or university, or with colleagues at other organizations (such as other institutions, industry partners, non-profits, educational systems, non-government organizations, etc.) which lead to scholarship and/or other scholarly activity.
- Developing/Acquiring funding for research through external grants and contracts (as principal investigator, co-investigator, senior personnel, or consultants)

S/CA activities are required for tenured/tenure-track faculty as addressed in Section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook. *The minimum workload effort in this area expected for a tenure-track or tenured teaching faculty expecting to be tenured and/or promoted is 20%.*

SDSA recognizes that the activities and products of S/CA will vary from person to person. The faculty member's contributions will be reviewed by peers with specific emphasis on the quality and significance of the work. The faculty member is responsible for providing evidence of quality and significance in their review materials using examples and supporting evidence as outlined below, as reviewers are likely to be from various disciplines and may not be experts in the research area. The ratings provided by the reviewers will be based on the faculty member's evidence provided.

Scholarship products: The minimum SDSA expectation in S/CA is one scholarship product every 6 years per 10% S/CA in their workload. *This is a baseline and <u>not</u> an absolute.* Quality and impact of scholarship is always more important than quantity. SDSA recognizes that the research process follows a cyclical pattern which includes a planning phase (identify question, lit review, establish a plan), an active phase (data collection, perform analyses, and actively investigate), a transferring/productive phase (writing manuscripts and disseminating results) and the pace through phases varies greatly across disciplines, projects, and faculty within the school. SDSA encourages faculty to involve undergraduate and/or graduate students in their scholarship activities and recognizes that this practice often takes longer to achieve substantial results. These contextual situations should be outlined by the faculty member and taken into consideration by reviewers. When evaluating faculty from such a range of disciplines, differences in the time required for establishing a research program, developing collaborative relationships, time required for data collection and analysis, and need for external funds must be taken into account.

> <u>Scholarship</u> for faculty in the school may appear in journals, conferences, and professional outlets in a variety of disciplines associated with data science and analytics. The faculty member's work on such projects is held to the same level of scrutiny for its quality and significance as it would be if it was part of discipline-based research. Evidence of individual contributions to the work, as well as the quality and significance of the work, should be documented. If not the primary lead, a letter from the lead author or PI of the project/grant indicating the faculty contributions and academic value added to the project is a typical approach, along with any relevant reviewer comments.

> **Funding for Scholarship:** SDSA faculty with more than 10% of their workload assigned to S/CA must *pursue* external funding unless currently supported on externally funded work. Funding for scholarship may be obtained directly from external funding sources (e.g., federal, foundation, industry, etc.) or through one of KSU departments/schools, centers, and/or institutes, such as the Center for Data Science and Analytics (CDSA), with connections to funding organizations. Faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion must successfully obtain external funding related to their scholarship OR if unsuccessful must demonstrate a persistent, scholarly, and cyclical approach (and provide supporting evidence) to the pursuit of external funding consistent with a strong promise of being funded in the future. Funding granted by the college, university, or USG System Office is not considered external. Faculty must demonstrate a scholarly approach to the pursuit of external funding in their annual review document (ARD), unless they are currently working on a funded project. This pursuit is expected to increase in intensity with S/CA workload. External funding providing direct course buyouts, as well as director and dean approval, is required for more than 50% workload in S/CA (CCSE P&T Guidelines II.B).

> One's funding pursuits should align with one's research objectives. Funding amounts, terms, and roles vary across the different disciplines within SDSA, a one-size-fits-all threshold amount is not appropriate for such a diverse faculty. Therefore, each faculty member should discuss the quality and significance of funding received in context of their research agenda and discipline.

> It is natural to expect that junior faculty having recently earned their doctorate or who are new to academia have yet to be trained in funding pursuits. First and second year activities should include, but are not limited to, applying for internal funding, and attending grant writing

workshops to learn the process. Growth in rank can be demonstrated by leveraging these initial small successes to larger external attempts. Initial unfunded funding submissions, through the process of cyclical reflection and improvement should lead to external funding success.

Examples of Quality and Significance Markers for Scholarship Products: Examples of scholarship products and accompanying supporting evidence that can be used by faculty to demonstrate the quality and significance of S/CA may include but are not limited to:

- Peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations. When available and relevant, faculty should include some of the following (but not necessarily all):
  - Impact factor and/or acceptance rate for the journal or conference.
  - The number of citations by others in the field (H-index).
  - For multi-authored papers, documentation of quality and significance of the contribution should include letter(s) from coauthor(s) or other documentation addressing the provided scholarship.
- Grants, Contracts, or Any External Funding Sources. When available and relevant, faculty should include some of the following (but not necessarily all):
  - Evidence of funded grants or contracts total amount, expected research expenditure per calendar year, simplified breakdown of grant expenditure categories (e.g. faculty, students, equipment, travel, etc.)
  - Explanation of impact of funding on scholarly goals/trajectory.
  - Degree of competitiveness of the program or funding agency (i.e., number of proposals received and funded by the funding agency or program).
  - Letter from PI or co-PIs that documents the significance of the contribution to the success of the proposal and your role in the proposed project.
  - Documentation on the project and results from obtaining external funding addressing the faculty member's contribution.
  - For unfunded proposals: All reviewer comments and any score/measure provided by the funding unit, if available. A scholarly reflection that includes resubmission plans that support the faculty member's research and funding agenda.
- Book chapters, online materials, textbooks, software packages, research reports, policy brief/white paper, working paper, or other products. When available and relevant, faculty should include:
  - Acceptance Rate, Impact Factor, Review Process, if document is publicly available or not.
  - Number of adoptions or downloads relative to comparable textbooks.
  - An external review by editor(s) or by an expert in the field or other documentation of the quality and significance of the work.

In addition to reporting the results of individual and collegial research in annual ARD and multi-year reviews, faculty should report student-related S/CA activities.

C. Professional Service

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member's academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks which benefit or support individuals and/or groups in the school, college, institution, university system, professional associations, or external communities at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels. In the school, faculty

professional service activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Leadership and/or active participation in university, college, or school-level activities, committees, faculty governance bodies, or student groups.
- Leadership and/or significant achievements in activities among professional organizations at the international, national, regional, and state level.
- Leadership and/or consulting/advising among relevant internal, community, state, regional, or national organizations, agencies, schools, or businesses. Philanthropic and pro-bono community outreach projects could fall under this category.
- Leadership or participation in endeavors that seek to promote the school, college, university, or university system.
- Organization of a school-related professional event at KSU (e.g., Analytics Day)
- Outreach to schools, including presentations, teacher workshops, judging student competitions, etc.
- Service as coordinator for programs or courses.
- Organizing or chairing local, regional, national, or international conferences.
- Organization of a symposium or workshop at a regional, national, or international conference.
- Reviewing journal articles, books, grants, etc.
- Serving as a session chair at professional meetings or serving on professional committees.

Sources of evidence that can be used by faculty to assess and demonstrate the quality and significance of PS may include, but are not limited to:

- Impact of the service role on students (or a student population), school, college, university and/ or profession.
- Product(s) developed in the course of a service role (indicate your specific contribution to the product).
- Policy or procedural changes that result from the service role (note the nature and scope of the change).
- Recognition by others of your contribution and/or leadership in the service activity.
- Scholarship generated through PS.
- Award/recognition for PS.

Professional service activities will be evaluated based upon the time, nature, and scope of PS accomplishments within a) the school, b) the college, c) the university community in support of teaching, service and scholarship functions, d) the community and/or non- profit organizations, governmental groups, or private business/agencies whose missions align with this school, college and university, and e) local, state, regional, national, or international professional organizations.

D. Student Success

Student success is at the core of the university's mission. SDSA actively supports the university's efforts in student success with multiple programs that enhance student skills and enable them to become qualified for cutting-edge employment. SDSA views student success as a collaborative and shared responsibility among its students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Students achieve success by actively engaging in opportunities inside and outside of the classroom that equip them with knowledge and skills, along with the intra- and inter-personal competencies, to fulfill their

academic, career and personal goals. SDSA values activities that help promote the progression, academic achievement, and professional development of undergraduate and graduate students.

Faculty are to clearly highlight and document activities promoting student success in at least one of the three performance areas (Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, Professional Service). Additionally, faculty are encouraged to take a cyclical approach to student success. One such approach is to identify the intention or student issue being addressed, the approach or approaches used, document the results obtained, implement changes based on results (if needed), and reassess.

Examples of student success activities are listed in Section 4.4 of the BOR Faculty and Section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook, as well as Appendix A in the CCSE P&T Guidelines. Examples of student success activities in SDSA by performance area may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Teaching
  - Advise or mentor students outside the classroom.
  - Employ forms of experiential learning and other high impact practices in their class(es)
  - Participate in professional development activities aimed at student success.
  - Participate in school, college, university, or USG initiatives which contribute to students completing degrees successfully, retention in degree programs or at KSU, etc.
  - Mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students in teaching activities (such as mentoring GTAs, etc.)
  - Supervise research labs and/or vertically integrated projects (VIPs)
- Scholarship and Creative Activity
  - Dissemination of work with student authors at internal and external academic conferences, in publications or presentations
  - Mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students in research activities (such as research, conference proceedings, GRA mentoring, etc.)
  - Involve students in interdisciplinary internal or external projects (such as CDSA sponsored projects, primary data collection, etc.)
- Professional Service
  - Coordinate internships, service-learning, and other community-engaged student-centric activities (such as Analytics Day)
  - Serve on various committees dedicated to student success (such as dissertation committees)
  - Contribute to extracurricular activities aimed at student success (like Analytics Day, The Showcase, or student groups)
  - Mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students through service activities (such as writing letters of recommendation, advising on graduate school applications, etc.)

III. Workload Models

Faculty workload models take into consideration school, college, and university goals and needs and the faculty members' professional goals. *A faculty member's strengths, interests, and past three years' annual reviews will serve as the primary guide to the selection of the model* (Section 2.2, Faculty Handbook). A typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of

faculty effort for the academic year, and all faculty must allocate at least 10% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution. This section defines five common workload models used by the school, as well as the process for workload adjustments.

Table 1 summarizes typical percent effort for common SDSA workload models.

Alternate workload assignments are available when negotiated between the faculty member and director, documented in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA), and approved by the dean. The school director can reassign time allocation from any workload area to any other workload area to meet school needs. Expectations in the different review areas are provided for the baseline (most common) models and should be scaled according to the percent effort in each faculty member's FPA.

A. Teaching Focus Model
The Teaching Focus Model is utilized by faculty employed full- time in a non-tenure seeking position (e.g., Lecturer Track Faculty), which has annual review and renewal, see Section 3.10 of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty following this model will typically carry an average teaching load of nine 3-credit hour classes or equivalent per year (90% effort) and select service activities (10% effort). There is no expectation of scholarship for faculty on this model. This model is not available to tenured or tenure-track faculty.

B. Teaching Emphasis Model
The Teaching Emphasis Model is utilized by either full-time, non-tenure seeking faculty or tenured faculty not seeking promotion. Faculty following this model will typically carry an average teaching load of eight 3-credit hour classes or equivalent per year (80% effort), with 10% effort assigned to S/CA and 10% to Service. This model is not available to faculty seeking tenure or to tenured faculty seeking promotion. Because this is a decision that can change for tenured faculty, 20% should be the minimum RCA for faculty who are not fully promoted (see Section 3.3. of KSU Faculty Handbook). A tenured faculty member not seeking promotion and having talents and primary interest in teaching may choose this model with the approval of the director.

C. Teaching Hybrid Model
This model combines a teaching focus with a secondary emphasis in service and/or research. Faculty on this model will have a teaching load of seven 3-credit hour classes or equivalent per year (70% effort). The remainder of faculty effort will be divided between professional service activities (minimum 10% effort) and/or S/CA activity. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to contribute in all three areas and therefore must have some of their workload assigned to S/CA (minimum 10% effort). Tenure-track and tenured faculty are only promotable if S/CA workload is at least 20%.

D. Teaching-Scholarship/Creative Activity Balance Model
This model is the baseline expectations for tenured and tenure-track teaching faculty with six 3-credit hour classes or equivalent per year (60% effort), 30% S/CA, and 10% Service. The teaching load may be adjusted based on external funding sources. Faculty on this model will work towards establishing a sustained, cohesive and deliberate research program.

E. Scholarship/Creative Activity Emphasis Model

This model provides an opportunity for faculty to concentrate on specific scholarship activities. Criteria that may be used to support a request for this workload model may include a combination of, but not limited to, leading dissertations (organizing, mentoring and associated research); acquired external funding; recent and pending publications; collaborations; and potential for continued research outcomes. From Section 2.2 of the Faculty Handbook, the typical teaching load for this model will be two, three credit hours per semester (2-2 teaching load, 40% effort), with 50% S/CA and 10% Service. Newly hired faculty may be assigned to this workload model in their beginning year(s) to expedite the process of establishing a scholarship profile.

F. Jointly Appointed Model

Faculty holding joint appointments between SDSA and another unit should consult the Faculty Handbook guidelines for joint appointees and individual Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) for their workload assignment and review processes. The tenure home unit's guidelines will take precedence in P&T reviews. Faculty whose home unit is the school will have at least one representative from the P&T unit of the sharing unit to assist in the review of the portfolio. Representation on the review committee will be reflective of the faculty member's distribution of time between units specified in the MOU.

G. Workload Adjustments

Workload models for faculty members can vary, but a faculty member must have a minimum of 10% service. "Faculty for whom a different model would be more appropriate will collaborate with their chair/director in the selection of that model" (Section 2.2, Faculty Handbook). It is likely that faculty will have a changing focus and/or assignments during their careers and will therefore consider transitioning between available models. When a faculty member experiences a change in contextual situation potentially requiring a new FPA workload allocation, the director should be consulted. A new FPA with revised workload percentages can be processed with the dean's approval. The next ARD will utilize both the initial and revised FPAs for the annual evaluation. (See Section IV.A.)

IV. Faculty Performance Agreement and Annual Review

The annual review cycle consists of a faculty member preparing an electronic Annual Review Document addressing objectives established in the previous year's Faculty Performance Agreement (Section VII link). The workload model percentages of time spent in Teaching, S/CA and Service are set in the FPA and guide expectations in each area as detailed in Section III. ARDs, FPAs, and any additional comments, such as response letters, must be submitted with documents and materials for all Promotion and Tenure reviews, including pre-tenure reviews and post-tenure reviews. Faculty members must identify which performance area will focus on student success in their FPA and then report those activities and corresponding results in their ARD.

A. Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA)

According to the Faculty Handbook Section 3.2, *The FPA must: clarify the general responsibilities and relative emphasis of the individual in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service; articulate the way the faculty member's activities relate to the school and college mission and goals, identify the expectations for scholarly activity in all of the faculty member's performance areas, identify the performance area(s) that will include*

scholarship expectations and describe those expectations. Additionally, faculty should indicate how they will promote student success in at least one performance area and how they will pursue professional development to maintain currency in their field in one area. This agreement is developed by the faculty member in consultation with the director and requires final approval by the dean. The university guidelines state that if the faculty member and the director cannot reach an agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to inform the director that an adjustment to the FPA may be necessary during a given year, due to unforeseen changes in assignments or workload percentages. With approval, the faculty member should prepare a new plan for the remainder of the year. This adjusted new FPA will have the same approval process as the original FPA. According to the Faculty Handbook, *both this new and the old FPA will be used in the evaluation of the faculty member at the conclusion of the year and in subsequent promotion and tenure recommendations and decisions.*

B. Annual Review Document (ARD)

Faculty members must compile an ARD to demonstrate progress toward the criteria in the previous year's FPA. The faculty member will address the activities and accomplishments in three performance areas for the ARD calendar year review period. The faculty member should make specific reference to the FPA planned accomplishments in each performance area and the results. Quality and significance of work accomplished should be discussed. If plans deviate from what was discussed in the previous year's FPA, an explanation of this change in course should be discussed. Additionally, faculty are to highlight activities promoting student success in at least one of the three performance areas: Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activities, and/or Professional Service. Teaching faculty should document and discuss their teaching effectiveness by reflecting on student feedback and at least one additional assessment tool discussed in Section II.A. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate cyclical improvement discussions in their narratives. If faculty have participated in professional development activities, Section 3.2 of the Faculty Handbook states, *Faculty should address in their portfolio narrative how their continuing development activities influence, support, and/or shape their activities in their performance area(s) of emphasis.*

C. Annual Review Evaluation Process

The director will evaluate each of the three performance areas based on the FPA plan and accomplishments document in the ARD. The director will rate the faculty member's performance using a 5-point scale, as Exemplary (5), Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Needs Improvement (2), or Does Not Meet Expectations (1).

An overall ARD annual rating is also assigned for all full-time faculty on the five-point scale using the workload weights in the FPA and rounded to the nearest whole number as indicated in the Faculty Handbook Section 3.12. If faculty are not meeting expectations (rating of 1) in <u>any</u> category, then the overall rating cannot be 5 (Exemplary) regardless of the category proportion of their workload. If more than 50% of the faculty work was evaluated as not meeting expectations, the faculty member would be rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" (1) regardless of the rating of the remaining of the work. If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member has received a needs improvement (2) or does not meet expectations (1) in any performance area, the faculty member

13

and the school director must develop a formal Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) together (see Section 3.12 of the Faculty Handbook).

Reviews of faculty holding joint appointments between SDSA and another unit should follow the Faculty Handbook guidelines for joint appointees and their MOU. The faculty's home unit review guidelines will take precedence unless otherwise agreed upon in the MOU.

SDSA expectations and criteria for ARD ratings of faculty members for *each* performance area are described in this section and summarized in Table 2. Given the diverse faculty within SDSA, faculty should document the quality and significance of their work in *each* performance area of their review. Failure to properly document may result in a rating of 1 or 2. Examples of quality and significance markers for *each* performance area are discussed in Section II of this document.

1. Teaching

The baseline expectations for teaching in SDSA is for faculty members to complete their scheduled teaching in a satisfactory fashion. Additional approved teaching activities described in the FPA should be conducted in a timely, professional manner with the goal of helping students succeed.

Indicators of *satisfactory* teaching for SDSA are outlined as the "Basic Expectations and Responsibilities" in Section 2.4 of the Faculty Handbook 2.13, as well as the CCSE Standards and Expectations for Faculty Teaching document. Examples include, but are not limited to,

- Being on time and well-prepared for class
- Adhering to scheduled class time and format
- Providing a syllabus for the course which includes all KSU required content.
- Teaching appropriate and relevant materials for the course
- Creating assessments designed to assess students' learning of course content.
- Being available and accessible to students
- Providing timely and professional communication with students
- Highlight student success initiative (if indicated for this performance area in FPA)
- Receive positive student course evaluations.
- Post grades and submit assessment reports on time.

Indicators of *Outstanding* teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Use of high-impact practices to effectively deliver course content.
- Use of experiential learning opportunities
- Substantial updates or redesign of a course
- Engaging in new course/curriculum development
- Mentoring of student work being disseminated
- Taking additional teaching and mentoring tasks to the benefit of students and/or school as approved by the director
- Innovative delivery and assessment of course content (e.g., guest speakers from industry, use of data not provided by textbooks, use of real-world data to prepare students for future careers and research, etc.)

- Participation in multiple instructional development activities
- Textbook writing or development of other instructional materials to aid with teaching (such as computer packages, self-paced modules, distance education materials, etc.)
- Recipient of teaching awards from the college, university, and/or professional community.

Faculty rating in Teaching using the 5-point scale is:
- Exemplary (5) – The faculty member completed all assigned teaching in their FPA in a satisfactory way **and** implemented two or more outstanding teaching indicators. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding teaching indicators must be provided.
- Exceeds Expectations (4) – The faculty member completed all assigned teaching in their FPA in a satisfactory way **and** implemented one outstanding teaching indicator. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding teaching indicators must be provided
- Meets Expectations (3) – The faculty member successfully completed scheduled teaching in a satisfactory way.
- Needs Improvement (2) – The faculty member completed scheduled teaching and/or mentoring in a less than satisfactory way.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (1) – The faculty member did not complete scheduled teaching and/or mentoring activities in FPA **or** broke university or college policy with teaching activities.

Faculty members can receive a higher rating if documented quality and significance of accomplishments justifies a higher rating. Additionally, if significant effort and time are spent on teaching activities which benefit students and/or the school/college and are approved or requested by the director, faculty may receive a higher rating.

2. Scholarship/Creative Activity

The baseline SDSA expectation in S/CA is approximately one *scholarship product* every 6 years for 10% S/CA in their workload. Production is scaled by the S/CA allocation in their individual FPAs. This is a baseline and is **not** an absolute. SDSA recognizes that there is a cycle of scholarship production (planning, active investigating and analyzing, and transferring/productive phase) which varies in time and effort from project to project and across disciplines within the school. Often scholarship dissemination takes time, so the body of faculty work over a period of time should be considered, even in annual reviews. Faculty may document their S/CA dissemination as a per year or over time summary to demonstrate they are making adequate progress toward the multi-year review goal. Faculty should clearly document their efforts and roles in such ventures to allow evaluation of the weight of such a *scholarship product*. If the faculty member has contextual situations where percent effort in S/CA is needed but may not directly translate to a tangible scholarly product (e.g., primary data collection, philanthropic projects such as program evaluation, multi-center and mixed methods study planning and data collection, serving as the PI managing an external grant submitting multiple progress reports per year), it should be noted in the ARD by the faculty member and recognized by the school director in the review.

Indicators of *Satisfactory* S/CA are:
- Production of scholarship products (within the faculty member's research agenda) at the baseline rate relative to workload **or** on track to meet the baseline scholarly product for the multi-year review period (e.g., 3 products in 6 years for 30% S/CA or ½ product in 1 year, 4 products in 6 years or 2 products every 3 years for 40% S/CA, 5 products in 6 years for 50% workload)
- Consistent pursuit of external funding if S/CA >10% (unless currently funded)
- Highlight student success initiative (if indicated for this performance area in FPA)

Indicators of *Outstanding* S/CA include, but are not limited to:
- Production of scholarship more than the baseline rate for current workload
- Successfully obtaining external funding (may count for more than one *scholarly product* depending upon number of years, exclusivity and/or competitiveness of grants, etc.)
- Dissemination at scholarly conferences (refereed or invited)
- Receive an award or a professional fellowship for research.
- High impact community and/or socially significant projects (e.g., assist state agency with a project that impacts public welfare, etc.)
- High quality or impact scholarly and/or scholarship products (e.g., appearing in top mainstream journal, used for making policy changes, etc.)
- Other evidence of the candidate's scholarly reputation in their discipline

It is incumbent upon the faculty member to document the quality, significance, and impact of work in context of their discipline given the diversity of scholarship activities and dissemination among SDSA faculty. Examples of quality and significance markers for SDSA S/CA are discussed in Section II. Outputs of exceptional quality or impact may be counted as more than one *scholarship product*. Scholarly products resulting from the research process which are not themselves disseminated but have high quality and impact (e.g., primary data collection, publicly available code or applications, projects for non-profits or community good, etc.) may be viewed as equivalent in effort and significance to a *scholarship product*. The director may make note of this equivalence in the faculty member's ARD.

Faculty rating in S/CA using the 5-point scale is:
- Exemplary (5) – The faculty member met all satisfactory indicators, produced at least two *scholarly products* from the outstanding SC/A list, and received external funding, which could include ongoing funding from a multi-year project. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.
- Exceeds Expectations (4) – The faculty member met all satisfactory indicators and produced one *scholarly products* from the S/CA outstanding list OR the faculty member met the baseline *scholarly product* rate and received some external funding in S/CA. Evidence of the pursing funding and providing quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.
- Meets Expectations (3) – The faculty member completed scheduled S/CA activities within their research agenda in a satisfactory way.
- Needs Improvement (2) – The faculty member did not complete S/CA activities within

their research agenda and/or did not document the quality and significance of S/CA activity.

  o <u>Does Not Meet Expectations (1)</u> – No evidence of engagement in S/CA and/or no evidence of engagement in the cyclical improvement process.

3. **Professional Service**
   All faculty are expected to engage in service activities (minimum 10% effort per year) that benefit the school, college, university, and/or profession. The quality and significance of accomplishments will be assessed, with more weight being given to roles with greater responsibility. As a small school there are many critical service positions that must be filled each year and successful completion of these positions is essential.

   Indicators of *Satisfactory* Service are:
   - Present at departmental and college events (e.g., Analytics Day, faculty meetings, graduation ceremonies, etc.) and participate in the events.
   - Actively participate in and/or successfully complete tasks assigned in FPA.
   - Participate in service activities which benefit the school, college, university, or community.
   - Highlight student success initiative (if indicated for this performance area in FPA)

   Indicators of *Outstanding* Service include, but are not limited to:
   - Taking a service role above and beyond assigned duties to address specific school needs (as approved by the director)
   - Developing new initiatives to benefit students, the school, college, or university.
   - High quality or high impact leadership role in service which benefits the school, college, university, or the community (outside of 12-month administrative roles or leadership roles that are compensated with course reassignments/stipends). The community could be the physical community, research community, professional society/association, or other entity outside of the university.
   - Community engagement elevating the profile of the school, college, and university
   - Serve professional community at the national or international level (e.g., lead session at national professional conferences, etc.)
   - High impact in an assigned service assignment when there is an elevated workload within the service assignment (e.g., curriculum committee during university-wide curriculum update,
   - Service on a high impact working group (e.g., R2 Roadmap committee, etc.)
   - Consulting projects without a scholarly component
   - Recipient of service awards from the college, university, and/or professional community.
   - Mentoring/Supervising teaching assistants

   Faculty members who do not effectively complete assigned service FPA activities or are habitually absent and non-contributory in service, can be rated as not meeting expectations, especially if the lack of contribution is deemed detrimental to the life of the school.

- Exemplary (5) – The faculty member completed scheduled service activities in a satisfactory way **and** completed at least two service activities from the outstanding service list. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.
- Exceeds Expectations (4) – The faculty member completed scheduled service activities in a satisfactory way **and** completed one service activity from the outstanding service list. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.
- Meets Expectations (3) – The faculty member completed scheduled service activities within their research agenda in a satisfactory way.
- Needs Improvement (2) – The faculty member completed scheduled service in a less than satisfactory way. The faculty member serves on committees but is not recognized as contributing.
- Does Not Meet Expectations (1) – The faculty member performs service activities with minimal or no effort or fails at assigned task in a significant way. There is little collaborating with colleagues, serving on committees, or attending school meetings.

V. General Expectations for Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

In addition to annual reviews, tenure-track faculty have required multi-year reviews (e.g., pre-tenure review for tenure track faculty, promotion, and PTR). Faculty planning to apply for promotion are expected to demonstrate consistent growth in performance areas over time. Their overall record should support the conclusion that they are performing at the next rank and that is likely to continue in the long term. Third-year reviews and promotion are optional for Lecturer-track faculty. All faculty up for a multi-year review are required to compose a portfolio following the format outlined in the Faculty Handbook address requirements in the college and school guidelines (Section VII links). The review process for portfolios is outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section 3.12). All portfolios should document and discuss the quality and significance of work and make a clear case of how the faculty member's body of work contributes to the mission and vision of the school, college, and university. For tenure-track faculty, tenure requires prior or simultaneous promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. If a faculty member is hired as a tenure track associate professor without tenure, the application for tenure may or may not be accompanied by an application for promotion in rank. Faculty joining KSU with credit towards tenure and/or promotion should refer to their hiring letter at the time of hire and the university handbook for the timeline of their scheduled reviews. SDSA specific criteria for non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty are included in this section and follow processes.

A. Pre-Tenure Review for Tenure Track Faculty

Sections 3.5 and 3.12 of the KSU Faculty Handbook provide expectations for promotion and/or tenure of tenure-track faculty. Pre-tenure review for tenure-track faculty members takes place in the third year of a faculty member's employment in the professorial rank. The purpose of the review is to provide feedback addressing a faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The portfolio for this review should be prepared with the same time, professionalism, and documentation expectations as for promotion and/or tenure portfolio. It is recommended that faculty preparing their portfolios seek early feedback from an experienced faculty member not part of the current P&T Committee. The evaluation letters

provided by the SDSA P&T Committee, the school director and the dean of the college become part of the candidate's portfolio for later reviews.

If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). Please refer to the KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12 for the process. This will become part of the official personnel records. (See BOR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)

B. Third-year Review for Non-Tenure Track Lecturers

For non-tenure track faculty at the lecturer rank, this third-year review is optional. Section 3.10 of the KSU Faculty Handbook provides expectations for the promotion of lecturers. The purpose of the review is to provide early-career feedback addressing a faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in their progress toward promotion. The portfolio for this review should be prepared with the same time, professionalism, and documentation expectations as for promotion and/or tenure portfolio. It is recommended that faculty preparing their portfolios seek early feedback from an experienced faculty member not part of the current P&T Committee. The evaluation letters provided by the SDSA P&T Committee, the school director, and the dean of the college become part of the candidate's portfolio for later reviews. Lecturers who seek to undergo this optional review to get feedback regarding their progress on promotion need to inform the school director in the spring semester preceding the review in fall.

C. Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Lecturer Faculty Ranks

Faculty who are at the rank of lecturer may be considered for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer in the 5th year of service at the rank of Lecturer (KSU Handbook Section 3.10.1). Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer requires a well-established record of highly effective, noteworthy teaching and service (if service is part of workload). Lecturers may elect to go up for an optional three-year review to get feedback on their progress towards promotion in rank.

Faculty who are at the rank of senior lecturer may be considered for promotion to the rank of principal lecturer in the 5th year of service at the rank of senior lecturer (KSU Handbook Section 3.10.1). Promotion to the rank of principal lecturer requires continuous leadership in curricular activity and mentoring of junior lecturers; as well as evidence of creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices or a positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings, such as dissemination of instructional innovation or participation in special teaching activities. Principal lecturers are also expected to have a well-documented and valued record of service.

Lecturers and senior lecturers seeking promotion should consult Section 3.10 of the KSU Faculty Handbook and BoR Policy Manual 8.3.8.2 for details on the promotion process and expectations. SDSA expectations by rank are in Table 3.

Lecturer-Track faculty who have time assigned to course or program coordination should be effective in communication and leadership in their coordinating efforts. They have the added expectation of ensuring that course/program content stays current and leading efforts of course and program assessment (as applicable).

D. Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty

Guidelines provided in this section are neither a contract, nor a checklist, for promotion and tenure but outline school-specific expectations. Assistant Professors seeking promotion must acquire funding, or if unsuccessful, demonstrate with evidence that they are close to generating funding, in addition to their other scholarly contributions. Associate professors seeking promotion must acquire funding that demonstrates independent, sustainable research (e.g. funding GRAs, research related travel, needed equipment, data sources, etc.). Faculty who are applying for promotion and/or tenure are strongly encouraged to consult this document, the CCSE P&T Guidelines and the Faculty Handbook (see Section VII links). General expectations, procedures, portfolio requirements, and timelines for promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track faculty are described in Sections 3.5 and 3.12 of the KSU Faculty Handbook. The case presented in the narrative and portfolio should document how the faculty member is already meeting the expectations of the next rank outlined in Section VIII Table 4, demonstrate a consistent, self-directed progression of professional growth in all performance areas during the review period, and a clear plan to maintain this level of engagement and productivity. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to clearly make their case. They should focus on quality and significance of accomplishments during the review period. External review letters are required for faculty members seeking promotion-and-tenure or promotion (see Section 3.12 of the Faculty Handbook for details).

E. Tenure

SDSA will follow all tenure procedures listed in the KSU Faculty Handbook (Section 3.5 & 3.12). Per the Handbook, *tenure should only be granted to those faculty 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.* Successful candidates for tenure have achievements that demonstrate the quality and significance of required accomplishments under associate professor in Table 4. The decision to recommend tenure is based on how well the faculty member has performed in executing an agenda of scholarly activity in the three performance areas. Tenure should only be granted to those faculty whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of an associate professor and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the university in all areas. Tenure requires prior or simultaneous promotion to the rank of associate professor.

F. Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

A detailed description of the PTR process, aims, timing, possible outcomes, expedited review eligibility, and subsequent actions (if any) are documented in Sections 3.5 & 3.12 of the KSU Faculty Handbook. An overall PTR-score will be assigned on a five point-scale (where 1 denotes "does not meet expectations", 3 denotes "meets expectations", and 5 denotes "exemplary"). A successful PTR review for SDSA faculty (a score of 3 or higher) requires that the post-tenured faculty member meeting the expectations in rank in all performing areas as outlined in Table 4. A faculty member who receives a PTR score of 4 or 5 in a regularly-schedule PTR will receive a one-time monetary award. If a faculty member receives a 1 or 2 on the PTR score, a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will be drafted according to the policy described in Section 3.12 of the Faculty Handbook. A tenured faculty member may submit an expedited PTR if they receive at least a meets expectation rating (score of 3 or above) in *all* areas of faculty review *and* in *all* their overall annual reviews during the 5-year PTR period. A tenured faculty member will undergo a

corrective PTR if they receive a 1 or 2 on two consecutive annual reviews. Details of the expedited PTR, monetary PTR rewards, and corrective PTR are described in detail in Section 3.12 of the Faculty Handbook.

VI.   **Revisions to the School of Data Science and Analytics Guidelines**
The SDSA P&T Committee and School Faculty Council shall periodically review the school guidelines and make recommendations to the school director regarding needed revisions. Updating or adding links is not considered a revision. Requests to review school guidelines and/or make revisions may also come from the school director or CCSE dean. When revisions are to be made, the school director shall convene an ad hoc committee comprised of the school P&T committee and other members of the school faculty appropriate for the guideline review and revision process. Revisions to the guidelines shall be voted on in accordance with the school's bylaws. Revisions must be approved by SDSA faculty, School P&T Committee, School Faculty Council, SDSA director, the CCSE dean and the KSU provost.

VII.   **Links to Faculty Review-Related Materials**
The links below are intended to provide faculty with a broad range of promotion and tenure documents. Unavailable links indicate that an updated version should be utilized.

1) Board of Regents Resources[1]
2) KSU Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure[1]
3) KSU Faculty Handbook (Most recent version)[1]
4) CCSE P&T Guidelines (Most recent version)[1]
5) Categories of Faculty Performance: Section 3.3 Faculty Handbook
6) Workload Models: Section 2.2 Faculty Handbook
7) Faculty Affairs - Review & Evaluation Overview
8) Faculty Handbook - Quality and Significance Discussion Guidance
9) Faculty Handbook – Workload Models
10) Multi-Year Review Electronic Portfolio Preparation
    – Faculty Handbook Guidelines and Content – Required content given.
    – Bagwell College Video – Useful preparation steps.
    – Watermark Digital Portfolio – Steps required for preparation.
11) Faculty Handbook - External Letters Requirement
12) Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) – See Faculty Handbook.
        13) PIP Follow-up Actions and Due Process – See Faculty Handbook.

14) Faculty Appeal of the PIP Action Plans – See Faculty Handbook.
15) Performance Remediation Plans (PRPs) – See Faculty Handbook.

        16) Expedited Post-Tenure Review - See Faculty Handbook.

17) Corrective Post-Tenure Review
18) Monetary PTR Rewards - See Faculty Handbook.

---

[1] All guidelines must adhere to USG policy and KSU guidelines and policy. 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 department (or college) guidelines.

19) <u>Post-Tenure Review for Administrative Faculty</u> - See <u>Faculty Handbook</u>.

VIII. Summary Tables of Faculty Workload Models, Annual Review Ratings, and SDSA Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure

Table 1. Summary of SDSA Workload Models[1]

Performance Area	Teaching Focus	Teaching Emphasis	Teaching Hybrid	Teaching- S/CA Balance	S/CA Emphasis
Teaching[2]	80-90%	80%	70%	60%	40%
S/CA[3]	0%	10%	10-20%	30%	50%
PS[4]	10-20%	10%	10-20%	10%	10%

[1]Other workload distributions need verifiable justification and dean's approval. Less than 40% teaching for any model requires dean's approval.

[2]Each 10% of teaching workload is one standard 3-credit course per semester. The baseline normal workload model for tenure-track faculty is 60%-30%-10% for Teaching, S/CA and PS (3-3 load, 3 courses for two semesters). Per CCSE Guidelines, S/CA more than 50% is possible via direct cost buy-out through grants and contracts (in consultation with Chair and the approval from Dean).

[3]10% is the minimum S/CA for tenured or tenure-track faculty, 20% for tenure and promotions. 50% or more S/CA requires external funding.to support the research program. More than 50% S/CA requires some teaching buy-out.

[4]All faculty must contribute 10% time in Professional Service (PS), more than 10% requires justification.

Table 2: Summary of Annual Review Ratings for SDSA Faculty by Faculty Performance Area for All Faculty. Performance is scaled based on individual workload models. *Evidence of the quality and significance of outstanding indicators must be provided.*

	Teaching	S/CA	Service
Exemplary (5)	The faculty member completed all assigned teaching in their FPA in a satisfactory way **and** implemented two or more outstanding teaching indicators.	The faculty member met all satisfactory indicators, produced at least two *scholarly products* from the outstanding SC/A list, and received external funding, which could include ongoing funding from a multi-year project. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.	The faculty member completed scheduled service activities in a satisfactory way and completed at least two service activities from the outstanding service list. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.
Exceeds Expectations (4)	The faculty member completed all assigned teaching in their FPA in a satisfactory way **and** implemented one outstanding teaching indicator.	The faculty member met all satisfactory indicators and produced one *scholarly products* from the S/CA outstanding list OR the faculty member met the baseline *scholarly product* rate and received some external funding in S/CA. Evidence of the pursing funding and providing quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.	The faculty member completed scheduled service activities in a satisfactory way and completed one service activity from the outstanding service list. Evidence of the quality and significance of the outstanding S/CA indicators must be provided.
Meets Expectations (3)	The faculty member successfully completed scheduled teaching in a satisfactory way.	The faculty member completed scheduled scheduled S/CA activities in a satisfactory way.	The faculty member completed scheduled service activities within their research agenda in a satisfactory way.
Needs Improvement (2)	Completed scheduled teaching and/or mentoring in a less than satisfactory way.	The faculty member did not complete S/CA activities within their research agenda and/or did not document the quality and significance of S/CA activity.	The faculty member completed scheduled service in a less than satisfactory way. The faculty member serves on committees but is not recognized as contributing.
Does Not Meet Expectations (1)	Did not complete scheduled teaching and/or mentoring activities.	No evidence of engagement in S/CA and/or no evidence of engagement in the cyclical improvement process.	The faculty member performs service activities with minimal or no effort or fails at assigned task in a significant way. There is little collaborating with colleagues, serving on committees, or attending school meetings.

Table 3: SDSA Expectations for Faculty on the Lecturer Track Seeking Promotion

This table summarizes SDSA expectations for promotion of Lecturer-track faculty discussed in Section V.B. For promotion, faculty must already be meeting the expectations of the next rank.

	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Principal Lecturer
Teaching	- Have a well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning. - Deliver content in the classroom effectively. - Approach their teaching in a scholarly manner as defined in Section II.A. - Update teaching material and keep current in their field in order to improve the quality of teaching.	In addition to continuing the expectations of a Lecturer, the Senior Lecturer should demonstrate leadership in Teaching. This may include, but is not limited to, the following: - Showing leadership in curricular activity. - Mentoring incoming and junior lecturers in the area of teaching.	In addition to continuing the expectations of a Senior Lecturer, the Principal Lecturer should demonstrate long-term excellence and more leadership in Teaching and Mentoring. This may include, but is not limited to, the following: - Showing continuous leadership in curricular activity and mentoring of junior lecturers. - Dissemination of instructional innovation or participation in special teaching activities.
Service	Contribute meaningful service to the school, college, or university aligned with KSU, CCSE, SDSA mission	In addition to continuing the expectations of a Lecturer, the Senior Lecturer should demonstrate leadership in Service.	The Principal Lecturer should - Have a well-documented and valued record of service. - Show an increased level of leadership in service activities.

Table 4. SDSA Expectations for Promotion and Tenure by Professorial Rank for All Performance Areas

This table summarizes SDSA expectations for promotion of tenure-track faculty discussed in Section V.C. For promotion, faculty must *already be meeting the expectations of the next rank*. For tenure, faculty must meet the expectations for their rank in each area of evaluation. Tenure requires prior to or simultaneous promotion to the rank of associate professor. Narratives should discuss the quality and significance of work.

Performance Area	Assistant Professors *Faculty at this rank should:*	Associate Professors *In addition to continuing the expectations of the assistant professor, an associate professor should:*	Professors *In addition to continuing the expectations of the associate professor, a professor should:*
Teaching	• Have a well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning. • Approach their teaching in a scholarly manner as defined in Section II.A. • Be proficient in the delivery of at least two courses. • Advise and mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students. • Update teaching material and keep current in their field in order to improve the quality of teaching.	• Demonstrate commitment to continued improvement in teaching through scholarly approach to teaching. • Provide leadership in curricular updating and/or development in their area of expertise. • Provide leadership in advising and mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students, possibly including serving on dissertation committees.	• Mentor incoming and junior faculty in teaching and student mentoring. • Mentor undergraduate and/or graduate students on research (such as Capstone projects, Honors projects, graduate project hours, serving on a dissertation committee, etc.)
Scholarship /Creative Activity	• Have evidence that they have begun to establish a clearly defined, focused, well- structured research program in their area of expertise. • Have evidence that their research program is sustainable. • Disseminate scholarly work in professional venues. • Effectively pursue external funding (e.g., attend workshops, apply for internal/external funding).	• Demonstrate that they are a competent and effective researcher, using the quality and significance indicators in Section II.B. • Maintain an established and clearly defined research program in their area of competence. • Have an established record of peer-reviewed publications. • Have evidence that they are actively seeking funding. • Demonstrate reflective process and use of feedback from unfunded proposals to improve subsequent funding proposals.	• Have evidence that their research program has contributed in a meaningful way to the body of knowledge in their area of expertise. • Have recognition as evidenced by a record of peer-reviewed publications *and* dissemination in regional, national, or international settings. • Have attained success in externally funding their research program (including funding from consulting contracts through CDSA).
Professional Service	Contribute meaningful professional service to the school, college, university, or their discipline that is aligned with KSU, CCSE, SDSA mission.	Have taken on a leadership role within their discipline in at least one of the following: school, college, university service or professional service.	• Have a well-documented and valued record of service at all levels. • Show an increased level of leadership in service activities.

Certificate Of Completion

Record Tracking

Status: Original   Holder: Leslie Downs   Location: DocuSign
    11/10/2023 11:31:43 AM   ldowns@kennesaw.edu

Signer Events	Signature	Timestamp
Carmen Skaggs cskaggs4@kennesaw.edu Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs Kennesaw State University Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)	*CS* Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style Using IP Address: 130.218.12.38	Sent: 11/10/2023 11:34:35 AM Viewed: 11/10/2023 1:19:34 PM Signed: 11/10/2023 1:19:51 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)	*PC* Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style Using IP Address: 130.218.12.38	Sent: 11/10/2023 1:19:53 PM Viewed: 11/15/2023 4:51:18 PM Signed: 11/15/2023 4:51:33 PM

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:
    Accepted: 11/15/2023 4:51:18 PM
    ID: 9c93a977-370f-4a09-880e-157967a99e8e		

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 4:51:36 PM Viewed: 11/15/2023 4:51:55 PM Signed: 11/15/2023 4:52:01 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) **Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:** Not Offered via DocuSign	**COPIED**	Sent: 11/15/2023 4:52:03 PM Resent: 11/15/2023 4:52:05 PM Viewed: 11/29/2023 10:48:54 AM

Witness Events	Signature	Timestamp

Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	11/10/2023 11:34:35 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:51:55 PM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:52:01 PM
Completed	Security Checked	11/15/2023 4:52:03 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

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 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 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 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.