

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 04/30/2021, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Mathematics in accordance with department bylaws:

Meghan Burke (P&T chair) DocuSigned by: Meghan Burke May 17, 2021
Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair F48C3D1BC6784F8... Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:
Sean Ellermeyer DocuSigned by: Sean Ellermeyer May 17, 2021
Name (printed or typed) 0A9AABF9EC3D4C8 Signature/ Date

College P&T Committee Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:
Jeremy Gulley DocuSigned by: Jeremy Gulley May 17, 2021
Name (printed or typed) 856297F96C884EA... Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:
Kojo Mensa-wilmot DocuSigned by: Kojo Mensa-Wilmot May 17, 2021
Name (printed or typed) 39226A8692FB45B... Signature/ Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:
Kat Schwaig DocuSigned by: Kat Schwaig May 26, 2021
Name (printed or typed) 11EA3F49C7FD4B9... Signature/ Date

RHM - 08 Sept 16

**Kennesaw State University
College of Science & Mathematics
Department of Mathematics**

Guidelines for Reviews of Faculty Performance

Department Approved on 4/30/2021

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	3
I. Introduction	4
II. Performance Areas.....	4
A. Teaching	6
B. Scholarship and Creative Activity	7
C. Professional Service	8
III. Workload Models.....	10
A. Workload Effort.....	10
B. Teaching	11
C. Scholarship and Creative Activity	12
D. Professional Service	13
E. Summary.....	13
IV. Annual Review of Faculty Performance.....	13
V. Review of Faculty Performance for Promotion and Tenure.....	14
A. Pre-tenure review	14
B. Promotion and Tenure.....	16
C. Post-tenure Review	17
VI. Revisions to the Departmental Guidelines.....	17
VII. Tables Summarizing Performance Expectations.....	17

I. Introduction

The Department of Mathematics (the Department) is committed to achieving its own mission and strategic plan as well as the missions and strategic plans of the College of Science and Mathematics (the College), and Kennesaw State University (the University). University guidelines concerning performance and evaluation are provided in *The KSU Faculty Handbook* available on KSU's Academic Affairs website. The guidelines in this document are intended to support and elaborate on University guidelines as applied to faculty in the Department of Mathematics. Should there be a conflict between the guidelines in this document and the guidelines in *The KSU Faculty Handbook*, the latter take precedence. The purpose of this document is to provide department-specific guidelines that will be used as the primary basis for annual performance reviews, promotion and tenure decisions, and post-tenure reviews. In establishing goals and preparing for any review or promotion, faculty should consult both *The KSU Faculty Handbook* and this document. At all levels of review, the rationale and justification for decisions shall be stated in writing to the candidate with specific and detailed reference to the guidelines in this document, any extant College guidelines, and *The KSU Faculty Handbook*.

Faculty members are strongly advised to check *The KSU Faculty Handbook* regularly, as important changes to the university policies that might override or add to some of the guidelines herein may occur occasionally.

Types of Faculty

This document applies primarily to faculty with professorial rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor), or lecturer rank (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer), who are tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track with renewable contracts. (Below, these are referred to as "Corps of Instruction.") These guidelines do not apply to limited term faculty who are hired to teach over a specified number of semesters. Expectations for limited term faculty are typically related entirely to teaching classes and are detailed on a case-by-case basis in contracts negotiated with the Chair of the Department (the Chair).

II. Performance Areas

The three possible areas of performance for faculty are: 1) Teaching; 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity (research or SCA); and 3) Professional Service (PS).

Teaching is the central mission of the Department of Mathematics. From its service load teaching general mathematics courses, to its support of science and engineering majors, to its commitment to mathematics majors and graduate students, the Department plays an essential role in the education of a huge swath of the student body. As part of its teaching mission, the Department is committed to helping early-career faculty develop effective methods for teaching, supervising, and mentoring students.

Scholarship goes hand-in-glove with teaching and as such, is also central to the mission of the Department of Mathematics. The Department is committed to helping early-career faculty develop agendas for scholarly activity that will progress and mature over time and that will support their eventual application for promotion and tenure. The Department is likewise committed to helping veteran faculty members pursue their own plans for scholarship by encouraging a diverse set of research agendas.

Service to the Department, the College, the University, the community, and the broader professional community is considered part of every corps of instruction faculty member's basic obligation. Though there is a minimum expectation of service for all corps of instruction faculty, service carries less weight than teaching or scholarship in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The mathematics faculty teaches most general education mathematics courses as well as most of the upper division and graduate-level mathematics courses. This faculty teaches students from programs across the University. Though some mathematics faculty may produce research related to the teaching of collegiate mathematics, the traditional research from this group is in pure and applied mathematics. The audience for their research papers and presentations is typically composed of other mathematicians and academics of related disciplines, either as researchers, or as teachers of college and university-level mathematics courses.

Corps of Instruction faculty are subject to different types of reviews throughout their careers. Expectations for different types of review vary. We refer to pre-tenure review, post-tenure review, the review of an application for tenure, and the review of an application for promotion as *milestone reviews*.

When hired as tenure-track Assistant Professors, faculty undergo a pre-tenure review with the purpose of assisting faculty members in determining whether they are making appropriate progress toward tenure and to assess the individual's current readiness toward tenure.

Lecturers, Clinical Assistant and Clinical Associate Professors undergo no milestone reviews with the possible exception of a voluntary application for promotion. A faculty member at the rank of Senior Lecturer or Clinical Professor undergoes no further milestone review.

All tenured faculty, however, are required to undergo post-tenure reviews at intervals specified in *The KSU Faculty Handbook*. Among tenured faculty, many, but not all, choose to follow a path towards promotion to Professor. The activities of faculty in these different cohorts will differ noticeably. These differences are addressed below.

A milestone review requires the assembly of a portfolio and narrative that explain and document the faculty member's activities over the course of several years. In composing a portfolio for any milestone review, the faculty member should establish the *quality and significance* of the work carried out in each performance area. Reciting or enumerating tasks, courses, projects, and accomplishments is insufficient. Any milestone review is conducted, at least in part, by committee and may be conducted entirely by colleagues with little or no understanding of mathematics. Even within the Department, colleagues conducting a milestone review may have nothing more than a passing acquaintance with the applicant's field or its situation in the larger field of mathematics. **When assembling materials for a milestone review, it is incumbent on the applicant, and the applicant alone, to make a strong case that can be understood easily by any colleague in the Department, the College, or the University.**

We provide examples of both the type of activities, and quality and significance indicators of activities that fall into each of the performance areas. In preparing a portfolio for a milestone review, faculty can and should employ such indicators in crafting an argument for the relevance of the work presented for review. These lists are not meant to be exhaustive, but to provide examples that faculty can use to guide their preparation of portfolios for review.

Applicants (other than clinical faculty) seeking tenure or promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor or Professor are expected to engage in mathematics research and to produce tangible, disseminated, peer-reviewed results of that discipline-based research. Section II.B deals with Scholarship and Creative Activity and in that section, *scholarly work* and *scholarship* are distinguished and defined.

At various stages in the career, faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they approach teaching, research, and/or service in a *scholarly manner*, that is, a manner that is reflective, and that employs a continuous process of improvement that is intentional, systematic, measured, analyzed, and implemented.

A. Teaching

The successful demonstration of effectiveness in teaching and mentoring students is essential for all faculty, both for continued employment, and in applications for tenure or promotion in rank. All corps of instruction faculty are expected to approach their teaching, supervision, and mentoring in a scholarly manner.

Teaching activities may include but are not limited to:

- High-quality teaching across a variety of instructional settings (classroom, online courses, seminars, directed study, study abroad, etc.) that reflects an implementation of effective pedagogical strategies that address students' learning needs
- Curricular development, including modification, implementation, and evaluation (e.g., within existing courses, new courses, programs, etc.)
- Student advisement for degree programs
- Mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students in research

When preparing portfolios for milestone reviews, faculty are required to include all electronically available student course evaluations/comments (Student Feedback reports) for all courses taught during the period of review. Along with these evaluations, faculty should include a report on modifications or improvements crafted and/or implemented in response to student comments. Faculty may also include course evaluations/comments from outside the review period as additional supporting documentation for teaching effectiveness.

The students who complete course evaluations are a self-selected subset of the students who enroll in a course; thus, the electronic surveys administered by the University are insufficient for demonstrating *quality and significance* in teaching. In any review, faculty must support the argument for quality and significance of their teaching with additional evidence.

Examples of such evidence include

- Peer observation or evaluation of course materials and teaching strategies by an experienced faculty member;
- Supplemental evaluation instruments administered by the faculty (e.g., student questionnaire, pre- or post-content assessment results, etc.);
- Assessment of student learning based on course learning outcomes;
- Sample syllabi, course materials, teaching artifacts, assignments, assessments, and projects;
- A statement of teaching philosophy indicating ongoing reflection;
- Student acknowledgements (former students and alumni);
- Awards/recognition for teaching.

B. Scholarship and Creative Activity

The Department of Mathematics values a variety of discipline-based scholarly activities that can include idea generation, gathering and analyzing data, theoretical and computational calculations and/or modeling, and the dissemination of results at professional meetings. These processes comprise *scholarly activity*. When scholarly activity leads to creative, intellectual work that is professionally reviewed by peers in the discipline and disseminated, that work is designated *scholarship*. Scholarly activity and scholarship may involve research based on the faculty member's training and expertise ("discipline-based research"), teaching-and-learning-based research, or other appropriate efforts as defined in the Faculty Performance Agreement.

The Department recognizes that faculty working on different sorts of projects will have different rates of production. For example, research done in collaboration with students may take more time to bear fruit. Methodologies for collecting and analyzing data may involve a significant time commitment. Certain areas of mathematics are more highly developed, thus more difficult to advance in.

Nonetheless, any tenured or tenure-track faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion is expected to establish an active research agenda appropriate to an R2 institution.

As in teaching, the *quality and significance* of research must be supported by evidence in any application for promotion or tenure. Examples of such evidence follow.

Scholarship

- Research papers published in peer-reviewed professional journals (including practitioner journals). Applicants should speak to the breadth of readership of the journal, and should include citation metrics.
 - For multi-author publications, the applicant should describe his or her specific contributions to the publication. Documentation of the quality and significance of the contributions can include a letter from co-author(s).
- Reviewed grant or contract proposals for projects in mathematics. Include award letters as applicable. Applicants should speak to the degree of competitiveness of the funding agency/program (i.e. the number or percent of proposals received and funded by the funding agency/program).
 - Documentation of the significance of the faculty member's work may include letters

from co-PIs attesting to the applicant's contribution to the preparation of the proposal and his or her role in the proposed project.

- For unfunded proposals, applicants should include all reviewer comments, the proposal score (if given by funding agency), and a copy of the grant application, including cover page with signatures.
- Books or book chapters externally reviewed by editor(s) or by an expert in the field.
- Peer-reviewed conference proceedings.
- Externally reviewed online materials or software. Review by an editor or by an expert in the field can substantiate significance of the work. Documentation of the number of adoptions or downloads relative to comparable textbooks or materials.

Scholarly Activity

- Preparing and submitting results of research to peer-reviewed professional journals (including practitioner journals) or peer-reviewed conference proceedings. Applicants should speak to the breadth of readership of journal, including the number of citations by others in the field.
 - For multi-author publications in which the candidate is not the corresponding author, the applicant must describe his or her specific contributions to the publication. Documentation of the quality and significance of the applicant's contributions can include a letter from co- author(s).
- Formulating and identifying research questions, engaging in research methodology, collecting and analyzing data.
- Dissemination of results of research at professional conferences (including practitioner conferences), consortia, or seminars. Document whether the presentation was by invitation. Note the scope of conference (regional, national, or international attendance). Indicate the acceptance rate, if available.
- Preparing and submitting grant or contract proposals for projects in mathematics. Include grant or contract proposals. Supply evidence of related proposals that were funded. Indicate the degree of competitiveness of the funding agency/program (i.e. the number or percent of proposals received and funded by the funding agency/program).
 - The faculty member may include a letter from co-PIs that document the significance of the faculty member's contribution to preparation of the proposal and his or her role in the project.
- Developing online materials or composing software.
- Devising a new algorithm to solve a problem.
- Awards/Recognition for research.
- In addition to any external letters that the University may require and solicit, faculty members applying for tenure or promotion in rank may include in their portfolios external letters evaluating their research and scholarship products. The most effective evaluation letters are from distinguished individuals in the candidate's field who are in a position to provide an authoritative assessment of the *quality* of the candidate's research and to comment on its *significance* in the discipline. When external evaluation letters are supplied as a result of the faculty member's initiative, the faculty member must detail the nature of the relationship with the reviewer.

C. Professional Service

Professional service is the application of a faculty member's mathematical, academic, and professional skills and knowledge to support individuals, groups, programs, and functions within the Department, the College, and the University; state education entities; the local, regional, national, and international communities; and professional organizations. All corps of instruction faculty must perform a certain amount of service as service facilitates the efficient and successful delivery of programs and student services within and outside of the University.

Professional service activities for faculty in the Department of Mathematics may include, but are not limited to:

- Leadership or active participation in University, College, or Department activities, committees, faculty governance bodies, student-groups;
- Mentoring junior colleagues;
- Leadership or significant achievements in activities involving professional organizations at the state, regional, national, and international level (such as organizing a regional, national, or international conference or serving as an officer of a state, national, or international professional association);
- Leadership or consulting/advising among relevant community, state, regional, or national organizations, agencies, or schools;
- Outreach to schools, including presentations, teacher workshops, judging or monitoring at math bowls;
- Serving as coordinator for programs, courses, or groups of courses;
- Professional review of journal articles, books, grants, etc.;
- Participation in programs that provide scholarship funds/resources for students in STEM disciplines (NSF-STEM, NSF-STEP, NSF-REU, etc.).

As in all the performance areas, service will be evaluated for its *quality and significance*, which must be supported by evidence. Sources of evidence that faculty can use to argue the impact of their service may include:

- The effect of the service on students (or a student population) in the Department, the College, University, or the profession;
- Product(s) developed during the time of service (the applicant should indicate the specific contribution to the product);
- Policy/procedural changes that result from the service role (note the nature and scope of the change);
- Recognition by others of the faculty member's contribution or leadership in the service activity;
- Awards/Recognition for service.

Service activities may be considered scholarly when they result in tangible, disseminated, and peer-reviewed results (scholarship). Scholarship of service alone is not sufficient to meet, nor can it substitute for the research and creative activity required for promotion or tenure. Scholarship of service is distinguished from routine service work by the significance and scope of the leadership exhibited and the products produced by the activity. Examples include:

- Authoring a significant institutional document for the Department, College or University.
- Making significant contributions to writing institutional self-study reports, governance

- documents or other notable institutional documents.
- Preparation of accreditation reports.
- Being the PI/Co-PI on reviewed grant or contract
- Proposals for programs that provide scholarship funds/resources for students in STEM disciplines (NSF-STEM, NSF-STEP, NSF-REU), etc.

Some service activities fall under the category of administration and leadership. Examples include:

- Day-to-day operational management of the Department;
- Budgeting and budget reporting;
- Strategic and operational planning;
- Scheduling courses and events for the Department;
- Staffing functions, including screening, hiring, and training employees of the Department;
- Conducting performance reviews of faculty and staff.

Sources of evidence that faculty can use to measure and demonstrate the quality and significance of administration and leadership service may include:

- Faculty reviews of administrative performance;
- Accreditation, growth, and sustainability of programs;
- External recognition of a program;
- Letters of support from peer(s) or supervisor addressing effectiveness in managing and advancing the necessary fiscal, physical, interpersonal, and intellectual environments.

III. Workload Models

A. Workload Effort

Each year, faculty in the Department of Mathematics work with the Chair in developing their Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). The FPA is an annual agreement between the Chair and the faculty member that specifies the faculty member's workload model and details how the faculty member will allocate their time over the course of the ten months that comprise Spring and Fall Semesters. Both the FPA and the Annual Review Document (ARD) are composed with respect to calendar year. The FPA is the basis upon which the faculty member is evaluated for the annual review. The ARD is the document that summarizes the review.

Workload models are flexible, and they take into consideration the needs of the Department, College, and University, as well as the professional goals of faculty.

In the Department of Mathematics, the norms for workload effort expected in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA), and Professional Service (PS) for tenure-track faculty who are untenured and tenured faculty with a demonstrably active and productive program of research are 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively. Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure will be on a workload that is at least 30% SCA. For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, the norm is 90%, 0%, 10%, depending on departmental needs. For Clinical Faculty, because their primary responsibilities are in the area of professional service and teaching, their workload distribution will be split between Teaching and PS as needed to support the needs of the department and to

allow them to demonstrate leadership in professional service and excellence in teaching. The workload effort for Administrative Faculty must be determined with the support and written approval of the faculty member's supervisor, as well as the Dean of the College.

Workload adjustments are made from these norms depending on whether or not a faculty member is meeting expectations in their current model and on changes in career focus that a faculty member may have. Examples of such workload adjustments follow.

1. Tenured faculty who are not seeking promotion and not sustaining a robust research agenda may be assigned teaching Teaching workload up to 90%.
2. The SCA or PS workload for a tenure-track or tenured faculty member can be increased, but it requires accountability. In order to increase the SCA workload above 30% or the PS workload above 10%, a detailed agreement between the faculty member and the chair will be developed within the faculty member's FPA with clear and reasonable expectations for higher productivity and involvement in the corresponding areas. The agreement will include a timeline for assessing the success of the modified workload. In the event that a faculty member and the Chair cannot agree on the terms of the expectations for higher than 30% SCA or higher than 10% PS, the Dean will make the final decision.
3. First- and second- year tenure-track faculty will be on a 50% SCA workload to give them time to develop an active research program. The minimum research productivity expected for tenure-track faculty as they go up for tenure will be that associated with the corresponding SCA workload from faculty's FPA beyond the second year.

Each faculty member will develop a specific formulation for their own FPA in consultation with the Chair, and subject to the approval of the Dean. As the activities of a faculty member may change over the course of the career, so may the workload model. Indeed, FPAs may be re-negotiated with the Chair at any time in light of changing needs of the faculty member, the Department, the College, or the University.

B. Teaching

All faculty are expected to demonstrate noteworthy achievements in Teaching. To demonstrate excellence in and a scholarly approach to teaching, all faculty are expected to:

1. Collect and evaluate outcome data regarding student learning, revise courses from semester to semester based on this data, and then systematically assess the effect of the revisions on students' learning.
2. Over a rolling 6-year period, participate in at least one Professional development activity such as attending workshops and conferences related to teaching. These may include, but not limited to:
 - i. College of Science and Mathematics Faculty Learning Communities;
 - ii. KSU Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning workshops and/or consultations;
 - iii. Professional Society workshops focused on teaching and learning.

A 3-credit-undergraduate course is typically considered 10% of a faculty member's workload, so a 100% teaching workload would mean 15 credit hours of teaching each term. Finer points about how teaching counts towards workload are detailed below.

1. Each 1000-2000 lower level three credit undergraduate course with a cap up to 48 students will count as 10% of the faculty member's workload for the year. Sections of 1000-2000 lower level courses with a cap of 49 to 72 students will count as 15% of the faculty member's workload for the year. Sections of 1000-2000 lower level courses with a cap of 73 to 96 students will count as 20% of the faculty member's workload for the year.
2. Each four-credit 1000-2000 lower level course with a cap up to 48 students will count as 13.3% of the faculty member's workload for the year. Large four-credit 1000-2000 lower level sections with a cap of 49 to 72 students will count as 20% of the faculty member's workload for the year.
3. Each 3000 level three credit undergraduate course with 36 or fewer students enrolled will count as 10% of the faculty member's workload for the year. Each 4000 level three credit undergraduate course with 25 or fewer students enrolled will count as 10% of the faculty member's workload for the year.
4. Each graduate level three credit course with 25 or fewer students enrolled will be count as 10% of the faculty member's workload for the year.
5. Directed Study, Undergraduate Research, Internship and Cooperative Study courses will be counted in accord to the College of Science and Mathematics policies.

C. Scholarship and Creative Activity

To be satisfactory in Scholarship and Creative Activity, during any consecutive 6-year period, tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to:

1. Have 1 peer-reviewed publication for every 10% workload effort in SCA over a rolling 6-year period (or equivalent, appropriate for the overall percentage of effort in a faculty member's workload dedicated to SCA). One external grant submission that demonstrates quality and significance of research is equivalent to one peer-reviewed publication. For example
 - a. A faculty member with a 10% SCA workload is expected to have 1 peer-reviewed publication or 2 scholarship products in the form of posters or presentations at conferences, perhaps with one or more students.
 - b. A faculty member with a 30% SCA workload is expected to have 3 peer-reviewed publications.
 - c. A faculty member with a 50% SCA workload is expected to have 5 peer-reviewed publications.
2. Mathematics faculty with an increased SCA workload of 40% or 50% and not falling within 1.c above with respect to their FPA should be active in generating and submitting proposals to funding agencies to sustain their research/scholarship program. This activity may include
 - a. Submitting proposals to external agencies to support SCA efforts
 - b. Using feedback from an unsuccessful proposal submission to focus projects by:
 - i. Obtaining additional preliminary data to demonstrate proof of concept
 - ii. Rework proposal concepts based on referee reports.
 - c. Securing internal funding to seed projects and obtain preliminary data to support subsequent proposals to an external agency. Receiving any internal funding from CSM or OVPR comes with the expectation that a proposal to an external agency will be

produced, and internal funding should only seed projects and not be considered as a way of sustaining research/scholarship programs. Internal funding will be considered as meeting the goals of SCA if it results in a proposal to an external agency.

- d. The amount of effort in proposal generation should be appropriate for the percentage of workload dedicated to SCA and should scale with the percentage of effort in a faculty member's workload dedicated to SCA. In particular, due to the nature of mathematics research, a field in which high-quality research can be conducted even without funding, faculty members in a 30% research load or lower may choose to focus only on the quality and significance of their research publications.

Faculty members in the College of Science and Mathematics should demonstrate how they have applied the scholarly, iterative process to their research and how these efforts have led to a sustainable research program before consideration of promotion.

D. Professional Service

Per university guidelines, all corps of instruction faculty will have a minimum PS workload of 10%. Faculty should be mindful that this should correspond approximately to the effort required to teach a 3-credit-hour course. Mathematics faculty should dedicate their specific PS activities as outlined in Section II.C.

In Annual Review Documents, faculty must address the role played in their service activities, the unique contribution made, and the alignment between these activities and the mission of the Department, the College, or the University. The faculty member must indicate the quality and significance of their Professional Service activities.

E. Summary

These metrics represent measures of the baseline effort for faculty members and should be considered necessary but not sufficient to be meeting expectations in each workload area. It is incumbent on the faculty member to frame their annual activities in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service within the context of the scholarly process they are following, and within the context of the overall agenda that they are establishing for their professional contributions.

IV. Annual Review of Faculty Performance

Every year, faculty members prepare two documents for the annual review: the FPA, which details the faculty member's plans for the coming year, and the ARD, which reports on the faculty member's activities for the past year. The FPA is an agreement between the faculty member and the Department Chair. It specifies a faculty member's workload model and an outline as to how the faculty member plans to use his or her time. Cases in which a faculty member and the Department Chair cannot agree on the terms of an FPA are resolved by the Dean.

The ARD is the most important instrument in a faculty member's annual review. In it, the faculty member addresses each performance area in which he or she has had responsibilities according to the previous year's FPA. The ARD should speak to the quality and significance of the faculty member's reported activities and accomplishments. The ARD is evaluated independently by the

Department Chair and the Dean of the College. Basing his or her remarks on the faculty member's ARD, the Department Chair constructs a detailed, thoughtful assessment of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, especially with regard to progress toward upcoming milestone reviews. There is then a face-to-face meeting between the Chair and the faculty member to discuss the review and to explore options, ensure clear communications, and establish mutual understanding. In the event that the faculty member and Chair cannot reach agreement on the evaluation of the ARD, the Dean will make the final determination.

For tenured faculty, receipt of two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews may result in modification of a faculty member's workload model. This modification may include an adjustment in the proportion of time spent in each performance area or movement to a different workload model.

Although satisfactory annual reviews are necessary in a faculty member's progress towards successful future milestone reviews, they are not sufficient to guarantee successful milestone reviews. *The KSU Faculty Handbook* has more information about the contents and uses of the FPA and ARD in annual reviews.

V. Review of Faculty Performance for Promotion and Tenure

There are four types of milestone review for corps of instruction faculty: pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. For most tenure-track faculty, the review for tenure is also a review for promotion to Associate Professor. If a faculty member is hired as an Associate Professor without tenure, the application for tenure may or may not be accompanied by an application for promotion in rank. As noted in Section III above, milestone reviews require the composition of a portfolio that will be reviewed by various individuals and committees from inside and outside the Department.

Any portfolio submitted for a milestone review should follow the format outlined in *The KSU Faculty Handbook*. Portfolios that do not follow these guidelines are subject to a negative decision without review. The burden is on the candidate to provide evidence of his or her qualifications. Reviewers' deliberations shall be based on whether or not the candidate has met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in the department guidelines, in light of the evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio as well as the reviewers' first-hand observations of the candidate's professional performance.

A. Pre-tenure review

Pre-tenure review takes place in the third year of a tenure-track faculty member's employment in the professorial rank. Because it occurs at the beginning of the third year, it reviews only two years of professional activities. Its purpose is to provide feedback as to a faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in progress toward promotion and tenure. As such, the pre-tenure review is itself a developmental exercise. Pre-tenure review, which is mandatory for tenure-track faculty, takes place before a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion or tenure. As such, a positive pre-tenure review does not constitute, nor does it guarantee, a positive promotion or tenure decision. The evaluation letters provided by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Chair, and the Dean of the College become part of the candidate's portfolio for later review. Poor preparation of the pre-tenure review is viewed in an extremely unfavorable light, as it precludes the faculty member from receiving valuable, constructive feedback towards successful progress to

promotion and tenure.

B. Promotion and Tenure

The purpose of the promotion and tenure process is to secure a committed, dedicated faculty for the Department, the College, and the University. Guidelines are neither a contract, nor a checklist, for promotion and tenure.

Promotion

Faculty members seeking promotion should meet the expectations delineated in the tables in Section VII below.

To be considered for promotion, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member must have produced and disseminated peer-reviewed journal publications. A publication record is not necessary for promotion to Senior Lecturer or for clinical faculty. Promotion in rank is based upon performance and established criteria, and not the faculty member's time in service.

The Department of Mathematics expects that all faculty seeking promotion in rank will demonstrate effectiveness and leadership in the area of teaching and effectiveness in the area of service. Tenured and tenure-track faculty will have an active and productive research program in their area of expertise.

Specific expectations by rank for each of the performance areas are provided in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 below.

Faculty considering application for tenure or promotion are strongly encouraged to consult this document and *The KSU Faculty Handbook*.

Tenure

The Department of Mathematics is the first level of tenure review for all faculty members of the Mathematics Department. The decision as to whether or not to award tenure to a faculty member is essentially a decision as to whether or not the University is willing to make a long-term commitment to that faculty member. Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure.

In an application for promotion and tenure, tenure presents the higher threshold. In particular, tenure may only be granted to those faculty members who either submit a successful petition for promotion to Associate Professor or who have already achieved the rank of Associate Professor. Successful candidates for tenure have achievements that demonstrate the quality and significance indicators delineated under Associate Professor in the tables in Section VII. They demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University. The decision to recommend tenure is based on how well the faculty member has performed in carrying out an agenda of scholarly activity in the three areas of professional activity. Faculty members applying for tenure are expected to produce discipline-based scholarship.

C. Post-tenure Review

Post-tenure review is a comprehensive five-year performance review which is required for all tenured faculty who are not on an administrative contract. Carried out by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, its primary purpose is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members. The outcome of the review is either: 1) Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance, or 2) Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance. *The KSU Faculty Handbook* describes the timeline for post-tenure review as well as the University policies on the two possible outcomes of a post-tenure review. In summary, three or more positive annual reviews are necessary but not sufficient for a faculty member to be achieving post-tenure expectations. The criteria for achieving expectations in post-tenure review are: (1) continued satisfactory performance in teaching, (2) continued satisfactory performance in scholarly activity and service, all as measured relative to the workload described in the faculty member's FPAs for the years under review.

VI. Revisions to the Departmental Guidelines

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Faculty Council shall periodically review the Department Guidelines and make recommendations to the Department Chair regarding needed revisions. The Department Chair or the Dean of the College may also request a review of or revisions to the Department Guidelines. When revisions are to be made, the Department Chair shall convene an ad hoc committee comprised of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and other members of the Department faculty appropriate to the process of review and revision of the guidelines. Revisions to the guidelines shall be voted on by all full-time permanent faculty of the Department. Revisions must be approved by the Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Provost.

VII. Tables Summarizing Performance Expectations

The fundamental rule of faculty evaluation and performance expectations is that on a year-to-year basis, corps of instruction faculty should perform in accordance with their FPAs. When preparing for a milestone review, a faculty member and the Department Chair should agree to a workload model, and to an associated series of FPAs that, when fulfilled, will result in a body of work that will position the faculty member for a positive review.

For **promotion**, faculty members must be **performing at the beginning level of the next rank**.

For tenure, faculty must be promoted to Associate Professor, and must meet the expectations for that rank in each area of evaluation. Note that Tables 1,3 and 4 refer to all corps of instruction faculty at all stages of the career. Table 2 refers specifically to tenured and tenure-track faculty seeking promotion.

Clinical faculty rank (clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, or clinical professor) will be based largely on professional background, accomplishments, and experience. In the areas of teaching and professional service, clinical faculty are expected to adhere to the same standards of performance as tenured and tenured-track faculty. Likewise, for promotion in rank, clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate the same standards of performance as tenured and tenured-track faculty in

Teaching and Professional Service.

Table 1. Expectations for Faculty in the Department of Mathematics in the Area of TEACHING

Assistant Professors, Clinical Assistant Professors and Lecturers	Associate Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, Professors, Clinical Professors and Senior Lecturers
<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach their teaching in a scholarly manner as defined in Section II. • Have a well-stated philosophy of teaching and learning and demonstrate how this philosophy has informed the development and selection of classroom pedagogies and activities. • Mentor undergraduate or graduate students. • Update teaching material and keep current in their field in order to improve the quality of teaching. 	<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to meet the expectations of the Assistant Professors, Clinical Assistant Professors or Lecturers, and • Demonstrate competence and effectiveness as a teacher using the quality and significance indicators in Section II.A. • Demonstrate that they are effective mentors for undergraduate or graduate students or junior colleagues.

Table 2. Expectations for Faculty Performance in RESEARCH, For Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure

This table should be read in light of the following statement from *The KSU Faculty Handbook*, "When a faculty member's experience, accomplishments, and career development evolve to the point where expectations applicable to the beginning level of the next highest rank are being met, the faculty member can make a strong case for promotion." The entry here under Assistant Professor thus applies to a faculty member who looks forward to submitting to pre-tenure review at that rank. Once past this first milestone review, the faculty member should use the entry under Associate Professor as a guide. Though there are faculty at the rank of Professor who do not engage in research, an Associate Professor who aspires to be promoted to Professor should use the expectations under Professor to determine whether he or she is positioned to make a strong case for promotion.

Assistant Professors	Associate Professors	Professors
<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach their research in a scholarly manner as defined in Section II. • Develop a clearly defined research program in their area of expertise. • Have evidence of sustainability of their research program. • Disseminate scholarly work off campus. • Disseminate scholarly work in peer-reviewed journals. • Investigate the feasibility of securing external funding to support their scholarly activity, as required by the nature of their research. 	<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to meet the expectations of the Assistant Professors, and • Demonstrate that they are competent and effective researchers using the quality and significance indicators in Section II. B. • Maintain an established and clearly defined research program in their area of competence. • Disseminate scholarly work in venues outside of campus. • Have an established record of peer-reviewed publications and demonstrate that they are the intellectual driving force behind some of the reported scholarship. • Increase efforts towards obtaining external support to maintain their research program, as required by the nature of their research, if this is feasible in the context of a long-term research agenda. 	<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to meet the expectations of the Associate Professors, and • Have evidence that their research program has contributed in a meaningful way to the body of knowledge in the area of expertise. • Have national recognition as evidenced by a record of peer-reviewed publications. • Have success in obtaining external support to maintain their research program, if an effort to obtain external funding fits well in the long-term research agenda.

Table 3. Expectations for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Tenured, and Tenure-track Faculty in the Area of SERVICE

Assistant Professors, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers	Associate Professors	Professors
<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute meaningful professional service to the Department. • Be able to demonstrate significant involvement in service to the discipline, if they have not been involved significantly in Department, College or University level service. 	<p>Should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to meet the expectations of the Assistant Professors. • Have taken on a leadership role in Department, College, University service or taken a leadership role in professional service within their discipline. 	<p>Should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue performing at the level achieved at the time of promotion from associate to professor. • Serve on promotion and tenure committees, as necessary to the Department. • Have a well-established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, and significance of professional service activities.

Table 4. Expectations for Clinical Faculty in the Area of SERVICE

Clinical Assistant Professors	Clinical Associate Professors	Clinical Professors
<p>Should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute meaningful professional service to the Department in an area (or areas) determined by negotiation with the Department Chair upon contract. 	<p>Should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to meet the expectations of clinical Assistant Professors. • Have taken on a leadership role in Department, College, or University service and have demonstrated a high level of effectiveness in this leadership role. 	<p>Should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue performing at the level achieved at the time of promotion from clinical associate professor to clinical professor. • Have a well-established record of service that reflects a pattern of growth and development in breadth, depth, and significance of professional service activities.

