

Kennesaw State University
Academic Affairs

Approval Form for Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A copy of this form, completed, must be attached as a cover sheet to the department guidelines included in portfolios for Pre-Tenure, Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review.

I confirm that the attached guidelines, dated 10/20/23, were approved by the faculty of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in accordance with department bylaws:

Sara Giordano DocuSigned by:
Sara Giordano
November 9, 2023
5313BFA92BBD448...

Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

stacy keltner DocuSigned by:
Stacy Keltner
November 9, 2023
B5BED18AD667473...

Name (printed or typed) Signature/
Date

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

Anja Bernardy DocuSigned by:
Anja Bernardy
November 29, 2023
B37AA100E4654C2...

Name (printed or typed) Signature/
Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Catherine Kaukinen DocuSigned by:
Catherine Kaukinen
November 5, 2023
4E4GB0582A0A43E...

Name (printed or typed) Signature/
Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

RHM - 08 Sept 16

Name (printed or typed) Signature/
Date

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Kennesaw State University

Norman J. Radow College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Interdisciplinary Studies Department

Revised May & October 2023

Table of Contents

I. DISTINGUISHING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS.....	2
II. ISD MISSION STATEMENT	3
III. GENERAL STATEMENT ON FACULTY REVIEWS	3
IV. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WITH A JOINT-APPOINTMENT IN TWO OR MORE DEPARTMENTS	4
V. TIMETABLES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY (Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks, Tenure-track Faculty)	4
VI. PRE-TENURE REVIEW TOWARD PROMOTION AND TENURE: PROCEDURES	4
VII. ADHERENCE TO BOR, UNIVERSITY AND RCHSS GUIDELINES	5
VIII. PRIMACY OF ISD GUIDELINES	5
IX. WORKLOAD MODELS AND EXPECTATIONS	5
X. FACULTY PERFORMANCE.....	6
1. Promotion and Tenure Review (P&T): Procedures.....	7
2. Optional Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer: Procedures	8
XI. COMMUNITY-BASED WORK AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT	9
XII. LECTURERS, SENIOR LECTURERS, AND PRINCIPAL LECTURERS: SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS.....	9
XIII. PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL RANKS	10
XIV. PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITH ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL RANKS.....	10
XV. EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING.....	11
1. Lecturer	12
2. Senior Lecturer.....	12
3. Principal Lecturer.....	12

4. Assistant Professor	13
5. Associate Professor	13
6. Full Professor	13
7. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	13
8. Promotion to Full Professor	14
XVI. EXPECTATIONS IN SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY	15
1. Assistant Professor	16
2. Associate Professor	16
3. Full Professor	16
4. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	16
5. Promotion to Full Professor	17
XVII. EXPECTATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL SERVICE	17
1. Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer.....	18
2. Assistant Professor	18
3. Associate Professor	19
4. Full Professor	19
5. Promotion to Senior Lecturer.....	19
6. Promotion to Principal Lecturer.....	19
7. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	19
8. Promotion to Full Professor	19
XVIII. ANNUAL REVIEW.....	20
XIX. PERFORMANCE REMEDIATION PLANS	21
XX. POST-TENURE REVIEW	21
1. Expedited Post-Tenure Review.....	22
2. Corrective Post-Tenure Review	22
XXI. REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY.....	23
XXII. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER GOVERNING RULES AND REGULATIONS	23
XXIII. AMENDING THE P&T DOCUMENT	23

I. DISTINGUISHING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Faculty in the Interdisciplinary Studies Department (ISD) of Kennesaw State University (KSU) share a commitment to interdisciplinary learning and scholarship; critical, cultural, and social

analysis; intersectionality; transnational perspectives; and public engagement. Grounded in the content knowledge bases and methodologies of a range of fields, the Department dedicates itself to crossing boundaries—whether disciplinary, social, cultural, national, or institutional—and engages students in an exchange of learning and service in local communities and abroad. Students and faculty seek opportunities for collaborative work by co-sponsoring events and projects reflecting a shared vision of social justice, global awareness, and the power of critical analysis linked to social action.

A distinguishing feature of the work of many ISD faculty members is systematic integration of research, teaching, and service. The Department greatly values public and community-engaged scholarship, publications that reach a broad audience, and the scholarship of teaching and learning, in addition to traditional peer-reviewed research.

Review committees at all levels should note that Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) for jointly appointed faculty usually specify more service in ISD than in the other department, regardless of which is the faculty's home. This provision reflects those exigencies not only of developing comparatively new programs in ISD but of engaging students, the University as a whole, and the broader community in interdisciplinary, intersectional, and transnational perspectives on knowledge and social action.

II. ISD MISSION STATEMENT

With its mission rooted in interdisciplinary teaching, scholarship, and community service; and with a special focus on cultural and international subjects, the ISD stands in a unique position to contribute to the University's mission of diversity and community outreach. The programs within the ISD share a commitment to interdisciplinary learning and scholarship, critical cultural analysis, intersectionality, transnational perspectives, and public engagement.

III. GENERAL STATEMENT ON FACULTY REVIEWS

Department Faculty Members (DFMs) are defined by departmental bylaws and are subject to rules elaborated by the *KSU Faculty Handbook*. As stated in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, “[n]o person can participate in more than one stage of the review process.”

It is incumbent upon all faculty of the Norman J. Radow College of Humanities and Social Sciences (RCHSS) undergoing reviews to become familiar with review procedures and faculty performance expectations and requirements. Whereas more specific performance expectations and requirements can be found in this document, review procedures and general performance expectations are stated in section three of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* and the *RCHSS Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines*. In addition, as noted in the latter, RCHSS faculty are required to include all quantitative and qualitative student evaluations in their portfolio. Tenure-track faculty submitting a portfolio for tenure and/or promotion must also notify the Chair of their intent to do so in their Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) and prepare a list of possible external reviewers by the end of January preceding the review that begins that August.

IV. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WITH A JOINT-APPOINTMENT IN TWO OR MORE DEPARTMENTS

For joint-appointed tenure-track faculty, the pre-tenure review will be conducted according to the process defined in their Joint Appointment Agreement, typically by a joint- appointment promotion and tenure (P&T) committee comprised of five members selected by the two units: three members from the home unit (the faculty member's tenure home) and two members from the complementary unit.

- Units having a standing P&T committee will select their representative from among the members of that committee to serve on the joint appointment P&T committee.
- ISD's Tenure, Promotion, and Joint Appointment Committee (TPJAC) will select two or three individuals from among its members to serve on the joint appointment P&T committee.
- The joint appointment P&T committee will consider the P&T guidelines of both units during its deliberations, but tenure-home departmental guidelines will have precedence.

For DFMs whose lines (lecturers) and tenure lines (tenure-track and tenured faculty) do not reside in ISD, consult the *KSU Faculty Handbook* guidelines for joint appointees and individual MOUs.

V. TIMETABLES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY (Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks, Tenure-track Faculty)

Annual, pre-tenure, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews in ISD will be conducted according to the schedules published yearly by the Office of the Provost on the Academic Affairs website. Faculty members are responsible for meeting exact deadlines.

VI. PRE-TENURE REVIEW TOWARD PROMOTION AND TENURE: PROCEDURES

The Interdisciplinary Studies Department, in accordance with the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, holds that the purpose of pre-tenure review is to assist faculty members in determining whether they are making appropriate progress toward promotion to Associate Professor and tenure and to assess their current readiness to be promoted and tenured. The pre-tenure review does not constitute a tenure decision, but, rather, provides feedback regarding faculty strengths and weaknesses. For non-administrative faculty, the review of pre-tenure portfolios begins with the Department P&T Review Committee, proceeding in turn to the department chair and the dean. At each level, review committees and administrators consider the progress of the candidate toward promotion and tenure. A letter is written at each level of review outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate with respect to this question. A copy of each review letter is uploaded into the online portfolio management system.

VII. ADHERENCE TO BOR, UNIVERSITY AND RCHSS GUIDELINES

These Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty Performance serve to interpret and make specific references to BOR, KSU and RCHSS's P&T guidelines. Departmental guidelines do not supersede Board of Regents, University, or College guidelines; they merely interpret those guidelines in the specific context of a department.

VIII. PRIMACY OF ISD GUIDELINES

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.

IX. WORKLOAD MODELS AND EXPECTATIONS

As described in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 2.2, the standard workload for teaching faculty is 60% teaching, understood as teaching 3 classes per semester, 30% scholarship and creative activity and 10% service, equivalent to 4 hours per 40-hour work week. As described in this document, faculty with a 30% Scholarship and creative activity (SCA) workload are expected to publish at least 2 peer-reviewed article length publications or the equivalent to be considered satisfactory for tenure and promotion to associate professor. This number is considered the minimum qualification, and faculty must publish at least 3 peer-reviewed article length publications or the equivalent to be considered "noteworthy." These numbers, while not absolute, are helpful for determining expectations for SCA as a percentage of a workload.

As also described in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, Section 2.2, "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 2.2 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* includes examples of different workload models, such as a workload with 40% teaching – or 2 classes per semester and 50% research. Any arrangement of workload amenable to faculty member and chair can be considered provided that for tenured faculty, all workloads meet the minimum SCA and PS loads of 10 percent each and may not exceed a teaching load of 80 percent, or 24 credit-hours per academic year.

Faculty with higher percentages allotted to SCA are expected to produce more scholarship in reasonable alignment with the given percentage relative to the baseline already established for publications expected for a 30% workload for promotion and tenure in this document. For example, faculty whose SCA is equal to 40% or 50% are expected to produce more than colleagues at a standard of 30%, but are not expected to produce twice or three-times as many

publications or equivalents as colleagues with a teaching load of 3/3. Faculty and department chairs agree upon reasonable expectations for the workload allocation during the Annual review and FPA process.

These minimums establish a floor for expectations related to scholarship and creative activity relative to the percentages of workload. However, minimums cannot account for the variations in quality and significance within a scholarship product (e.g., authorship/contribution, complexity or originality of the project, journal impact) or across a body of scholarship products. It is incumbent upon a faculty member undergoing a promotion and/or tenure review to articulate how their work in SCA compares to the noted expectations and demonstrate its quality and significance.

X. FACULTY PERFORMANCE

ISD is committed to preserving the University's focus on the "evaluation of the quality and significance of faculty scholarly accomplishments" as set forth in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* (Section 3.4), ISD uses a holistic approach to evaluate faculty performance and does not rely exclusively or primarily on the quantification of standards or the translation of expectations into numerical equivalents.

The *KSU Faculty Handbook* specifies that faculty contribute to and are evaluated in the following areas:

Teaching (T) (also called Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring, or TSM)

Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)

Professional Service (PS)

Contributions to the different evaluation areas are likely to vary from semester to semester and year to year, as well as over a career. The diversity of contributions should be consistent with and draw on the strengths of the candidate. Over time, a faculty member's contribution to each of the primary three evaluation areas should be evident. Work in each evaluation area should be consistent with principled interpersonal behavior that fosters strong relationships among those affected by the candidate's work.

University guidelines specify that faculty should take a scholarly approach in all areas. Scholarly in this context "is an umbrella term used to apply to faculty work in all performance areas. Scholarly is an adjective used to describe the processes that faculty should use within each area. In this context, scholarly refers to a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, revised and rethought" (*KSU Faculty Handbook*). Faculty members should also engage in activities that lead to scholarship, "a noun used to describe tangible outcomes of the scholarly processes."

In all evaluation areas, quality and significance are the main criteria for evaluating performance. Thus, DFMs should concentrate on these aspects of their work rather than on quantity.

Additionally, DFMs are expected to engage in academic professional-development activities that help them perform their T, SCA, and PS responsibilities with enhanced effectiveness. Faculty are to highlight activities promoting student success in at least one of the three performance areas: Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activities, and/or Professional Service in their FPA, ARD and portfolios for multi-year reviews.

According to the *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3:

“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.”

Section 3. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* provides examples of how to include student success in categories of teaching; scholarship and creative activity; and professional service in annual and multi-year review documents.

1. Promotion and Tenure Review (P&T): Procedures

Tenured and tenure-track faculty who are seeking promotion and/or tenure are required to provide external review letters in their P&T portfolios, following the policy and procedures outlined in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*. Faculty members must communicate to their Chair(s) in January whether they intend to go up for promotion the following fall.

During P&T review, evaluators must judge faculty performance as noteworthy in at least two areas and as at least satisfactory in the third. The candidate must be noteworthy in teaching and must have produced scholarship in at least one area.

Candidates for tenure and promotion must provide a record of substantive work demonstrating success in scholarship.

A variety of criteria may be used to establish the significance of a scholarly work as described below. The case for the work’s significance must be made by the applicant, using criteria and methods appropriate for the work in question. The applicant’s demonstration of the value of a scholarly work must be articulated in the portfolio narrative and in a manner likely to be clear to reviewers at the College and University levels who are not trained interdisciplinary scholars or who are not conversant in the relevant field(s).

While the annual review documents are part of the promotion and tenure portfolio, the 1-5 point scale used in annual reviews does not correspond directly to the measures of satisfactory and noteworthy in reviews for promotion and tenure. The evaluation of

satisfactory and noteworthy achievements is based on the entire portfolio presented as the accumulation of work done over several years and not the individual annual reviews.

Means of assessing the significance of scholarship include the following:

- Peer-review. As a general rule, peer-reviewed work is respected more highly than non-peer-reviewed work. It is the responsibility of the applicant to indicate the type of peer review undergone for each work of scholarship (for example, single blind, double blind, open, or review by an editor and/or editorial board).
- Available ratings for certain types of work that indicate the quality and the selectiveness of the press and journal (for example, journal acceptance rates, citation reports, book reviews, or portfolio reviews).
- Explicit discussion/demonstration of the quality and significance of the scholarly/creative product. These means might be especially relevant to certain types of regional scholarship, collaborative scholarship, and scholarship aimed at a non-specialist audience.

The Department recognizes that some forms of scholarship are not traditionally peer-reviewed. It is therefore incumbent on faculty members: (1) to solicit reviews of their work in the field or (2) to make the case that the product has been reviewed in a manner comparable to peer-review. It is also incumbent upon faculty members to make a case for the significance of their work in creating new knowledge, fostering effective learning environments, or engaging with public audiences in collaborative historical work.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to confirm that the Chair agrees with the faculty member's assertions regarding the comparability and significance of non-traditional scholarship in the annual reviews for the years leading up to the application for tenure and/or promotion.

2. Optional Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer: Procedures

Lecturers planning to go up for promotion will participate in a mandatory internal department pre-promotion review during their third year of employment, proceeding with review by the department P&T committee, and proceeding through the department chair.

Per the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, "A faculty member who was hired without credit toward promotion may apply for promotion during the fifth year of service, after serving a minimum of four years in rank." (Section 3.10.1). Those wishing to be considered for promotion to senior lecturer will be reviewed according to the process established in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*. Per the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, criteria for promotion to senior lecturer are evidence of noteworthy teaching inside and/or outside the classroom environment and value to the University in the areas of teaching and service.

Faculty wishing to be considered for promotion to principal lecturer must serve a minimum of four years in the rank of senior lecturer.

The same committee structure that is used for promotion for tenured and tenure track faculty will be used for optional promotion review for lecturers. Promotion reviews for lecturers begin with the Department P&T Committee, then proceed to the department chair, dean, Provost, and President (discrepant reviews and requests for an additional review also go to the College P&T Committee). Lecturers should refer to the *KSU Faculty Handbook* regarding the contents of the digital teaching portfolio. In addition to the materials found there, faculty may submit documentation of peer-evaluation of teaching.

XI. COMMUNITY-BASED WORK AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Congruent with the ISD distinguishing characteristics, and the mission of the institution, RCHSS, and ISD, faculty engagement in community-based work will be recognized and supported. Community-based work by faculty may include work in schools, in government agencies, in not-for-profit and for-profit organizations, and at the local, national, and global level. As appropriate, such efforts may be connected to scholarship and creative activity, professional service, and/or curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities in the form of students' coursework, field-based teaching experiences, volunteer initiatives, service-learning projects, internship and study abroad experiences.

In consultation with the ISD Chair and RCHSS Dean, faculty members must negotiate community-based work in their FPA and ARD documents and document the scope and significance of their work in relation to a performance area (i.e., teaching; scholarship and creative activity; and professional service). Thus, the faculty members' community-based work must benefit either their own professional development, student learning, or the work and services provided by stakeholders in the community. Properly documented and peer-reviewed faculty engagement in community-based work is considered in the appropriate performance area in the promotion and tenure process.

XII. LECTURERS, SENIOR LECTURERS, AND PRINCIPAL LECTURERS: SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS

All three ranks of lecturers are integral members of the Department, and the important service work they do merits recognition as part of the review process.

Lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers have a 5/5 workload with a one-course reassignment for service, making the normal teaching load 5/4. Service assignments are negotiated individually between the Chair and the lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer at the time of annual review and are documented in the FPA and ARD.

Non-tenure positions will use the five-point scale in annual reviews. They are not required to create PRPs or PIPs because they are on non-tenure track lines. Performance of 1s and 2s in annual reviews will be addressed as they previously have been in ARDs/FPAs in accordance with prior practice for "not meeting expectations."

XIII. PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITH PROFESSIONAL RANKS

Per KSU guidelines, non-tenure track faculty with professorial ranks are educators-practitioners who have a background in their disciplinary area and who practice the discipline in the work setting.

According to the Board of Regents policy (8.6.3), “promotion to the rank of professor requires the earned doctorate or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience.”

In the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, non-tenure track faculty in professorial ranks make practical contributions in education, industry, clinical and/or professional settings. These faculty must maintain a balance that is different from the workload of tenure-track faculty.

Unless otherwise set forth in the FPA, non-tenured faculty with professorial ranks generally spend less time engaged in SCA. Typically, the primary responsibilities emphasize their applied experience. Such responsibilities include, but are not limited to, student supervision (e.g., supervision of field, practicum, internship, or clinical experiences), applied instruction (e.g. teaching a course on news reporting or psychological assessment), or other applied activities that contribute to the Department or College (e.g., advising or grants and contracts).

In addition to annual reviews, non-tenure track faculty with professorial ranks may apply for an optional promotional review. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia requires a minimum four full academic years of service at KSU (including the year of review) at the rank of assistant professor to be eligible for promotion to rank of associate professor, and five full academic years of service at KSU (including the year of review) at the rank of associate professor to be eligible for promotion to the rank of professor.

Non-tenure track faculty with professorial rank must prepare a portfolio for promotion consideration. The portfolio contents will follow the guidelines for tenure track faculty who are reviewed for promotion. (See *KSU Faculty Handbook*, Section 3.12, “Portfolio Guidelines and Contents”).

The Interdisciplinary Studies Department will follow the “general expectations for promotion and faculty performance for non-tenure track faculty in professorial ranks” set forth in the *KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.6*. When submitting a portfolio for promotion in rank, these faculty are responsible for making a strong case for the quality and significance of their work as defined in their FPAs. Recommendation for promotion in rank will be based on a thorough review of the faculty’s portfolio according to responsibilities and goals set forth in annual FPAs.

XIV. PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY WITH ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL RANKS

Academic Professionals have workload responsibilities in a range of performance areas (Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Professional Service) as outlined in their situational context and set forth in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). General categories

for Academic Professionals include Training and Instructional Support, Technical Assistance, and Specialized Management (*KSU Faculty Handbook* 3.10.2). The *KSU Faculty Handbook* outlines performance expectations and annual review processes for Academic Professionals.

XV. EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING

ISD values and rewards classroom practices that embrace collaborative teaching and learning, inquiry-based learning, academically based service learning, and interdisciplinary modes of teaching and learning. The Department supports teaching that challenges students to examine previously held positions critically. Faculty are encouraged to highlight how their teaching integrates these values and practices into the curriculum.

Appropriate Activities in All Ranks:

The following lists suggest activities relevant to the review area of Teaching in all ranks. Faculty members should not view these as checklists, in part because quantity is not necessarily an indication of quality and significance. Nor are the lists exhaustive; faculty should view them as a series of possibilities. Furthermore, certain activities may, in the context of some faculty, suggest a closer fit with a different area of evaluation. Faculty members choose activities in Teaching in consultation with colleagues and especially in consultation with the Chair. The faculty member and the Chair agree on planned activities annually, in the written FPA.

Standard teaching expectations for all faculty are as follows:

- Engaging students in learning, inside and outside of the classroom, through group instruction, individual instruction, mentoring, advising, and curricular and other pedagogical innovations.
- Designing effective teaching materials, including syllabi, assignments, and grading standards.
- Redesigning and updating learning materials and modules using available training, peer consultation, and/or relevant research/theory.
- Assessing student learning outcomes at the course level.
- Thoughtfully engaging student feedback and comments in the improvement of courses and teaching.
- Developing a philosophy of teaching and learning that establishes educational goals.

It is the responsibility of all candidates to demonstrate the quality and significance of Teaching. Indicators or “proofs” of effective and reflective teaching may include but are not limited to the following:

- Student evaluations, comments and feedback.
- Teaching-related presentations and publications (alternatively, these may be used as evidence under SCA).
- Collegial critique of course materials.
- Collegial critique of classroom teaching.
- Faculty-developed questionnaires to elicit student feedback.

- Exit interviews of students graduating, transferring, or completing a course.
- Evidence of student growth over the semester (e.g., assessment of student learning outcomes).
- Placement of students in academic or professional positions or graduate school.
- Dissemination of student research (e.g., student presentations).
- External reports of student performance.
- TSM awards/nominations.

1. Lecturer

According to the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, “The heavy teaching load of these individuals constitutes a full workload and offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty workload at KSU.” Thus, Teaching will be the primary category used in evaluation of lecturers. Lecturers must demonstrate excellence in teaching, supervising, and mentoring. Expectations for lecturers include meeting scheduled classes, assessing and providing feedback on student assignments, maintaining regular office hours, using student evaluations of teaching for professional growth and improvement, documenting student learning, supervision and mentoring of students when FPA includes it, staying current in one’s field and integrating current methods and content into teaching, and implementing appropriate teaching methods to support student learning.

2. Senior Lecturer

As experience increases, lecturers should increase in breadth and depth of their knowledge of course subject matter and of effective teaching techniques. Development of new courses, including team-taught and cross-disciplinary courses, and mentoring of other faculty members may be undertaken.

Expectation for Senior Lecturers include meeting the listed expectations for lecturers as well as maintaining consistent pedagogical reflection, remaining current in the teaching field, continually reflecting on and assessing course quality, and demonstrating effectiveness in teaching.

3. Principal Lecturer

Principal lecturers are highly effective teachers who have a consistent track record of highly proficient and highly effective teaching across the courses to which they have been assigned, including evidence of positive impact on student learning or positive student outcomes. In addition to fulfilling all requirements expected of lecturers and senior lecturers, principal lecturers demonstrate “evidence of creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices, or a positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings, such as dissemination of instructional innovation or participation in special teaching activities” (*KSU Faculty Handbook* 3.10.1). Principal lecturers also provide impactful and highly effective professional service related to their teaching, such as through mentoring other lecturers.

Faculty seeking promotion to principal lecturer must also provide evidence of highly effective teaching over their time as senior lecturer. Promotion to principal lecturer is not a function simply of time in rank. Portfolios are “evaluated based on highly effective accomplishments.”

4. Assistant Professor

In adjusting to the new role of Assistant Professor, faculty members typically spend significant time and effort in developing and refining pedagogical skills. Additionally, most novice assistant professors devote substantial time and energy to developing, testing, and refining their assigned courses and teaching effectiveness. As comfort with the role increases, an expanded view of teaching is acquired. This expanded view may be reflected in engaging teachers, students, and others in learning inside and outside the classroom through group instruction; individual instructions; student supervision, mentoring, and advising; and curricular or pedagogical innovation. The teaching repertoire typically expands somewhat. During this time, faculty develop a philosophy of teaching and learning that establishes their educational goals, incorporate into course materials regular revisions reflecting current research and theory, practice innovative approaches to teaching, and make use, as appropriate, of information contained in course evaluations.

5. Associate Professor

As experience increases, faculty members should continue to demonstrate proficiency in this area and should increase the breadth and depth of their knowledge of course subject matter and effective teaching techniques. New courses in the faculty member’s area of expertise, mentoring of other faculty members, or (as opportunity or need arises) cross-disciplinary courses may be undertaken.

6. Full Professor

The full Professor is a well-established and effective teacher who continues to demonstrate proficiency in this area. The Department expects faculty at this rank not only to maintain high standards for remaining current in their areas of expertise but also to provide guidance and to serve as mentors to less experienced DFMs where possible and appropriate.

7. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

Satisfactory: The candidate demonstrates a record of successful teaching, advising, and mentoring in which instruction and assessments are aligned with course objectives. The candidate is available and responsive to students. The candidate has achieved a standard level of excellence by meeting the criteria for effective and reflective teaching as indicated under “Standard Teaching Expectations for All Faculty.”

Noteworthy: The candidate is demonstrating a level of quality and effectiveness that goes beyond the standard expectations. Indicators of noteworthy teaching might include but are not limited to the following:

- Departmental or upper-level awards (or award nominations) for TSM.
- Teaching collaborations (e.g., interdisciplinary courses or learning communities).
- Directed study with undergraduate or graduate students.
- Joining undergraduate or graduate students on research projects.
- Teaching at other institutions (e.g., with a faculty exchange program or study abroad program) or in the Honors College.
- Incorporating regular revisions in course materials so as to reflect current research and theory (this may include online teaching pedagogy).
- Expanding the teaching repertoire in the preparation of additional courses or in the development of methods or materials for existing courses.
- Development of a new course, a course in a new format, or a new program.

8. Promotion to Full Professor

Satisfactory: Candidates maintain the standards described in “Standard Teaching Expectations for All Faculty” but include significant increases in recognized quality and significance. Indicators pointing toward promotion to full Professor might be demonstrated by a variety of factors, including but not limited to the following:

- Involvement in curriculum developing/revision/assessment.
- Dissemination of theories and/or practices related to teaching, supervision or mentoring.
- Evidence of working with undergraduate or graduate students on research projects.
- Supervising Registered Student Organizations (RSOs).

Noteworthy: Candidates demonstrate a record of successful teaching, advising, and mentoring. Candidates have established records of successful teaching substantiated by identifiable student achievements. Other factors that might identify the candidate as noteworthy include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Receiving College- or University-level or external awards.
- Developing a new educational theory whose excellence is recognized by peers.
- Assuming a regional, national, or international leadership role in the area of scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Receiving a Fulbright or other teaching fellowship.
- Receiving a Fulbright Specialist or other assignment focused on curriculum development.

- Assuming a leadership role in curriculum development/revision/assessment.
- Teaching collaboratively (e.g. in interdisciplinary courses or learning communities).
- Supervising directed studies with undergraduate or graduate students.
- Mentoring undergraduate or graduate students, peers, or community members.
- Serving on and chairing thesis or dissertation committees.
- Joining undergraduate or graduate students on research projects.
- Teaching at other institutions (e.g., in a faculty exchange program or study abroad program) or in the Honors College.

XVI. EXPECTATIONS IN SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Faculty research should follow an arc that is reflective of their academic expertise, teaching assignments, and consonant with the Department's mission. Given that faculty come from various academic backgrounds, and in consideration of the interdisciplinary mission of the Department, which includes a high level of public engagement, evidence submitted by the candidate for P&T must be considered and analyzed broadly.

Candidates must explain the quality and significance of their achievements in scholarship and/or creative activity and demonstrate that a credible peer review process has been integral to their publications and other scholarly and creative activity.

Appropriate Activities for all Tenure-Track Faculty:

Examples of SCA to be considered during P&T review include, but are not limited to the following products, which appear in no particular order:

- Journal articles
- Book chapters
- Grants (in exceptional cases, unfunded grants may be submitted as evidence).
- Substantial works of public scholarship such as resource collections or toolkits that reflect scholarly expertise
- Publications in conference proceedings
- Review essays that demonstrate professional expertise
- Original works of fiction, poetry, drama (e.g. scripts, screenplays), and nonfiction
- Textbooks and other instructional materials published by reputable outlets
- Products created independently or in collaboration with partners, where candidates employ their expertise and professional skills
- Other scholarly and creative activities for which candidates can make a strong case regarding quality and significance

Additional examples of scholarly and creative activities and the status of different types of publications and other products relative to tenure and promotion requirements may be found in

the internal ISD document entitled, “Scholarship and Creative Activity Equivalency Guidelines: A Working Document.”

Faculty in ISD recognize that it is difficult to set clear and specific minimum standards across a department so diverse insofar as different fields and disciplines emphasize different forms of knowledge and scholarly production. However, faculty also recognize the need to set and make transparent minimum standards for P&T that take into account both faculty workload and the research aspirations of KSU. Attempting to balance these factors, these guidelines clearly delineate specific minimum expectations for satisfactory and noteworthy achievement in SCA.

1. Assistant Professor

SCA for Assistant Professors are varied and broadly defined. In a candidate’s early years in the academy, focus is placed on developing areas for SCA. Peer-reviewed products (or comparable activity) and evidence of a productive trajectory of scholarship are required for the award of P&T.

2. Associate Professor

Activities for Associate Professors in the area are varied and broadly defined. Associate Professors continue developing their area(s) of expertise. There is continuing expectation of peer-reviewed products or comparable activity at this level.

3. Full Professor

Activities for full Professors in this area are varied and broadly defined. There is a continuing expectation of peer-reviewed products or comparable activity.

4. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

Satisfactory: The candidate on a standard workload has a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications or the equivalent (e.g., one peer-reviewed journal article and one significant work of public or creative scholarship or significant grant). Scholarly evidence should be published, in press, or fully accepted for publication/funding, and it should be accepted/published during the candidate’s time at KSU unless probationary credit toward tenure and/or promotion was awarded at the time of hiring. The candidate must address the quality and significance of the scholarly work or creative activity submitted for consideration in the evaluation of performance in this area.

Noteworthy: The candidate on a standard workload has a minimum of three publications in peer reviewed venues or the equivalent. (A monograph will count as more than two publications.) Scholarly evidence should be published, in press, or fully accepted for publication, and should be published during the candidate’s time at KSU unless probationary credit towards tenure and/or promotion was awarded at the time of hiring. Other scholarly work or creative activity may be taken into consideration in evaluating noteworthy performance. The candidate must address the quality and significance of the scholarly work or creative activity submitted for consideration in evaluating performance in this area.

5. Promotion to Full Professor

Satisfactory: The candidate on a standard workload has a minimum of three publications in peer reviewed venues or the equivalent (e.g., two peer-reviewed journal articles and one significant grant or work of public or creative scholarship) since the last promotion. Manuscripts should be published, in press, or fully accepted for publication/funding and should have gone to press, been published, or been fully accepted since the last promotion. Additionally, the candidate has a credible record of conference presentations at the local, state, regional, national, or international level, or other evidence of reputation building and recognition among scholars. Other scholarly work can be taken into consideration in evaluating satisfactory performance.

Noteworthy: The candidate on a standard workload has a minimum of four publications in peer reviewed venues or the equivalent (e.g., three peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters and one significant grant or work of public or creative scholarship) since the last promotion. Manuscripts should be published, in press, or fully accepted for publication/funding and should have been published since the last promotion. Additionally, the candidate has a credible record of conference presentations at the local, state, regional, national, and international level. The candidate has achieved recognition for career advancements and is able to demonstrate a national and/or international profile. Other scholarly work can be taken into consideration in evaluating noteworthy performance in this area.

XVII. EXPECTATIONS IN PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

A candidate's PS should be consonant with the Department's mission and follow an arc reflecting academic expertise and teaching assignments. Included in this category of PS is activity that is undertaken on behalf of the Department, College, University, profession, and/or community and that is related directly to the candidate's professional career. As noted in the ISD bylaws, DFMs are expected to serve on "at least one Department committee (or as Department representative to a college or university level committee) each calendar year." Higher level PS should be widely recognized for its impact and importance to the candidate's professional field or career.

It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the quality and significance of PS. Provided here is a list of some of the ways in which candidates may contribute in this area. Faculty should not view these as checklists, in part because quantity is not necessarily an indication of quality and significance. Nor is the list exhaustive; faculty should view it as a series of possibilities. Furthermore, certain activities may, in the context of some faculty, suggest a closer fit with a different area of evaluation. Faculty choose activities in this area via consultation with colleagues and especially with the Chair. The faculty member and the Chair agree on planned activities via the written FPA.

Appropriate Activities in All Ranks:

Service to the profession may be established through these activities:

- Editing academic journals.
- Reviewing grant proposals.
- Reviewing submissions to journal editors or book publishers.
- Reviewing proposals to professional conferences.
- Evaluating textbooks and other instructional materials.
- Serving on review committees for funding agencies.
- Serving on committees and boards and in elected positions of scholarly societies. ○
Holding elected positions in professional organizations.
- Serving in leadership roles at professional conferences or meetings.
- Serving on departmental committees.
- Serving in departmental administrative positions.
- Serving on College committees.
- Serving on Faculty Senate.
- Serving on University Council.
- Organizing symposia or conferences at KSU.
- Coordinating educational events (e.g., film discussions, roundtables, faculty learning communities.)
- Serving as author or editor of major institutional reports.
- Advising student organizations.
- Serving in administrative positions at KSU.
- Receiving awards for service at KSU.

Service to the public/community may be established through such activities as the following:

- Responding to public queries in the candidate's area of specialization.
- Performing public service in the candidate's area of specialization.
- Giving public lectures or speeches on professional topics to community group
- Organizing events in the community related to the candidate's scholarly expertise.

1. Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer

Expectations for both lecturers and senior lecturers include attending relevant department meetings and participation in relevant department committees. Principal lecturers will often engage in additional service by assuming a leadership role on a department committee and/or being involved in service responsibilities outside the department (e.g., college or university committees or relevant professional organizations).

2. Assistant Professor

PS activities for the Assistant Professor should be limited, for Teaching and SCA take precedence due to the intensive time each requires. Although the Assistant Professor's PS

activities (e.g., extra-departmental activities) may not be substantial in the first few years in a rank, an increase is appropriate over time.

3. Associate Professor

In comparison with Assistant Professors, Associate Professors often demonstrate an increase in quantity and/or quality of PS within and outside the Department.

4. Full Professor

Full Professors share their experience and expertise with the Department, institution, profession, and community. Full Professors are often involved in a high level of service and leadership within and beyond the departmental level.

5. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Satisfactory: Expectations for senior lecturer include attending relevant department meetings and participation in relevant department committees.

6. Promotion to Principal Lecturer

Satisfactory: Expectations for principal lecturer include not only attending relevant department meetings and participating in relevant department committees, but also demonstrating impactful and highly effective service through appropriate leadership roles and/or serving outside the department.

7. Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

Satisfactory: The candidate has prioritized teaching and scholarship during the first few years in rank, but over time an increase in contribution to PS has occurred. The candidate demonstrates a record of engagement on appropriate departmental committees and has engaged in some service at the College or University level, or with relevant disciplinary organizations.

Noteworthy: The candidate provides a clear rationale demonstrating the relation between the service commitments and academic expertise. Community engagement with academic significance is also considered noteworthy.

8. Promotion to Full Professor

Satisfactory: The candidate demonstrates evidence of PS to the wider University and academic community. The candidate has taken leadership roles in the Department, College, or University, or in professional fields and has had a demonstrable impact in these roles.

Noteworthy: Evidence of the significance and impact of the candidate's PS is supported by (for example) national or international leadership positions, invited professional consultations, invited speeches to professional and academic groups or awards. Recognition for leadership in service is evident. Candidates provide a clear rationale

demonstrating the relationship between their service commitments and academic expertise.

XVIII. ANNUAL REVIEW

As described in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* section 3.12 A “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.” Faculty should consult the *KSU Faculty Handbook* section 3.12 on the Faculty Review process in developing ARDs and FPAs.

These documents will be assessed annually according to a five-point scale as follows.

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

In ISD, faculty meeting expectations in teaching, are regularly teaching their assigned courses, providing syllabi that meet the university requirements, engaging in at least one faculty development activity each year, and reflecting on their teaching in their annual review narratives. Teaching that exceeds expectations at the level of 4 might include additional participation in faculty development activities, publishing scholarship of teaching and learning, engaging in collaborative research with students, or mentoring independent studies and graduate projects. Teaching that is defined as exemplary or a 5 on the scale might include any activities described as exceeding expectations at the level of 4, but with demonstration of higher quality, significance, or impact. Faculty who do not provide syllabi to students or who do not reflect on their teaching in their annual reviews may be found to need improvement. As the category for a rating of 1” reads “faculty neglected their duties” in teaching, this would include failing to provide a syllabus, failing to provide assessment activities, or failing to do other basic elements of teaching, or failing to participate in the annual review.

Faculty meeting expectations in scholarly and creative activity pursue a regular research agenda by engaging in research or other creative activity, whether or not this results in publications during the year under review. Meeting expectations can include preparation of work, gathering data, pursuing grants, drafting, and other activities relevant to the production of scholarly and creative work. Meeting expectations can also include presenting work at conferences and publishing scholarly and creative work. Exceeding expectations at the levels of “4” in scholarship and creative activity can include publishing and/or presenting works of particular quality and significance, as described in the narrative. Exceeding expectations may also include

publishing a number of publications, publishing diverse types of publications in a calendar year, or making significant progress on a number of publications in one calendar year, as demonstrated through such activities as grant applications, reception of grants, gathering data, and participation in publication workshops in a given calendar year. Certain kinds of public presentations may also be considered to be exceeding presentations, such as invited talks. An evaluation of “exemplary” earning a “5” in scholarship and creative activity includes exceeding expectations at the level of “4” but may include work that is of greater quality and significance, include a significant number of publications or equivalent products, or include publications or equivalent products that have demonstrably broader reach or impact in the field. Faculty who do not pursue research or creative activity in data gathering, preparation, or drafting of publications, grants, or presentations in a given calendar year, will be found to need improvement or found to be not meeting expectations in their annual review. As described under workload in this document, faculty whose FPA identifies a higher-workload percentage to scholarship and creative activity are expected to be more productive than faculty with lower percentages assigned to SCA in their FPAs. A possible result of regularly not meeting expectations in research over a period of three years during annual reviews may be the reduction in the workload percentage assigned to SCA.

In the category of service, faculty are meeting expectations if they participate in committees and do work for the university in a variety of ways at the department, college, university or to the profession at large. Faculty may exceed expectations in service by providing service that produces major outcomes, by playing a leadership role, and by engaging in service that hews closely to ISD departmental philosophy and goals for the betterment of students, faculty, and staff at KSU. Exceeding expectations in service does not correspond to exceeding the workload percentage for service in terms of time and hours but can correspond to the quality and significance of service. The difference in a 4 and 5 for professional service is determined by quality and significance of service understood as a contribution to the university. Faculty who do not perform service for the department, college, university or profession amounting to the allotment of service in their workload will be found to need improvement or not meet expectations in this area.

XIX. PERFORMANCE REMEDIATION PLANS

Tenured or tenure-track faculty who receive a “1” or a “2” in any area of the annual review must undergo a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) as mandated by the Board of Regents and described in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* 3.12.A.5. Additionally, during pre-tenure review, if performance in any category is deemed not to be satisfactory or successful, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). (KSU Handbook 3.12.B.1)

XX. POST-TENURE REVIEW

The *KSU Faculty Handbook* explains the post-tenure review process in section 3.5.C. and 3.12. According to the handbook, the purpose of post-tenure review is “not to reconsider the faculty member’s tenure status” but rather “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.” The post-tenure review is assessed on the same five-point scale as the annual review, such that:

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

Each reviewer only gives an overall rating on the complete portfolio. Although there is no PTR rating by area as there is in the annual reviews, reviewers should consider the descriptions of the 1-5 scale in each area from the annual reviews when assigning a point value to the PTR portfolio. Similarly, the faculty narrative should refer to individual areas when making the case for the quality and significance of their work for the PTR portfolio.

Faculty who have received a 3 or better on each annual review during the five-year review period qualify for an expedited post-tenure review.

Faculty who have received ratings of “1” or “2” in any area on an annual review during the five-year period prior to the annual review will submit a complete portfolio for the post-tenure review. “If a tenured faculty member receives a ‘1’ or a ‘2’ on two consecutive and their review is considered annual review, the faculty member will undergo a “corrective post-tenure review.” (*KSU Faculty Handbook*, Section 3.12.A.6.).

Whether submitting a full portfolio or an expedited review, faculty who receive an assessment of “4” or “5” on the post-tenure review are eligible for a one-time monetary reward.

Faculty who receive a “3” or better on their PTR review are considered to have had a successful PTR review. Their PTR clock will be re-set. Faculty who receive a “1” or “2” on the post-tenure review must work with the department chair to create a performance-improvement plan (PIP). *KSU Faculty Handbook* 3.12.B.4 lays out PIP procedures and due process.

1. 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, a current curriculum vita, 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.

2. Corrective Post-Tenure Review

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. See the *KSU Faculty Handbook* section 3.12.II for the process to follow in the case of receiving a “1” or “2” on a post-tenure review and developing a post-tenure review performance improvement plan.

XXI. REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY

For the purpose of promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, administrative faculty, including the Department Chair, follow all department, college, and university guidelines (see *KSU Faculty Handbook*, Section 3.11.).

XXII. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER GOVERNING RULES AND REGULATIONS

All guidelines must adhere to USG policy and KSU guidelines and policy. If any information contained in the college or department promotion and tenure guidelines contradicts the USG policy or the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, USG policy and the KSU guidelines and policy will supersede the department (or college) guidelines.

XXIII. AMENDING THE P&T DOCUMENT

Amendments of these P&T Guidelines shall be approved by a majority vote of the permanent, full-time faculty of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies. A secret ballot system may be used, if requested.