2.1 - Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Instructional Responsibilities

II. *As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They strive to enhance student success. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.*

2.2 - Workload Model for Teaching Faculty

The purpose of this model is to provide a common vocabulary to describe the varied work faculty members do and an agreed framework for discussions of that work. The model establishes some core standards, for instance that a typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year, and that all faculty must allocate at least 10% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution. The model also requires that each department establish, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught; and that equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research) be formally negotiated and incorporated into the faculty assessment process. Likewise, disciplines with writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio, and field experiences, etc., or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities shall establish teaching load equivalencies through the shared governance process on the basis of this model. The model does not dictate, or even favor, any particular mix of activities. That mix is for individual faculty members and their chairs to agree upon (with their dean's approval) based on institutional needs and KSU's shared governance process. But the application of the model's core standards and the common vocabulary across campus should enable KSU to distribute faculty work more wisely and fairly, to assess it more accurately, and to reward it more appropriately. To ensure this distribution, the norms for workload effort expected in the area of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty are 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively. Workload adjustments are made from these norms. Faculty for whom a different model would be more appropriate will collaborate with their chair/director in the selection of that model. 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 3 - Review and Evaluation of Faculty Performance

3.1 – Introduction

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.

3.2 - Overview of Faculty Responsibilities

As described in the KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.3, the three basic performance areas in which faculty must be evaluated at KSU are teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service. While faculty may focus in all areas of student success, they are to highlight activities promoting student success in at least one of these three areas in both their annual reviews and in their multi-year reviews**.** Depending upon college and departmental guidelines, faculty members need not demonstrate noteworthy achievements in all three areas but must be noteworthy in two and satisfactory in the third in their promotion and tenure reviews**.** All teaching faculty are expected to emphasize excellence in teaching and demonstrate noteworthy achievement in at least one other area (BoR Policy Manual 8.3.5, 8.3.6, and 8.3.7). Appropriate activities and noteworthy achievement in all three areas are defined by the specific departmental guidelines. These standards must be honored by all levels of review in the tenure and promotion process. Regardless of the individual's relative emphasis in the performance areas, all faculty members are expected to devote at least 10% of their time to professional service activities, which are essential to the life of the institution.

The Faculty Performance Agreement (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 departmental and college mission and goals,
- identify the expectations for scholarly activity in all of the faculty member's performance areas, and
- identify the performance area(s) that will include scholarship expectations and describe those expectations.
- clarify how the faculty member will promote student success in one of the three areas.

Consistent with the University’s culture of shared governance, the details of an individual FPA are worked out in consultation between the chair and the faculty member and are subject to final

approval by the dean. If the faculty member and the chair cannot reach agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

As a faculty member matures and develops and as the focus of colleges and departments evolve, an FPA may change. New agreements may reflect changes in the workload percentages assigned. It may, in fact, be necessary to change an FPA during the course of a given year due to unexpected circumstances, such as changes in departmental staffing and/or other opportunities. If this occurs, the faculty member, in consultation with supervisors, will draw up a new FPA that will be signed by all parties. 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.

3.3 - Basic Categories of Faculty Performance

The basic categories of faculty performance at KSU are teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service**.** In addition, faculty are to highlight activities promoting student success in at least one of these three areas. The Faculty Performance Agreement delineates the relative emphasis of an individual faculty member's activities in these three areas. The typical faculty member will focus work in the specific areas that reflect their knowledge and expertise in advancing the University's mission. In all cases, evaluation of faculty performance will be based on evidence of the quality and significance (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.4) of the individual faculty member's scholarly accomplishments in respective areas of emphasis. Faculty for whom a different model would be more appropriate will collaborate with their chair/director in the selection of that model. A faculty member's strengths, interests, and past three years' annual reviews will serve as the primary guide to the selection of the model.

Kennesaw State University is committed to the success of all its students. Student success is at the core of the University's mission and arises from those activities that help promote the academic and professional development and achievement of its undergraduate and graduate students. Those activities include, but are not limited to, "effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by the institution to deepen student learning." (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)

At Kennesaw State University, student success is embedded within the three basic categories of faculty performance—teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service. As such, their evaluation is also embedded within these categories. While faculty often engage in student success activities that span all three basic categories, they must demonstrate student success activities in at least one of the three categories. They can do this by including products of student success in their evaluation documents. Focusing in one area allows faculty to strategically target meaningful and impactful activities.

Kennesaw State University encourages faculty to pursue continuous professional growth throughout their careers. Continuous professional growth for faculty can occur in their teaching, scholarship, and creative activity, and/or professional service, and can range broadly from attending CETL or professional conference workshops to implementing new techniques and ideas into their classrooms to building their scholarship. Like student success, faculty should identify how they will pursue continuous professional growth in at least one area of their teaching, scholarship, and creative activity, and/or professional service in their FPA. Faculty will then annually record their progress in the narrative for their ARD.

A. Teaching

This category of faculty performance refers to a wide variety of instructional activities that engage faculty peers and others to facilitate student learning. Teaching also includes activities such as mentoring, advising, and supervision. The norm for workload effort expected in the area of teaching for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 60%. By definition, scholarly teachers (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.4) demonstrate mastery of the current knowledge and methodology of their discipline(s). Teaching effectiveness at KSU will be assessed and evaluated not only from the perspective of the teacher's pedagogical intentions but also from the perspective of student learning. Such assessment may employ multiple methods, including a variety of classroom techniques. Instruments to assess student perceptions of their own learning should not be the sole means but may be used in conjunction with other instruments. Depending on the faculty member's situational context, evaluation of teaching and curricular contributions will not be limited to classroom activities but will also focus on the quality and significance of a faculty member's contributions to larger communities. Examples include curricular development, community-engaged teaching practices, program assessment, student mentoring and supervision, public lectures and workshops, teaching abroad and international exchange, and academic advising.

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

Examples of Student Success in Teaching

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

B. Scholarship and Creative Activity

Scholarship and creative activity at KSU are broadly defined in the institution's mission statement as a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge, understanding,

application, problem solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy in the communities served by the University. The norm for workload effort expected in the area of scholarship/creative activity for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 30%. 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%. 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. These professional activities become recognized accomplishments when the work exhibits the use of appropriate and rigorous methods, is formally shared with others, and is subject to informed critique and review (peer-review). Documentation and evaluation of accomplishments in scholarship and creative activity will focus on the quality and significance of the work. Merely listing individual tasks and projects does not address quality and significance. Faculty members are encouraged to disseminate their best teaching practices to appropriate audiences and to subject their work to critical review.

College and departmental guidelines must identify the specific criteria for determining quality and significance of scholarship and creative activity appropriate to that college's and department's disciplines and scholarly contexts.

Accomplishments will be judged in the context of their use of current knowledge, their impact on peers and communities who are stakeholders in the processes, and the products of the scholarship and creative activities. In evaluating scholarship, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty member's accomplishments.

In certain fields such as writing, literature, performing arts, fine arts, architecture, graphic design, cinema, and broadcast media or related fields, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in more traditional areas of research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to determine the quality and significance of the faculty member's accomplishments. Criteria such as originality, scope, richness, depth of creative expression, and recognition by peers may be used to evaluate quality and significance. In disciplines such as music or drama performance, conducting, directing, design, choreography, etc. are evidence of a candidate's creativity.

Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, cross-institutional, international, or community-engaged research programs are highly valued. Documenting collaborative research might involve evidence of individual contributions (e.g., quality of work, completion of assigned responsibilities), work facilitating the successful participation of others (e.g., skills in teamwork, group problem-solving), and/or the development of sustained partnerships that involve the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources. KSU recognizes publishing in pedagogical journals or making educationally focused presentations at disciplinary and inter-disciplinary gatherings that advance the scholarship of teaching and curricular innovation or practice.

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

Examples of Student Success in Scholarship and Creative Activity

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

C. Professional Service

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member's academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks that benefit the University, the community, or the profession. Professional service includes service to the department, school, college, University, profession, and community. The service activity must be related to a person's status as a faculty member. For example, faculty members might draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of scholarly service to the governance and professionally related service activities of the department, college, or University. Service is a vital part of faculty governance and to the operation of the University. Evidence of the quality and significance of institutional service can support promotion and tenure. Governance and professionally related service create an environment that supports scholarly excellence and the achievement of the University's mission. Administrative faculty are encouraged to engage in service activities such as faculty development, fundraising, fiscal management, personnel management, and public relations. Whatever the individual's relative emphasis in the performance areas, all faculty members are expected to devote at least 10% of their time to professional service activities that are essential to the life of the institution (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 2.2). That is, the norm for workload effort expected in the area of service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 10% (120 hours/year).

Scholarly service to communities external to the University is highly valued and frequently enhances teaching, scholarship, and creative activity. Service to the community should be related to the faculty member's discipline or role at the University. For example, a faculty member might engage in professionally related service to a community agency, support or enhance economic development for the region, provide technical assistance, or facilitate organizational development. Likewise, some scholarly service activities might rely on a faculty member's academic or professional expertise to serve their discipline or an interdisciplinary field. This type of service might also include developing linkages with partner institutions both locally and globally.

In all types of professional service, documentation and evaluation of scholarly service will focus on quality and significance rather than on a plain recitation of tasks and projects. Documentation of the products or outcomes of professional service should be provided by the faculty member and considered as evidence for the evaluation of accomplishments. Documentation should be sufficient to outline a faculty member's agreed-upon responsibilities and to support an evaluation of effectiveness.

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

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

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

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

Examples of Student Success in Professional Service

Student success can occur through a faculty member's work in professional service. Faculty who direct study abroad programs or other experiential learning activities, who coordinate internships, service-learning, and other community-engaged activities, and who serve on various committees dedicated to student success are examples of those engaged in student success in professional service.

3.5 - General Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Faculty Performance for Tenure Track Faculty in Professorial Ranks

A. Tenure

Academic tenure is an employment status at the University that assures a tenured faculty member of continuous appointment from contract year to contract year, except under conditions of dismissal for cause (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 4.1.9), termination or layoff of tenured personnel due to program modification (see BoR Policy Manual 8.3.7.9), financial exigencies, or after an unsuccessful performance improvement plan (PIP). The awarding of tenure is a highly important decision through which the University incurs a major commitment to the individual faculty member well into the future. Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure. It should only be granted to those faculty members whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of an Associate Professor and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University. Tenure requires prior or

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

C. Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

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

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

The primary purpose of post-tenure review is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of all tenured faculty members, thereby strengthening the quality and significance of faculty work. Post-tenure review serves to highlight constructive and positive opportunities for all tenured faculty to realize their full potential of contributions to Kennesaw State University and the University System of Georgia. It also serves to identify deficiencies in performance and provide a structure for addressing such concerns.

Post-tenure review is not a reconsideration of the faculty member's tenure status. Instead, it is a comprehensive five-year performance review that occurs after an individual is tenured. This post-tenure performance review is more comprehensive and concerns a longer time perspective (at least five years) than the annual performance reviews; post-tenure review feedback also comes from multiple peer and administrative perspectives, rather than from the perspective of one administrative head as is the case in annual reviews.

Post-tenure review provides both retrospective and prospective examination of performance, taking into account that a faculty member probably will have different emphases and assignments at different points in his or her career. It is directed toward a career development and a multi-year perspective of accomplishments and plans for professional development.

The primary evidence to be considered by review committees/administrators for post-tenure review consists of the five most recent annual evaluations and a current curriculum vitae (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12 for the review process and portfolio instructions). Post-tenure

review also considers the broader peer and administrator perspectives provided by members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and by administrative levels of review.

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

5 -- Exemplary

4 -- Exceeds Expectations

3 – Meets Expectations

2 – Needs Improvement

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations

Successful Post-Tenure Review

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

In cases where the faculty member receives a score of 3 or higher, no formal faculty improvement plan is required. The results of the post-tenure review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development activity would focus on further enhancing the faculty member's performance.

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

Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review

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

3.12 - Faculty Review Process

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

A. Annual Reviews

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

1. Format (ARD and FPA)

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

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

2. Evaluation of Categories by Chairs

Chairs will evaluate faculty members in each of the three performance categories--teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service—based upon the following five-point rubric:

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

(BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)

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

Score	Category	Description	Comments
5	Exemplary	Faculty member far exceeded the department and/or college expectations in the performance area.	

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

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

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

3. Academic Administrative Review

Per BoR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.5.3, academic administrative officers shall be evaluated by the administrator's supervisor using a performance management instrument which emphasizes:

1. Leadership qualities,
2. Management style,
3. Planning and organizing capacities,
4. Effective communication skills,
5. Accountability for diversity efforts and results; and,
6. Success at meeting goals and objectives.

4. Process for Annual Review

Each full-time faculty member at KSU, regardless of rank or responsibilities or contract type, must receive an annual review of his or her performance (BoR Policy Manual, Section 8.3.5). In January of each year, the department chair or direct supervisor of the faculty member conducts an annual review of the faculty member's activity (provided in the ARD) in relation to the FPA goals for the previous calendar year. Administrators reviewing candidates should be very clear in stating their expectations and in discussing problems in detail with the faculty member.

The annual review process begins when the faculty member submits documentation and materials for the annual evaluation (including ARD and FPA). The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and his/her progression towards achieving future milestones. The faculty member will be given 10 calendar days to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation. Within 14 calendar days, the appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in the digital workflow the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. (BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)

The entire package is then forwarded to the next administrative level for review. Within 10 calendar days from the review decision, the faculty member has the right to submit electronically a written appeal to the next level of review addressing specific items from the review providing clarification or additional perspective. Such responses become integral to the ARD throughout the review process. The response is archived with all other documentation for future reference (e.g., inclusion in portfolio reviews). No response is required by the last administrative reviewer.

If the faculty member believes that the process of review has been violated, the faculty member may request review under the provisions of the KSU Grievance Policy.

Evaluation of faculty performance via the Annual Review Document and Faculty Performance Agreement will be conducted in the digital workflow system. The general timeline for annual reviews and evaluation of faculty performance adheres to the following schedule:

- Last Friday of January: Completed ARDs/FPAs submitted by teaching and administrative faculty to next level supervisors.
- 2nd Friday of March: All reviews between teaching and administrative faculty and next level supervisors completed; portfolios submitted to second level supervisors.
- 2nd Friday of April: Second level supervisors return annual review submissions to teaching and administrative faculty; salary recommendations (if applicable; exact date TBD based on Budget Office and Board of Regents directions).

Each college may elect to have the faculty due date sooner, but not later, than those listed above. All faculty must have an annual review digitally signed by the appropriate administrators at all levels by the final due date listed above. Failure by a faculty member to submit all documentation required for annual reviews according to the University review timeline above shall be deemed as

not meeting performance standards. Eligibility for merit, if applicable, is contingent upon completion of the ARD process.

A faculty member returning from a full leave of absence must complete their ARD and FPA within two weeks of returning from leave during their academic or fiscal contract period. If a faculty member on an academic contract officially returns from leave when they are not under contract (e.g., during the summer), the ARD and FPA must be completed within two weeks of the next contract start date.

Within 30 days after the start date, new faculty should develop an FPA in consultation with the Department Chair, to cover the period from the start date to December of the start year.

The requirement for annual reviews does not preclude the possibility of having additional reviews during the year. Non-renewal schedules as outlined in Section 4.1.8 of the KSU Faculty Handbook must be followed.

ARDs, FPAs, supervisor evaluation, 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.

5. Performance Remediation Plan

If a tenured faculty member receives a "1 – Does Not Meet Expectations" or "2 – Needs Improvement" in any of the categories during an annual review, the chair of the department and the faculty member will develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) in consultation with the faculty member to remediate the faculty member's performance. A Performance Remediation Plan sets forth realistic goals and strategies for the faculty member to begin meeting expectations in the following year's annual review. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4) The PRP should include the following:

1. A set of realistic goals that are achievable within the timeframe of the Performance Remediation Plan.
2. A set of realistic strategies for achieving those goals.
3. A realistic measurement.
4. A realistic timeline.
5. Available resources for enacting strategies and achieving goals.
6. Set meetings between the chair and the faculty member – at least two (including the PRP planning meeting) during the Spring Semester and two the following Fall semester. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4)

In addition to setting forth realistic goals that are specific and achievable during the evaluation period, the PRP should fit within the faculty member's situational context and workload. Moreover, it should address the issues that caused the 1 or 2 rating(s). The PRP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to Academic Affairs. Important note: Faculty cannot be required to fulfill their PRP while they are off contract.

Examples of such goals and strategies may include but are not limited to:

- Attend development activities (seminars, workshops, conferences, etc.)
- Seek mentorship, either inside or outside the department (may be facilitated by chair; mentor may have duties re-assigned to facilitate this)
- Produce updated curriculum or other work products
- Develop and/or disseminate scholarship
- Produce reflective evaluation of any area that resulted in the 1 or 2 rating.
- Undertake leadership or other active roles in service activities

During the annual review process in the following year, the faculty member will address the goals and strategies in the PRP from the previous year. If the faculty member's performance in every category is determined by the chair/director to be 3 or above, the PRP is successfully completed. If the PRP was not successfully completed – the performance in any category (whether the same or different area from the prior year) is evaluated by the chair/director to be a 1 or 2 – the faculty member, if tenured, will participate in a corrective post tenure review the following fall. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.4, 4.7)

6. Corrective Post-Tenure Review

If a tenured faculty member receives a "1 – Does Not Meet Expectations" or "2 – Needs Improvement" on two consecutive annual reviews, the faculty member will undergo a corrective post-tenure review. (Importantly, the faculty member does not have to receive a "1 – Does Not Meet Expectations" or "2 – Needs Improvement" in the same area as the previous year for a (faculty member to be required to undergo a corrective post-tenure review.) Faculty undergoing a corrective post-tenure review will follow the same processes as faculty undergoing a regular post-tenure review. If the outcome of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review is successful, the faculty member will reset the post-tenure review clock. If the outcome of a corrective post tenure review does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the same process for an unsuccessful PTR will be followed. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

B. Multi-Year Reviews

1. Pre-Tenure Reviews

For non-administrative faculty, the review of pre-tenure review portfolios begins with the Department P&T Committee, proceeding in turn to the department chair and the dean. The pre-tenure review portfolio of a department chair is reviewed by the Department P&T Committee, followed by the College P&T Committee, and then the dean. The pre-tenure review for other academic administrators (deans, college-level administrators, and university-level administrators) will mirror the first three levels of review for the tenure and promotion process.

At each level, review committees and administrators consider the progress of the candidate toward tenure. A letter is written at each level of review outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate with respect to this question. This review letter is placed in the digital portfolio workflow.

Within 10 calendar days from the date of Advance of each review recommendation, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's recommendation and justifications by submitting a letter written by the faculty member to the reviewing committee or administrator for the information of the next level of review. The faculty member will place the response letter into the digital portfolio workflow. The response letter should address the interpretation of the information in the portfolio, but it should not include new evidence to be considered in the review process. The reviewer (committee or administrator) does not respond to this letter.

2. Review for Promotion and/or Tenure

The review of promotion and tenure documents begins with the Department P&T Committee. Documents are then reviewed in turn by the department chair and the college dean. Promotion and tenure of department chairs/school directors begins at the level of the Department P&T Committee, then proceeds to a committee of department chairs from the college (composition of this committee follows procedures outlined in College Bylaws), and finally proceeds to the dean with the remainder of the process to follow as ordinary cases of promotion and tenure (see KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.13).

Promotion and tenure portfolios without any negative recommendations among required levels of review proceed from the dean to the Provost. In the event of any negative recommendations among required levels of review, the portfolio goes to the College P&T Committee that serves as the appeals committee for promotion and tenure cases (composition of this committee follows procedures outlined in College Bylaws). The college committee may request written clarification from previous levels of review and will have access to all portfolios in the current year in that college to see examples of successful portfolios in that year.

After the review and recommendation of the college committee (when such a review is necessary), the portfolio proceeds to the Provost for a recommendation. In cases where the portfolio did not go to the College P&T Committee, the Provost may choose to send it to the appropriate College P&T Committee for review and recommendation.

Within 10 calendar days from the date of Advance of each review recommendation, the faculty member has the right to respond to the committee's or administrator's recommendation and justifications by submitting a letter written by the faculty member to the reviewing committee or administrator for the information of the next level of review. The faculty member will place the response letter into the digital portfolio workflow. The response letter should address the interpretation of the information in the portfolio, but it should not include new evidence to be considered in the review process. The reviewer (committee or administrator) does not respond to this letter. The Provost makes a recommendation, and the portfolio then goes to the President, who makes a final decision. If, after the Provost review, a candidate for tenure or promotion believes

that the process of review has been violated, the candidate may request review under the provisions of the KSU Grievance Policy.

If a tenured faculty is under review for promotion and post-tenure review simultaneously, the portfolio is reviewed by the department's promotion and tenure committee and the department chair for the promotion review only. The portfolio is then reviewed by the dean for promotion and post-tenure review. The portfolio is subsequently sent to the Provost for a promotion consideration. If the Provost is inclined not to support a recommendation of previous levels for promotion, if previous levels of review are discrepant for promotion, or if previous reviews are consistently negative for promotion, the Provost sends the portfolio to the college committee for a promotion and post-tenure review. The Provost then provides a promotion review and finally the President provides a promotion decision. If the president provides a negative promotion decision and the portfolio has not been reviewed by the college committee for post-tenure review, this committee will meet and provide this review during spring semester.

If a faculty member has a joint appointment in two or more academic departments or across two or more divisions, the faculty member's joint appointment Memorandum of Understanding, which delineates how the academic home unit and the sharing unit(s) will provide input during promotion and tenure processes, will be followed.

At each level, review committees and administrators must make a positive or negative recommendation on the question of tenure and/or promotion and must write a letter to be placed in the digital portfolio workflow [for administrative faculty, recommendation letters must be copied to the candidate's academic supervisors (e.g., department chair, dean) and administrative supervisors (Director of Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Director of the Division of Global Affairs, etc.) if the supervisor is not included in the electronic workflow during the review process]. The letter includes the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion and articulates the strengths and weaknesses that contributed to the recommendation. Within 10 calendar days from the date of Advance of the review recommendation at each level, the faculty member has the right to respond to a committee's or administrator's recommendation and justifications by submitting a letter written by the faculty to the reviewing committee or administrator for the information of the next level of review. The faculty member will place the response letter into the digital portfolio workflow. The response letter should address the interpretation of the information in the portfolio, but it should not include new evidence to be considered in the review process. The reviewer (committee or administrator) does not respond to this letter.

External Letters

The inclusion of external letters as part of the Promotion and Tenure process is required. External letters will not be required for non-tenure track faculty unless research and scholarship expectations are 50% or more of their workload expectations nor for Post-Tenure Review (PTR). For faculty submitting for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and tenure, 3 external letters will be required. For faculty submitting for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and/or tenure, 3 external letters will be required. The actual process for obtaining external letters will be as follows:

I. Teaching Faculty

a. The person submitting a portfolio (herein after referred to as the "candidate") and the department chair/school director (herein after referred to as "chair") develop a list of potential letter writers, twice the minimum number of the total required, with the candidate supplying at least half the names on the list.
b. The chair and the candidate will discuss potential letter writers and in collaboration will develop a mutually acceptable, hierarchized list. The majority of letters must come from individuals who are neither co-authors nor dissertation committee members. If the candidate and the chair cannot reach agreement on the list of potential letter writers, the dean will make the final determination of the list.
c. Individuals who pose a conflict of interest (such as friends, relatives, KSU coworkers) will be removed from the list.
d. For promotion to Professor, the candidate chooses 2 names out of the final 3 letter writers; the chair chooses 1.
e. For promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate chooses 2 out of the final 3 letter writers; the chair chooses 1.
f. The candidate may veto two names on the chair's initial list with no reasons or explanations required.
g. Neither the chair nor the candidate may solicit a letter concerning Scholarship / Creative Activity from outside of the mutually agreed upon list.
h. The candidate may choose to solicit a maximum of 5 additional letters of support in any area of Teaching, and/or Service from outside the mutually composed list. When soliciting such letters, the candidate will include that the writer is asked not to make a recommendation as such. No individual may write more than one (1) letter of support for a single candidate's portfolio.
i. The candidate will enter the names and contact information for the reviewers on the final list into the digital portfolio system, along with the KSU faculty member's CV, department guidelines for promotion and tenure, and reprints and/or professional portfolios or other documentation as appropriate by discipline. The candidate should select the work to be shared with the letter writer. It is unnecessary to have all materials evaluated.
j. The department chair contacts the potential letter writers through the digital portfolio system requesting their assistance using the standard KSU "Letter to External Reviewers."
k. If the letter writer declines, the chair will choose another letter writer in the order of the list.
l. Once packets are sent to external letter writers, no additional information regarding the candidate's research/creative activity will be sent to the external letter writer.
m. The letter writers will upload their letter into electronic portfolio workflows before the faculty member submits the portfolio.
n. If requests are sent to more potential letter writers than are required, and if more than the required numbers are received, all letters will be included in the portfolio.
o. If fewer than the number of letters requested by the chair are received, the chair will so note in the portfolio and the review will proceed.
p. The candidate will not see the letters unless the candidate expressly requests a copy of the letters pursuant the Georgia Open Record Act (O.C.G.A §50-18-0 through 50-18-76).

II. Administrators

a. All department chairs, deans, associate deans, VPs, AVPS, etc. must follow the same procedure for soliciting incorporating external letters into their portfolio following the guidelines for teaching faculty.

4. Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

According to USG policy, "all tenured faculty members who have rank and tenure with an academic unit must undergo post-tenure review five years after the award of tenure and subsequently every five years unless it is interrupted by a further review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership promotion (e.g. department chair, Dean, Associate Provost). A corrective post tenure review follows the same process and outcomes as a regularly scheduled post tenure review. If the outcome of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review is successful, the faculty member will reset the post-tenure review clock" (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7).

The BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook goes on to note, "A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for a post-tenure review before the five-year time limit by informing the department chair in the annual review workflow. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure reviews should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the voluntary PTR post-tenure review date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year PTR review date remains in place." (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

I. Process for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

Although the primary evidence considered by review committees/administrators for post-tenure review is the five most recent annual evaluations and a current curriculum vitae, faculty members for post-tenure review must submit all materials listed on the Portfolio Document Submission List (see below). Supporting documentation is also submitted. External letters are not required for PTR.

The process begins with the faculty member submitting the required post-tenure review portfolio to the digital workflow. This digital workflow will then be routed to the department chair who will conduct the first level of review. The department chair will have the option of adding any feedback to the annual reviews that are already included in the documentation

The review of post-tenure portfolios for faculty then proceeds to the College P&T Review Committee. A letter indicating the committee's evaluation must be uploaded into the digital workflow. The committee's post tenure review letter will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in the quality and significance of a faculty member's performance in the context of individual roles and responsibilities. The letter will also include an overall assessment of

whether the faculty member is meeting expectations in post tenure performance, using the same 5-point scale as described for annual reviews (Section 3.12.A.2 above).

The review then proceeds to the Dean, then the Provost, and then the President. At each level, a letter indicating the reviewer's assessment must be uploaded into the digital workflow. This assessment will contain specific and detailed reference to the department promotion and tenure review guidelines used to justify the recommendations and decisions that have been made.

Within 10 calendar days from the date of Advance of the review recommendation at each level, the faculty member has the right to respond to a committee's or administrator's review and justifications by submitting a letter written by the faculty to the reviewing committee or administrator for the information of the next level of review. The faculty member will place the response letter into the digital portfolio workflow. The response letter should address the interpretation of the information in the portfolio, but it should not include new evidence to be considered in the review process. The reviewer (committee or administrator) does not respond to this letter.

The appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of PTR. In the event of an unsuccessful PTR (rating of 1 or 2) the faculty member must be informed in writing of next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

Expedited Post-Tenure Review

As the annual review documents constitutes the "primary evidence" for multi-year reviews, faculty members receiving ratings of "3" ("meeting expectations") or above in all areas of faculty review, as well as in their overall annual reviews during the 5-year period under PTR consideration, may submit an expedited PTR review. Expedited PTR reviews will contain all annual reviews (along with any rebuttal or response documentation) for the period under review, along with a shorter narrative (3-6 pages recommended with a 12-page maximum). No additional materials will be required for the portfolio to be considered complete. Faculty receiving a "1" or "2" rating in any area of review or in their overall annual reviews during any given year under PTR consideration, will submit the standard (full) set of portfolio materials.

Monetary PTR Rewards

If the final rating on the five-point scale in a regularly-scheduled post-tenure review is a 4 or 5, the faculty member will receive a one-time monetary award. Faculty will then be eligible for the same award in five years (and no sooner than five years) at their next post-tenure review. Faculty who undergo a corrective or voluntary post-tenure review, on the other hand, are not eligible for this one-time award.

If the faculty member does not submit any documentation for a regularly scheduled post-tenure review by the deadline, performance will be assessed as a 1 and a PIP will be put into effect, as described below.

II. Performance Improvement Plan

In the event of a post-tenure review that does not meet expectations (1) or needs improvement (2), the faculty member's appropriate supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the review committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the PTR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the post-tenure review. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

The following parties should be involved in the creation of a PIP, in the monitoring of the faculty member's progress towards completion of the plan, and in verifying the plan's completion:

1. the affected faculty member.
2. the academic home department chair/school director.
3. the dean of the faculty member's academic home.
4. an optional fourth colleague -the affected faculty member may ask one of the members of the College Review Committee to serve as this fourth principal.

The affected faculty member will be free to seek mentors, as needed, for the successful completion of the plan.

This work may begin as soon as the first level committee issues an evaluation of 1 or 2. The PIP is not finalized until the President issues the final evaluation of the post-tenure review.

The PIP should include the following:

1. A set of realistic goals that are achievable within the timeframe of the Performance Improvement Plan.
2. A set of realistic strategies for achieving those goals.
3. A realistic measurement.
4. A realistic timeline.
5. Available resources for enacting strategies and achieving goals.
6. Set meetings between the chair and the faculty member – at least two (including the PIP planning meeting) during the Spring Semester and two the following Fall semester.

In addition to setting forth realistic goals that are specific and achievable during the evaluation period, the PIP should fit within the faculty member's situational context and workload. It should address the issues that caused the 1 or 2 rating(s). Important note: Faculty cannot be required to fulfill their PIP while they are off contract.

Examples of such goals and strategies may include:

- Attend development activities (seminars, workshops, conferences, etc.)
- Seek mentorship, either inside or outside the department (may be facilitated by chair; mentor may have duties re-assigned to facilitate this)

· Produce updated curriculum or other work products
· Develop and/or disseminate scholarship
· Produce reflective evaluation of any area that resulted in the 1 or 2 rating.
· Undertake leadership or other active roles in service activities

The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. Before each meeting, the faculty member will submit a summary of progress (may be an interactive vita) into a digital workflow. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP in writing in the digital workflow. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member's progress will be assessed by the college P&T Review committee. The department chair and dean will assess whether the faculty member demonstrated substantive progress. (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

If the College P&T Committee, the chair, and the dean find that the faculty member demonstrated no substantive progress towards remediating the deficiencies identified in the PIP, the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The letter indicating Dean's assessment and proposed action is sent to faculty member for response (14 calendar days). (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

The five-year clock for post-tenure review will be restarted in the year in which an individual has successfully completed a formal **PIP.**

III. PIP Follow-up Actions and Due Process

According to USG policy, in the case of a faculty member who has failed "to make sufficient progress in performance, then the institution will take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies." (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

Note that complete resolution of the deficiencies is not necessary for the successful completion of a PIP. The USG policy only requires that faculty "demonstrate sufficient progress in performance" (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7). It is an option that an action recommended for an unsuccessful PIP be an additional year on a PIP.

Unsuccessful PIPs, therefore, will not be equal in seriousness and nature, and thus, each situation will require a calibrated and proportional set of corrective actions. In the selection of corrective actions, the department chair and the dean should weigh the nature of the deficiencies identified in the PTR report and the faculty's effort in working to successfully complete the PIP.

Examples of corrective actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Continuation of-PIP, without eligibility for pay increase
- Temporary loss of any preferences earned (i.e., seniority)
- Temporary workload adjustments imposed.
- Temporary loss of preferred teaching schedule.
- Temporary loss of summer teaching or other paid opportunities
- reduction of salary
- loss of tenure
- termination from KSU

All guidelines articulated in the Employee Handbook apply to the PIP Process in the same way that they apply to the annual review process. Faculty are encouraged to reach out to HR with any questions.

Faculty Appeals of PIP Action Plans

Faculty members may appeal an action plan following an unsuccessful PIP by requesting that the university's review committee examine the evidence of their progress on the PIP and assessing the proposed action. Faculty members may request an in-person hearing with the University Review committee to state their case and to hear their recommendation. In cases where tenure revocation or dismissal is proposed, faculty may be accompanied by an advisor, who may or may not be legal counsel.

According to USG policy:

The faculty member has 14 calendar days to respond and request review by the University Review Committee. This committee is made up of the chairs of all of the College Promotion and Tenure Review Committees.

1. The University Review committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and the proposed remedial action recommendation of the department chair and dean. The University Review committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the University Review committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The University Review committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within 30 calendar days of the request for review by the faculty member.

2. Within 7 calendar days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the University committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying them of the decision.

3. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within 7 calendar days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision shall be made within 14 calendar days and should notify the faculty member of their decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.

4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.

5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26). (BoR Faculty and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7)

5. Post-Tenure Review for Administrative Faculty

Keep and Revise Original Handbook Language (Section 3.11) (Original Language in Black Below)

Administrative faculty have administrative matters as their primary area of responsibility. These faculty have academic rank and are normally located within the Division of Academic Affairs. Administrative faculty are those members of the corps of instruction who receive a contract for faculty ranked administrators and are eligible to receive an administrative stipend while serving as an administrative faculty. Positions in which faculty are eligible to receive administrative contracts and administrative stipend include department/school chairs/directors; assistant/associate deans; deans; assistant/associate/directors of academic units (e.g., CETL); assistant/associate/vice presidents; assistant/associate/vice/senior vice provosts; Provost; special assistant to President/Provost; others per President/Provost. (See Section 1.1, KSU Faculty Handbook).

All employees who are defined as administrative faculty in Section 1.1 of Kennesaw State University's Faculty Handbook are not subject to the process described in Section X for tenure-track teaching faculty.

Such individuals will undergo the following process, known as "Administrative Post-Tenure Review" (Administrative PTR). Although all administrators are subject to Administrative PTR, there will be occasional differences between those administrators within Academic units (such as department chairs/directors and college deans) and those who are not (such as those in Academic Affairs, the Office of Research, etc.). The former are herein referred to as "Academic Administrators" and the latter as "University Administrators". Unlike the Post-Tenure Review process for tenure-track teaching faculty, Administrative PTR is largely developmental, reflecting the fact that individuals in these positions serve at the discretion of their supervisors. Per BoR Policy 3.2, their tenure protects their faculty position, but their administrative position is not "protected". As such, performance reviews inform supervisory decisions, but do not result in formal remediation or improvement plans in the same manner as tenure-track teaching faculty reviews.

1. **Purpose of Administrative Post-Tenure Review**
    a. The intent of Administrative PTR is to ensure accountability for those administrators who hold tenure, and to provide comprehensive developmental feedback regarding an individual's administrative duties and job performance. This will be accomplished through an inclusive collection of data at multiple levels, known as a "360 degree"

review, which ensures a full perspective of one's performance, strengths, and areas for improvement.

2. **Frequency of Administrative Post-Tenure Review**
   a. All eligible administrators shall be reviewed in the second full academic year in their position inclusive of "interim" years, and every five years thereafter. If an individual is permanently assigned to a different administrative position, the timeline shall be reset. If administrators are hired by October 1, then this will be considered their first year and they will be reviewed in the following year.
   b. Applications for promotion in rank are separate from Administrative PTR and subject to the regular procedures outlined in (Section X).
   c. This process shall commence in Fall 2023, with the Administrative PTR Committee (see below) collaborating with Academic Affairs to ensure staggered reviews and appropriate review loads for units and supervisors.
   d. In exceptional circumstances, the Administrative PTR committee may recommend to the Provost to conduct a 360 review outside of the timeline in 2.a. above.
3. **Management of Administrative Post-Tenure Review**
   a. Management of the Administrative PTR process shall be led by a Faculty PTR Coordinator appointed by the Provost. This faculty member will be a tenured associate or full Professor teaching faculty member.
   b. The Faculty PTR Coordinator shall work with a committee to facilitate the Administrative PTR process, and separately to resolve discrepancies should they occur. This committee shall be known as the Administrative PTR Committee, consisting of the Faculty PTR Coordinator and:
      i) Chair of the Chairs and Directors Assembly
      ii) President of the Faculty Senate
      iii) Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
   c. The responsibilities of the Faculty PTR Coordinator include:
      i) Collaborating with Academic Affairs on developing and maintaining the Administrative PTR review calendar.
      ii) Collaborating with Academic Affairs on developing and maintaining the timeline for each year's Administrative PTR.
      iii) Facilitating all activities, communication, and responsibilities with an outside firm that will conduct the data collection for Administrative PTR.
      iv) Communicating with reviewee and supervisor about development of reviewer list, consulting with the Administrative PTR Committee if necessary.
      v) Working with the Administrative PTR Committee to consider changes to process, to be developed in consultation with appropriate shared governance bodies and approved by the Provost and the President.
      vi) Coordinating with supervisor and, if applicable, shared governance committees, for contextual meetings and feedback.
      vii) Providing training and consultation, as needed, with all stakeholders in the process, including reviewees, supervisors, and reviewers.
      viii) Working with supervisor to ensure appropriate survey is sent to respondents.

4. **Timeline of Administrative Post-Tenure Review**

a. The Faculty PTR Coordinator shall collaborate with Academic Affairs to determine which administrators are to be reviewed each year. This list shall be completed by the end of August, and all individuals on the list shall be notified by the Faculty PTR coordinator.
b. During September and October, the Faculty PTR Coordinator shall work with reviewees and their supervisors to complete the necessary tasks in Section 5 below.
c. The surveys for 360 reviews shall be distributed by an outside contractor during November.
d. The survey results shall be distributed during December, or as soon as the outside firm is able.
    d.1. A secure data link shall be distributed to the Faculty PTR Coordinator, who will forward secure links containing relevant data and reports to:
        d.1.1. The reviewee
        d.1.2. The supervisor
        d.1.3. The relevant shared governance body (if applicable) of Academic Administrators
    d.2. Only responses from faculty and staff will be shared with shared governance bodies
e. The survey results shall be compiled into a summary report by the outside contractor, and in the case of Academic Administrators, responses from faculty and staff shall be reported separately from other respondents. Raw data shall also be provided if requested for specialized analysis.
f. Reviewed administrators shall meet with their supervisor as early as feasible in the spring, according to the timeline approved by the Provost. This meeting serves as both the annual review and the Administrative PTR meeting and shall cover topics traditionally associated with the annual review, as well as the feedback collected as part of the 360 review.
g. Supervisors of "Academic Administrators" shall meet with relevant shared governance bodies (such as Department Faculty Councils, College Faculty Councils, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) prior to meeting with the reviewee. Each shared governance body will include one staff member for this review. In cases where an entire department serves as the Department Faculty Council, the department will identify three individuals to serve as the review committee and name a chair. This meeting is meant to provide greater context to the responses from faculty and staff, and to explore areas for growth and development in the administration of the academic unit. Supervisors are encouraged to meet with these bodies during the spring of non-review years as well, to maintain communication and to collect informal feedback about the performance of Academic Administrators. Supervisors are also encouraged during the spring of non-review years to meet with other relevant stakeholders to discuss the context of the reviewees' performance. For instance, it may be useful to meet with a college curriculum committee chair to discuss the performance of an associate dean who handles curriculum matters.
h. Supervisors of "University Administrators" are encouraged to meet with relevant individuals and stakeholders prior to meeting with the reviewee, though this will vary greatly across the university.

i. A hard copy of all data and/or summaries shall be placed in the University Archives by the Faculty PTR Coordinator no later than June 30 each year.

5. Participants in Administrative Post-Tenure Review

a. University Administrators

i) University Administrators serve in a variety of capacities, with diverse organizational structures to consider. As such, their 360 reviews will vary and be highly individualized. Reviews of these individuals should seek to sample five respondents from "above", five respondents considered "peers" and ten respondents considered subordinates or customers of the service they provide to the university. Each position is unique, but reviewers from "above" may include university administrators above their position, external stakeholders, or peers of their supervisor. Reviewers considered "peers" would be other university administrators not above their administrative rank. Reviewers considered subordinate or customers would include all direct reports, and, if appropriate, colleagues from around the university below their administrative rank who work regularly with the administrator.

ii) The administrator and supervisor develop a list of potential reviewers, ideally twice the minimum required in each group, with the administrator under review supplying at least half of the names on the list. The goal is to develop a mutually acceptable list of reviewers who have sufficient experience working with the administrator to provide valid responses.

iii) The supervisor shall narrow the list of reviewers to no fewer than ten. The overall number of reviewers shall ensure appropriate representation based on the position. Ideally, reviewees shall only exceed twenty when the number of direct reports from below exceeds ten. In exceptional circumstances, the number may be fewer than outlined above. Exceptions must be approved by the Provost or Provost designee. The Administrative PTR Committee may be consulted in such instances. The Committee shall resolve disputes regarding reviewers.

b. Academic Administrators

i) Academic Administrators serve in positions that are more consistent across the university, though there are certainly variations in job descriptions and portfolios. Most Academic Administrators are:

1) department/school chairs/directors;
2) associate/assistant deans;
3) deans;
4) provost.

ii) Reviews of academic administrators shall mirror those of university administrators, attempting to secure five reviews from "above" and five from "peers". However, all faculty and staff in their unit shall also be invited to complete review surveys. All permanent, full-time department/school faculty and staff will have the opportunity to evaluate a chair/director. All permanent, full-time college faculty and staff will have the opportunity to evaluate assistant/associate deans and deans. All permanent, full-time university faculty and staff under the umbrella of Academic Affairs will have the opportunity to evaluate the provost.

iii) In all cases above, the supervisor may decide to expand the list of eligible reviewers. In exceptional circumstances, the number may be fewer than outlined above. Exceptions must be approved by the Provost or Provost designee. The Administrative PTR Committee may be consulted in such instances.

6. **Outcomes of Administrative Post-Tenure Review**
   a. Supervisors shall write a narrative that is inserted in the annual review document highlighting the findings of the Administrative PTR. It shall also be sent to the chair of the relevant shared governance body, if applicable.

6. Committee Structure and Process

Department P&T Review Committee: Department P&T committees and the Department P&T Committee chair are elected by the tenure track faculty of the department during the spring semester. An individual committee chair must be identified for each P&T committee. Department P&T committees, except for the KSU Library System, have a minimum of three tenured teaching faculty members. Administrative faculty, as defined in Section 3.11 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, are not eligible to serve on Department P&T committees.

College Review Committee: For the purpose of reviews, except for the KSU Library System, the members of the College P&T Committee are one or two tenured teaching faculty members from each department as described in the College Bylaws (there must be the same number of faculty representing each department in the College, i.e., one from each department or two representing each department). Administrative faculty, as defined in Section 3.11 of the KSU Faculty Handbook, are not eligible to serve on college P&T committees. Members of the College P&T Committee and the College P&T Committee chair are elected by the tenured and tenure track faculty of the department during the spring semester. An individual committee chair must be identified for the College P&T Committee. No person can participate in more than one stage of the review process. Departmental representatives to the College P&T Review Committee serve two-year staggered terms. When a department does not have tenured faculty members who are eligible to serve, it will elect tenured faculty from outside the department.

Both College and Department Review Committees: Committee members for department and college P&T committees must be at the same rank or higher than the rank that the candidate is being evaluated. That is, for faculty applying for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, both Associate Professors and Professors are eligible to review the portfolio. Portfolios of faculty applying for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are only reviewed by Professors. (NB: this rank requirement does not apply to department chairs or deans as they are evaluating portfolios based on their roles as administrators and not by professorial rank.) Because all Promotion and Tenure committees must have a minimum of three voting members to review each portfolio, departments may elect ad hoc committee members from inside or outside the department to serve in reviewing full professor promotion cases. Specific departmental policies on electing ad hoc committee members for full professor promotion cases must be clearly stated in the department and college promotion and tenure guidelines. Faculty whose documents are under review may not serve on their departmental or college P&T committees. There is one exception:

a candidate under review for Post-Tenure Review can serve on the department Promotion and Tenure committee, because the candidate's portfolio is not reviewed by the department committee.

In special cases requiring deviations from the established structure, permission must be obtained in advance from the Provost. Once permission has been obtained, the changes will be communicated to all affected parties.

Reviewers' deliberations shall be based on whether 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 and the reviewers' first-hand observations of the candidate's professional performance.

Votes of review committees are by secret ballot. All deliberations and recommendations of reviews are confidential and may not be discussed with the candidates or with others outside the review committee's membership. The vote tally for and against recommending promotion and/or tenure will be recorded in the digital portfolio workflow (but not names of individuals casting those votes). The committee chair must electronically sign the letter and place it in the digital portfolio workflow. Individual committee members can submit a dissenting letter if they so desire; individual committee member letters will be added to the digital portfolio workflow by the committee chair when the majority letter is submitted. All letters by the committee members and the committee as a whole must be dated the same. All reviewers should remember that e-mail is not a confidential medium; therefore, committee minutes, notes, drafts of review letters, or final letters may not be circulated by e-mail. Sharing documents via OneDrive is permissible.

7. Portfolio Guidelines and Contents

All faculty members who are considered for tenure, promotion, pre-tenure, or post-tenure review must prepare a portfolio for consideration by all involved in the formal review process. On an annual basis (usually at the time of contract renewal), the Office of Academic Affairs will notify all faculty of the dates of their next eligible and their next required reviews.

Failure by a faculty member to submit all documentation required for any review according to the scheduled timeline will result in a negative decision. Failure to submit a required tenure or pre-tenure review portfolio according to the scheduled timeline will result in the issuance of a terminal contract.

To initiate the review process, the faculty member submits the portfolio to the digital portfolio workflow by 11:59 pm on the scheduled date in the fall semester. Failure to submit a required tenure portfolio by the required time will result in a negative tenure decision. After the deadline, no material can be changed, and no new material can be added. However, "updating" information (e.g., a paper going from submitted to accepted or a grant going from submitted to funded) may be included in a response letter and considered by subsequent levels of review. This is a simple "status" change of something already submitted; it is not considered a submission of new information. Previous levels of review will not reconsider their recommendation based on this status change. If, in the course of its consideration of the portfolio, the review committee discovers what it deems to be an inadvertent omission of a required document or incomplete forms, the committee will ask the supervisor or designee to provide the missing item(s). The review

committee will place this information in the digital portfolio workflow along with the committee review letter.

The portfolio consists of the following: items in the Portfolio Document Submission List (below) and Linked Supporting Materials. The specific material required for inclusion in the portfolio can be found in the next two sections. Beyond the required material, all faculty members submitting portfolios for review should make their own decisions on what additional information to include, especially those materials relating to accomplishments at prior institutions and accomplishments since their last tenure and/or promotion review at KSU. Although material from other institutions may be considered, the quality of more recent accomplishments at KSU are major considerations for review recommendations and decisions. All materials that demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty member's work should be included in the portfolio and review committees should consider all materials included in the portfolio to make their recommendation.

I. Portfolio Document Submission List

- Narrative (no more than twelve pages, double-spaced, 12-point type, with one-inch margins). Sample narratives are available on the Faculty Affairs web page. The narrative describes the quality and significance of the faculty member's contributions during the period under review in the following areas as appropriate:
    - Teaching
    - Scholarship and Creative Activity
    - Professional Service

  The student success part of the above three areas will be noted for review. Faculty should address the quality and significance of their student success activities in at least one of the three areas. The narrative will refer to the Linked Supporting Materials listed below using the List of Links to Supplemental Evidence Files.

- List of Links to Supplemental Evidence Files
- Vitae - Vitae should be formatted to clearly demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty members' accomplishments, especially to those beyond the department. An example of a vitae template can be found on the Faculty Affairs webpage. The Vita Interactive report may be used to provide links to Linked Supporting Materials listed below.
- Annual Review Materials (including all signed ARDs, FPAs, and any faculty response letters).
    - Faculty eligible and submitting for tenure and/or promotion should include all annual review documents and supporting materials since their last pre-tenure, tenure, and/or promotion review.
    - Faculty eligible and submitting for pre-tenure review should include all annual review materials since their start date at KSU.
    - Faculty eligible and submitting for PTR should include all annual review documents and supporting material since their last promotion, tenure, or PTR review.
    - For any faculty who has received a "Not Meeting Expectations" in their post-tenure review, a copy of the formal plan for faculty development (as described in Section 3.5C) must be included.

- Departmental guidelines (Administrative Faculty should include the guidelines from the academic home department of their faculty appointment) and college guidelines, if applicable.
- Review Letters from Pre-tenure Review (only submitted for tenure review, if applicable) or from Third-Year Review (only submitted for non-tenure track promotion review, if applicable).
- Joint Appointment Memorandum of Understanding, if applicable.

II. Linked Supporting Materials

- Teaching - This section contains illustrative evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's teaching While student evaluations are required, evidence may also include, but is not limited to, the following (college and departmental guidelines may be more specific):
    - Peer review letters
    - Course syllabi
    - Course materials
    - Evidence of student learning
    - Student survey results
    - Evidence of advising activities
    - Evidence of faculty development
    - Evidence of student success activities.
    - See also KSU Faculty Handbook Section 2.5 Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness
- Scholarship and Creative Activity - This section contains illustrative evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's scholarship and creative activity. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following (college and departmental guidelines may be more specific):
    - Excerpts from conference programs/proceedings
    - Conference presentation evaluations
    - Title pages and abstracts from professional journals or the full article
    - Title pages and tables of contents from books or the full books
    - Evidence of grant solicitation
    - Book, chapter, and article reviews
    - Copies of exhibit and performance programs
    - Photographs of commissioned or exhibited art works
    - Evidence of student success activities.
- Professional Service - This section contains illustrative evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's professional service. These materials may include, but are not limited to, the following (college and departmental guidelines may be more specific):
    - Committee assignment documentation
    - Copies of meeting minutes
    - Copies of products developed
    - Recognition by others of contributions
    - Evidence of student success activities.

- Evidence of statewide, regional, national, or international professional service. For Administrators, additional evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member's administration and leadership:
    - Documentation indicating leadership assignments
    - Evidence of program evaluation
    - Supervisor, peer, and employee evaluations
    - Copies of products developed

Beyond the material listed above, the faculty member may link to a one-page summary of activity not readily supported by documentation.

8. Withdraw from an Elective Review by Submitting a Written Request for Withdrawal

A faculty member who has initiated an Elective Tenure or Elective Promotion Review may withdraw from the review process at any point prior to the Provost review. Failure to withdraw prior to the Provost review will result in the portfolio proceeding automatically through the remainder of the review process. To withdraw from the review process, the faculty member should fill out the "Form Requesting Withdrawal from an Elective Review for Tenure or Promotion at KSU" and send it to the current level of review. If the portfolio is at a Faculty Response step, the faculty member can upload the form and withdraw the portfolio directly. (See note below if the review involves both an elective and a required review.) The form can be found on the Faculty Affairs website (https://facultyaffairs.kennesaw.edu/docs/resources/form-requesting-withdrawal-from-an-elective-review-for-tenure-or-promotion.pdf). Because a portfolio proceeds whether it has received positive or negative evaluations and may receive different evaluations at different levels of review, the decision to withdraw must be made on the merits of each individual situation. You are encouraged to discuss your situation with your department chair or a colleague who is familiar with your situation (but not on a current review committee) and the review process before submitting a withdrawal request.
Credit towards tenure and/or promotion is considered "used" upon submission of a portfolio to the department review committee. Withdrawal of a portfolio does not reinstate used credit.

Withdrawing from an elective tenure and/or promotion review does not alter requirements for completing a required pre-tenure or post-tenure review. The withdrawal from elective review form will be inserted into the portfolio and it will then be reviewed only for pre-tenure or post-tenure following the routing for those reviews, if applicable. In this case, the faculty member may upload the withdrawal form for the elective review at a faculty response step, but should advance the workflow, not recall it.

9. Queries about Process and Ethical Violations

Proposed revisions to the process are directed to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Process Review Committee. Committee membership consists of the chairs of College P&T Committees from the previous year. Disputes about the Promotion and Tenure procedures, including structure and content (conflict of interest or conflicting guidelines for example), will be directed to the chair of the process review committee for investigation and resolution. Violations of process (late letters, committees not elected according to guidelines, etc.) should be reported to the Provost or designee

and to all levels of review. In these cases, the college committee should make a recommendation to the Provost as to an appropriate course of action. Potential ethical indiscretions during the promotion and tenure process should be directed to the Provost or designee.