



Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Guidelines¹

I. Introduction

The Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance section of the Kennesaw State University *Faculty Handbook* states that:

There will be three categories of faculty performance: 1) Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring; 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity; and 3) Professional Service. In addition to teaching, the Teaching category includes activities such as mentoring and advising. Scholarship and Creative Activity will include a broad array of scholarship with the expectation that in order for something to be considered scholarship it must meet the expectations of scholarship as established by the department, school, or college. Professional Service includes service to the department, school, college, university, profession, and community (but the service activity must be related to a person's status as a faculty member).

The purpose of this document is to

- Present the guidelines for promotion & tenure for tenure-track faculty in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Present the guidelines for the promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Present the guidelines for promotion in rank of clinical faculty in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Serve as a bridge between University and departmental guidelines
- Provide continuity and consistency among departments in the College
- Assist everyone involved in the review process in interpreting University guidelines

The normal teaching load for tenure-track faculty is 3/3.

The quality and significance in each performance area should be further specified at the department level.

The KSU *Faculty Handbook* clearly presents the general expectations for tenure-track faculty, i.e., instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, and non-tenure-track faculty, i.e., lecturers, senior lecturers, and clinical faculty.

¹ In this document, "department" or "departmental" refers to a department or school, "department chair" includes "school director."

II. Faculty Workload

Faculty workload models provide alignment of faculty interests and strengths with department, college, and university goals and resources. They ensure equity among faculty while recognizing the broad range of disciplines and degree programs within our college. The standard workload for pre-tenured and tenured faculty consists of a 3/3 teaching load (60 percent of the annual workload), 30 percent effort toward scholarship and creative activity, and 10 percent toward service. The standard faculty workload for lecturers and senior lecturers is 90 percent teaching and 10 percent service (90/0/10). The workload for clinical faculty depends on situational context and must be defined in the FPA.

Workload models for tenured faculty can vary, with a minimum service load of 10 percent. As presented in the *Faculty Handbook*, there are a number of possible modifications to workload, which can either increase or decrease a faculty member's teaching load. Tenured faculty who consistently meet expectations on the standard workload model (60/30/10) will not be required to move to a different model; however, faculty for whom a different model would be more appropriate will collaborate with their Chair/Director in the selection of that model through the annual ARD/FPA process, which must be approved by the Dean. A faculty member's strengths, interests, and past five years' annual reviews will serve as the primary guide to the selection of the model. The number of years of ARDs to consider shall follow the most recent *Faculty Handbook*. A faculty member may appeal a workload decision approved by the Chair and the Dean to the next level of authority. Modified workloads for tenure-track faculty who wish to maintain a path back to the standard workload model will not exceed a teaching load of eight three-credit hour courses.

III. Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty Expectations

This section of the CHSS Guidelines summarizes the general expectations of tenure-track faculty members and, in regard to teaching, advising, and mentoring, adds a stipulation not in the university-wide guidelines (see Section IV below).

There will be three categories of faculty performance: 1) Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring; 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity; and 3) Professional Service. In addition to teaching, the Teaching category includes activities such as mentoring and advising. Scholarship and Creative Activity will include a broad array of scholarship with the expectation that in order for something to be considered scholarship it must meet the expectations of scholarship as established by the department, school, or college.

Professional Service includes service to the department, school, college, university, profession, and community (but the service activity must be related to a person's status as a faculty member).

As stated in the KSU *Faculty Handbook*, the categories of faculty evaluation are

- Teaching, advising, and mentoring
- Scholarship and Creative Activity
- Professional service

Faculty members' performance must be noteworthy in at least two areas, of which teaching, advising, and mentoring must be one, and satisfactory in the third. Faculty members are to engage in scholarly activity in all of the chosen areas. In one area, at least, faculty members are expected to produce scholarship.²

² The *Faculty Handbook* defines scholarly activity as "... a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, revised and rethought." It defines

The College of Humanities and Social Sciences guidelines acknowledge the three schools and the eight distinctive, diverse academic departments making up the College. Further, the College acknowledges that departmental guidelines will address the distinctive expectations of faculty members in the schools and departments.

Nevertheless, in all of the areas selected for evaluation, all faculty in the College are expected to

- Maintain the up-to-date knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to fulfill their commitments and to incorporate them into their scholarly activities and scholarship
- Meet their responsibilities and carry out their assignments in a constructive, productive, and professional manner
- Cultivate excellence and demonstrate a commitment to developmental improvement, innovation, and progress
- Work in close consultation with their chairs and develop a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) in which they outline their goals and priorities for the period of time they note in the Agreement

Note: the Agreements must take into consideration the mission and guidelines of the College and departments, and the Agreements must be approved by the Dean of the College.

IV. Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty Evaluation and Review

For promotion in rank, as stated in Section III, tenured or tenure-track faculty must be noteworthy in two of the three areas of review, one of which must be teaching, and at least satisfactory in the third. In the area of scholarship and creative activity, the minimum requirements for satisfactory performance are two publications, or its equivalent, for promotion to Associate Professor and three publications, or its equivalent, for promotion to Full Professor. The minimum requirements for noteworthy performance in scholarship and creative activity are three publications, or its equivalent, for promotion to Associate Professor and four publications, or its equivalent, for promotion to Full Professor. Departments/Schools have the flexibility and authority to decide how these minimum thresholds can be met.

The evaluation process in the College of Humanities and Social Science has four parts: the annual Review, the Pre-Tenure Review, the Promotion & Tenure Review, and the Post-Tenure Review.

During each academic year, faculty members will have an annual review with their department chairs. Prior to the review, faculty members will prepare an Annual Review Document (ARD) in which they present evidence to demonstrate the progress they are making on the plans presented in their Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). Department chairs will provide written evaluations of the faculty. Along with the ARD, they are forwarded to the Dean's office for review. After the review, both chairs and faculty members sign the documents and return them to the Dean's office for signing. At all levels of review, within ten calendar days of the date the document is signed, faculty members may make a written response to the evaluation.

The Annual Review Document, the Faculty Performance Agreement, and all written responses from faculty members, are material for Pre-Tenure Review-the second kind of evaluation in the College. Section 3 of the *Faculty Handbook* presents the pre-tenure process for the faculty at Kennesaw State University. Beginning with department P&T committees, to continuing to the Chair review, and on to the Dean, the *Handbook* outlines the details for each step. **The academic departments will have written guidelines that state specifically the expectations and evaluative criteria unique to the department.** New, tenure-track faculty members will have a pre-tenure review that will give them a

scholarship as "... tangible outcomes of the scholarly processes".)

clear picture of the progress they are making toward tenure. Letters of review state specifically the strengths_ and weaknesses of the faculty members under pre- tenure review.

The Annual Review Document, the Faculty Performance Agreement, and all written responses from faculty members, are material for Promotion and Tenure -the third kind of evaluation in the College. Section 3 of the *Faculty Handbook* present the promotion and tenure process for the faculty at Kennesaw State University. Beginning with department committees, continuing to the College level, and on to the University level, the Handbook outlines the details for each step.

The fourth level of review is Post-Tenure Review. Board of Regents' policy states that each institution shall conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members. Each faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review. Section 3 of the *Faculty Handbook* describes the post-tenure review process and what faculty members up for post-tenure review have to submit.

At all levels of review, faculty are expected to demonstrate the quality and significance of their work (Section 3 if the KSU *Faculty Handbook*). Faculty members' performance must be noteworthy in at least two areas, of which teaching, advising, and mentoring must be one, and satisfactory in the third. In some cases, probationary credit towards tenure may be awarded at the assistant or associate professor level to new hires who have previously held full-time faculty employment at Kennesaw State University or other colleges or universities. In accordance with the Board of Regents (BOR) Academic & Student Affairs *Handbook* and the Kennesaw State University *Faculty Handbook* (see section "Tenure Review"), an individual may be granted between 1 to 3 years of prior credit towards tenure based on previous full-time faculty employment. Faculty members who use probationary years of credit towards tenure and/or promotion must clearly state in their narrative the number of years of previous work they are including as part of their portfolio performance evaluation and provide detailed documentation of performance in the three areas of evaluation during those years as the ones at KSU. In addition, the number of years of previous work included as part of the performance review cannot exceed five full years of full-time appointment.

In cases where prior credit towards tenure has been awarded, promotion & tenure review committees must take into account activities completed in all review categories for the period stated in the narrative before the individual was hired in a full-time associate or assistant professor position at KSU.

As stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, untenured faculty who use probationary credits toward tenure as part of their tenure bid and who do not receive tenure are given one additional attempt to obtain tenure during their sixth year of eligibility (i.e., their required year for tenure as outlined on their faculty tenure and promotion status sheet).

Definitions of Satisfactory and Noteworthy Contributions

Satisfactory faculty consistently fulfill fundamental job expectations and contribute to the everyday functioning of their department, college, and university. They are productive members of the greater academic community.³

Noteworthy faculty consistently exceed their fundamental job expectations. They make notable contributions to their greater academic communities.

The following sections intend to help clarify what satisfactory and noteworthy contributions means in CHSS. However, each department must develop its own examples of what constitutes satisfactory

³ Faculty who do not meet satisfactory standards are considered not meeting expectations.

and noteworthy performance in each performance area and at each rank.

Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring:

Faculty members are fulfilling satisfactory requirements at both the Associate and Full Professor levels through a demonstrated record of successful teaching, advising, and mentoring in which instruction and assessments are aligned with course objectives. Faculty members are expected to be available and responsive to students, and they should generally meet the criteria for effective teaching practices as specified by departmental guidelines. Further, candidates should demonstrate a commitment to incorporating relevant and timely best practices in their classrooms.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Noteworthy

By the time candidates petition for promotion to Associate Professor, they should have fulfilled all requirements for satisfactory teaching, advising, and mentoring as well as achieved some combination of

- The use of diverse and effective pedagogical strategies as evidenced by syllabi, lesson materials, teaching philosophy, peer observations, or student feedback
- The use of a variety of materials and techniques that are designed to enhance student learning and engagement
- A demonstrated commitment to continued improvement through reflection, participation in professional development courses or activities, attendance at conferences focused on teaching and learning, or solicitation of feedback from peers and students
- The development of new courses
- Demonstrated evidence of effective advising or mentoring

Promotion to Full Professor: Noteworthy

By the time candidates petition for promotion to Full Professor, they should have fulfilled all requirements for satisfactory teaching, advising, and mentoring at the Associate Professor level as well as achieved some combination of

- Departmental or college level awards/recognition of teaching
- The development of new courses or the development of courses to be delivered in new formats
- Publication in journals and/or presentation at conferences focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning
- Evidence of working with undergraduate or graduate students on research projects
- Involvement in curriculum revisions
- Involvement in curriculum assessment procedures
- Leadership at relevant faculty workshops in the area of scholarship of teaching and learning
- Mentorship of faculty in the area of teaching, advising, and mentoring
- The receipt of grants that are specifically for the scholarship of teaching & learning or classroom improvement
- Development of innovative pedagogical strategies
- Excellence in peer reviews (each department will develop its own objective peer-review process)

Scholarship and Creative Activity:

It is incumbent upon the faculty to demonstrate the quality and significance of their research and creative activities (such as publication venue, acceptance rates, readership, etc.) as well as their contributions in multi-authored works. The focus of research and creative activities should be to

generate original, peer-reviewed work. Faculty members' research should follow an arc commensurate with their academic expertise, teaching assignments, and mission of their specific departments. Examples of Scholarship and Creative Activity that will be given priority in evaluations of Scholarship and Creative Activity include, but are not limited to

- Journal articles
- Book chapters
- Edited volumes
- Single- or co-authored books
- Funded grants
- Other research and creative activities for which the candidate can make a strong case regarding their quality and significance
- Other activities as deemed appropriate by departmental P&T guidelines

There are other examples of Scholarship and Creative Activity which establish the research trajectory of the faculty member and should be given consideration in this category. Such works include, but are not limited to

- Conference presentations
- Conference proceedings
- Articles in trade publications
- External unfunded grants
- Other research and creative activities for which the candidate can make a strong case regarding their quality and significance
- Other activities as deemed appropriate by departmental P&T guidelines

CHSS recognizes that different fields and disciplines emphasize different forms of knowledge and scholarly production, and thus it is difficult to set clear and specific minimum standards across a college as diverse as CHSS. However, the college also recognizes the need to set and make transparent minimum standards for promotion & tenure, and it recognizes the need to require standards consistent with the research aspirations of the university. Balancing these needs, departments must establish promotion & tenure guidelines that clearly delineate specific minimum expectations for satisfactory and noteworthy achievement in Scholarship and Creative Activity.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor

Manuscripts should be published, in press, or fully accepted for publication, and they should be published during the candidate's time at KSU unless probationary credit toward tenure and/or promotion was awarded at the time of hiring. In that case, reviewers must take into account research and creative activities completed during up to the last five years while holding a full-time faculty member position. Other scholarly work or creative activity will be taken into consideration in evaluating one's performance in this area as defined in departmental guidelines.

Professional Service:

Professional Service is required for all faculty members. Faculty should consult with their department chairs to determine the percentage of workload that should be devoted to departmental, college, university, disciplinary, or other professional service.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Satisfactory

By the time candidates petition for promotion to Associate Professor, they should have a demonstrated record of engagement in appropriate departmental committees. Some service at the college or university levels, or relevant disciplinary organizations, is also expected.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Noteworthy

For noteworthy achievement in professional service, faculty members should provide a clear rationale demonstrating the relationship between their service commitments and academic expertise. By the time candidates petition for promotion to Associate Professor, they should have fulfilled all requirements of satisfactory service, as well as some combination of the following:

- Participation on a college level committee
- Contribution to statewide or regional professional or academic organizations
- Major engagement on a committee organized at the department level or higher
- Student organization advising
- Activity in department-, college-, or university-level community engagement
- Other service expectations as defined as relevant by departmental guidelines

Promotion to Full Professor: Satisfactory

By the time candidates petition for promotion to Full Professor, they should have a demonstrated record of engagement at the departmental level. Significant contributions to college, or university committees, or relevant professional or disciplinary organization beyond the university are expected.

Promotion to Full Professor: Noteworthy

For noteworthy achievement in professional service, faculty members should provide a clear rationale demonstrating the relationship between their service commitments and academic expertise. By the time candidates petition for promotion to Full Professor, they should be recognized for their leadership in service activities. They should meet all expectations of the satisfactory level of service, as well as some combination of

- Leadership in department-, college-, or university-level community engagement
- Major engagement in a regional, national, or international academic organization
- Editorial board member or peer reviewer for national or international-level publications and conferences
- Other professional service expectations as defined as relevant by departmental guidelines

V. Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty — Evaluation and Review Material

All material for Promotion and Tenure Review must be submitted using university procedures as defined in the *Faculty Handbook*. In addition, however, portfolios for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences must contain, from the period of the review, all quantitative student evaluations and a clear, concise, and meaningful statistical analysis of the evaluations; complete qualitative evaluations of all courses taught; and complete copies of all material submitted as examples of scholarship, e.g., entire articles and not just the first page of the article.

In addition, the faculty narrative must include the quality and significance of one's Scholarship and Creative Activity, including a description of the quality and significance of any publications or presentations and their venues (i.e., peer review process, acceptance/rejection rates, impact factors, and citation indexes).

VI. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

As stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (Section 3), the review for promotion of lecturers is optional. For lecturer and senior lecturer performance expectations, review process, portfolio guidelines and

content, lecturer promotion to senior lecturer, see *Faculty Handbook*. The *Faculty Handbook* does not require lecturers to undergo a third-year review nor a multi-year review once they are promoted to senior lecturer. However, it allows for colleges to create their own third-year review process. In the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, departments can opt to establish a third-year review process for Lecturers. That process will be similar to the one used for the pre-tenure review for tenure-track faculty, it must be included in the approved department P&T guidelines, and must apply to all lecturers in that department.

VII. Clinical Faculty

For clinical faculty performance expectations, review process, promotion process, portfolio guidelines and content, see section 3 of the *Faculty Handbook*. The timeline for Clinical faculty undergoing a promotion review will be identical to the timeline established for tenure-track faculty. Clinical Faculty who desire to be reviewed for promotion in rank must inform their department chair during the spring semester prior to the review. Department P&T guidelines will provide general performance expectations for clinical faculty. It is incumbent upon clinical faculty to work closely with their department chair to articulate clearly their responsibilities and performance expectations in their FPA/ARDs.

VIII. Department Chairs, School Directors, and Deans

Expectations and Evaluations. For the purpose of promotion and tenure, department chairs and deans follow all of the university, college, and department guidelines.

IX. Revision of Guidelines

Amendments to these College P&T Guidelines shall be submitted in writing to the College Dean and shall be approved by a majority vote of the permanent, full-time faculty of the College taken by a secret ballot. Revisions should be drafted by a task force established by the Dean in consultation with the CFC and representing all CHSS academic units and faculty ranks. Department Faculty Councils should nominate more than one candidate for the task force from among the department's permanent full-time faculty, with the ultimate task force composition to be determined from that pool of nominations.

Approved by CHSS full-time faculty vote on **March 5, 2019**.

<p>DocuSigned by:  <small>C48662018FA5497...</small></p> <hr/> <p>Chair of CHSS P&T Committee, Dr. Robert Simon</p>	<p>November 11, 2019</p> <hr/> <p>Date</p>
--	--

<p>DocuSigned by:  <small>C9F0D3FF36B148A</small></p> <hr/> <p>Dean Shawn D. Long</p>	<p>November 13, 2019</p> <hr/> <p>Date</p>
--	--

<p>DocuSigned by:  <small>11EA3F49C7ED4B9</small></p> <hr/> <p>Provost Kathy Schwaig</p>	<p>November 20, 2019</p> <hr/> <p>Date</p>
---	--