

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Department of Psychological Science

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Kennesaw State University

SECTION I – STANDARDS AND TERMINOLOGY

Purpose

Faculty in the Department of Psychological Science work collectively to advance the missions of the Department, College, and University. To support this effort, the Department of Psychological Science's *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*, hereafter referred to as "department guidelines," provide discipline-specific standards and procedures that faculty within the Department use when 1) planning their work, 2) conducting self-evaluations, and 3) evaluating the performance of departmental colleagues. Faculty and administrators outside of the Department acknowledge the primacy of the department guidelines and use them as the principal guide when evaluating the performance of faculty in the Department of Psychological Science.

Authority and Relevance

Department guidelines operationalize the promotion and tenure guidelines for Kennesaw State University (KSU) as well as the guidelines for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS). Portions of the department guidelines provide a concise description of key concepts and procedures that are elaborated in university and college guidelines. When citations are provided, faculty are encouraged to consult approved university and college guidelines for the most up-to-date information.

As stated in the faculty handbook, department guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for all evaluations of performance, including promotion and tenure decisions (KSU Faculty Handbook*, Sections 2.2 and 3.1). "Reviewers' deliberations shall be based on whether or not the candidate has met the standards for promotion and/or tenure in the department guidelines, in light of the evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio and the reviewers' first-hand observations of the candidate's professional performance" (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.12).

It is incumbent upon all CHSS faculty undergoing reviews to be familiar with review procedures and faculty performance expectations and requirements. Although 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 Faculty Handbook and the CHSS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Any revisions made to department guidelines must include the date of approval/adoption. Revisions to department guidelines become effective 12 months following their adoption. However, individual faculty may choose to be reviewed under revised guidelines immediately upon their adoption.

Categories of Faculty Performance

The nature and focus of faculty work vary as a result of faculty utilizing their unique strengths and pursuing their diverse interests in ways that support the missions of the Department, College, and University. Variations are also likely to occur over time as these missions, as well as faculty strengths and interests, evolve. However, there are basic categories of faculty performance, expectations within those categories, and options and constraints in developing a workload plan across categories.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members contribute to and are evaluated in the following three categories:

- 1) Teaching (including advising, mentoring, and supervision)
- 2) Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)
- 3) Professional Service (PS)

Lecturers and senior lecturers contribute to and are evaluated in the following two categories:

- 1) Teaching (including advising, mentoring, and supervision)
- 2) Professional Service (PS)

Key Elements of Faculty Performance

Scholarly

All faculty are expected to adopt a scholarly approach in all categories of their work and demonstrate the consistent use of this approach. “Scholarly” refers to a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, revised and rethought. A key element of a scholarly approach is reflective self-evaluation that utilizes multiple forms of input (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.4.A.).

Scholarship

All tenure-track faculty are expected to produce scholarship. “Scholarship” refers to a tangible outcome of a scholarly process that is disseminated in appropriate public and professional venues in which it is open to critique and evaluation. Although one category of faculty performance is titled “Scholarship and Creative Activity,” this area is not defined by scholarship alone as it also includes the scholarly work (e.g., literature review, research design, data collection, data analysis) necessary to produce scholarship (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.4.A.).

Quality and Significance

Quality and significance are the primary criteria for evaluating faculty performance. “Quality and significance” are overarching, integrative concepts that apply equally to all categories of faculty work and include such components as clarity and relevance of goals, mastery of existing knowledge, effectiveness of communication, significance of results, and consistently ethical behavior. The quality and significance of scholarly work and scholarship are paramount. However, aspects of quantity are related to quality and significance. For example, the quality and significance of one’s work can be impacted by and in part established through the quantity of activity and/or products. One major consideration in determining quality and significance is the extent and nature of a faculty member’s contribution to any collaborative work or product (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.4.B).

Ethical Behavior

All faculty members' work is expected to be consistent with principled interpersonal behavior and ethical standards in the field. Faculty shall foster respectful relationships with students, colleagues, and others who participate in or benefit from their work (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.4.B).

Promotion and Tenure

Faculty appointments include a tenure-track status (i.e., tenure-track or non-tenure-track) and rank (i.e., assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; lecturer and senior lecturer). Ranks are typically linked to the different stages of career development and accomplishment. Faculty members at different stages of an academic career tend to have different levels of experience, expertise, accomplishment, effectiveness, and productivity. When a faculty member's experience, accomplishments, and career development evolve to the point where expectations applicable to the beginning level of the next highest rank are being met, the faculty member can make a strong case for promotion. "A decision of promotion will result from a thorough review of a faculty member's accomplishments and contributions to the University by KSU teaching and administrative faculty colleagues." (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5).

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 certain conditions. 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. It is only granted to those faculty members whose achievements demonstrate the quality and significance expected of their current rank and who demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the University. 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. The review for tenure involves a retrospective analysis of how well the individual has met the needs and expectations of the University during the probationary period and a subsequent judgment of colleagues about the individual's prospect for future contributions and achievement as a faculty member. (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5).

Years of service or successful annual reviews alone are not sufficient to qualify for tenure or a promotion in rank. Reviews for both tenure and promotion are accomplished in consideration of the faculty member's situation and context and in relation to their stage of academic career development" (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5).

SECTION II – EXPECTATIONS

General Expectations for Tenure-Track Faculty by Rank

Assistant Professor

Assistant professors primarily focus on adapting to the expectations of the academy and of KSU and getting established in their scholarly work in all three categories of performance. A typical pattern of effective and productive scholarly work for the assistant professor is one that begins modestly in the early years, perhaps with limited or local significance, and expands in depth, focus, significance, recognition, and productivity in later years.

Teaching – Assistant professors devote substantial time to teaching as they concentrate on adapting to the contexts and expectations of the Department, College, and University. They concentrate on developing and refining their pedagogical skills, assigned courses, and philosophy of teaching and learning. When engaging in this development, assistant professors effectively utilize available training, peer consultation, student feedback, and teaching and learning research. As comfort and proficiency with teaching their assigned courses increases, assistant professors adopt a more expansive view of teaching that includes engaging teachers, students, and others in learning, inside and outside the classroom, through group instruction, individual instruction, student supervision, mentoring, advising, and curricular and/or pedagogical innovation.

SCA – Assistant professors devote substantial time to SCA as they concentrate on adapting to the contexts and expectations of the Department, College, and University. They concentrate on establishing their area(s) or line(s) of research in these contexts. This involves making strategic decisions about how they invest limited time, energy, and resources in ways that will ensure a programmatic and productive research agenda.

PS – Assistant professors devote limited time to PS given the intensiveness of their teaching and SCA work. Although PS activities may not be substantial in the first few years in rank, assistant professors are expected to engage in service to the Department, and the quality and significance of that engagement are expected to increase over time.

Associate Professor

Associate professors make contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly work. High quality and significance are the essential criteria for evaluation. Compared to the assistant professor rank, the specialty areas, expertise, and professional identities of associate professors should become more advanced, more clearly defined, and more widely recognized as their academic careers progress. Typically, as the faculty member's roles and contributions grow in significance, leadership, and initiative, the faculty member establishes a strong record of accomplishments. Compared to the assistant professor rank, these accomplishments will have broader impact and recognition within and beyond the University. As noted on p. 6, workload emphases can vary across the three categories of faculty performance.

Teaching – Associate professors increase the breadth and depth of their teaching activities. Knowledge of course subject matter and proficient use of effective teaching techniques increase substantially. Refinement of skills, courses, and a philosophy of teaching and learning continues. Further refinement of their developed courses or some expansion in their teaching repertoire is expected. As required by the needs of the Department or the interests of the faculty member, associate professors engage in teaching activities outside of teaching assigned courses (e.g., supervision and mentoring of students, curricular and/or pedagogical innovation, teaching or mentoring colleagues or individuals outside the University).

SCA – Associate professors advance and refine their area(s) or line(s) of research as well as their expertise. This is typically exhibited by the research having clearer definition or greater specialization and the scholarly products of the research having greater quality and significance as compared to the assistant professor rank. Such advancement does not preclude associate professors from establishing a new area(s) or line(s) of research.

PS – Associate professors' roles and contributions in PS increase compared to the assistant professor rank. This increase may be evident in the quantity and/or quality of activities. Associate professors' activities in PS demonstrate a clear record of accomplishments, leadership, and/or impact. Some of the service itself or its impact occurs outside the Department.

Professor

Professors are experienced members of the faculty who have become highly accomplished in their scholarly activities compared to the associate professor rank. Their careers have advanced to high levels of effectiveness and productivity. Professors have strong records of contribution to and leadership in their respective areas of emphasis. Professors make significant contributions to knowledge as a result of their scholarly work, whether demonstrated through the scholarly work of teaching, scholarship and creative activity, or professional service. Professors have a documented record of distinguished accomplishments using the criteria for quality and significance of scholarly work. These accomplishments will merit state, regional, national, or international attention and recognition. As noted on p. 6, workload emphases can vary across the three categories of faculty performance.

Teaching – Professors are well-established and effective teachers with a clear record of proficiency in teaching. Refinement of skills, courses, and philosophy of teaching and learning, as well as engagement in teaching activities outside of teaching assigned courses, continues. Expansion of their teaching repertoire is expected. As leaders and experts in teaching, professors are expected to mentor less experienced faculty where possible and appropriate.

SCA – Professors continue to advance and refine their area(s) or line(s) of research as well as their expertise, dependent upon their workload emphasis. This is typically exhibited by the research having clearer definition or greater specialization and the scholarly products of the research having greater quality and significance as compared to the associate professor rank. Such advancement does not preclude professors from establishing a new area(s) or line(s) of research.

PS – Professors' roles and contributions in PS increase compared to the associate professor rank. This increase may be evident in the quantity and/or quality of activities. In addition to PS within the Department, professors' activities in PS demonstrate a clear record of accomplishments, leadership, and/or impact outside the Department.

General Expectations for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty by Type

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Because in most cases the primary responsibility of lecturers and senior lecturers is teaching, they are expected to be highly effective teachers. Unless otherwise set forth in the FPA, lecturers and senior lecturers are not expected to devote any portion of their workload to SCA or to the production of scholarship, but they are expected to devote 10% of their workload to service. "Their service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g., attendance at relevant department meetings and participation on appropriate department committees)" (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.10).

Clinical Faculty

Per KSU guidelines, clinical faculty are educators-practitioners who have a background in their disciplinary area and who practice the discipline in the work setting. The following clinical ranks are recognized at KSU: Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor. The clinical faculty position is non-tenure track, and the holder is not eligible for tenure or probationary credit toward tenure. According to 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 Psychological Science, clinical faculty make practical contributions in education, industry, clinical, and/or professional settings. Clinical faculty must maintain a balance that is different from the workload of tenure-track faculty. Unless otherwise set forth in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA), clinical faculty generally spend less time engaged in SCA. Typically, the primary responsibilities of CHSS clinical faculty shall 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).

Workload Emphasis

Typically, tenure-track faculty in the Department will have a workload emphasis of 60% Teaching, 30% SCA, and 10% PS; lecturers and senior lecturers will have a workload emphasis of 90% Teaching and 10% PS; and clinical faculty will have a workload emphasis as defined in the preceding section. “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. 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)” (Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.C). (Although faculty performance is assessed based on effort, the approximate time commitment associated with workload effort should be considered when developing an FPA and evaluating annual and multiyear review materials.) All faculty may seek a different workload emphasis through the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) negotiation.

As part of negotiating an FPA, faculty in the Department, in conjunction with the Chair and upon approval of the Dean, identify a workload emphasis that best reflects the faculty’s planned distribution of work across the three categories of faculty performance. The negotiated workload emphasis should be consistent with the faculty member’s skill set, work plans, and career trajectory, and it should help meet the needs of the Department and take into consideration the mission and guidelines of the College and Department. During these negotiations, the Chair and the faculty member are explicitly cognizant of the necessity of work-life balance and respect boundaries and limits on faculty time. Consistent with College and University guidelines, faculty members may appeal the Chair’s/Dean’s decision regarding workload emphasis.

Identifying a workload emphasis facilitates planning for the faculty member and the Department. It also facilitates the review of faculty performance in both annual and multiyear reviews as it assists reviewers in using a faculty member’s individual context and applicable expectations as the basis for evaluation.

Because a workload emphasis is identified as part of long-term planning, workload emphasis may be adjusted through consultation between the faculty and Chair. Adjustments can be initiated by the faculty, when there has been a substantive shift in their plans and trajectory, or by the Chair, when necessary. If significant deviations in workload occur after the identification of a workload emphasis (e.g., appointment to an administrative position), FPAs should be revised accordingly.

Satisfactory and Noteworthy

According to the CHSS P&T Guidelines (2019), “satisfactory faculty consistently fulfill fundamental job expectations and contribute to the everyday functioning of their department, college, and university. They are productive members of the greater academic community.” Furthermore, “noteworthy faculty consistently exceed their fundamental job expectations. They make notable contributions to their greater academic communities.”

When undergoing tenure or promotion reviews, tenure-track faculty members must be *noteworthy* in teaching and one other category and at least *satisfactory* in the third. “For annual or post-tenure reviews, the requirements are that a faculty member is *noteworthy* in teaching and at least *satisfactory* in the other two categories.” Appropriate activities, as well as what constitutes *satisfactory* and *noteworthy* achievement in all three categories, are defined in the department guidelines. These standards must be honored by all levels in the faculty performance evaluation process (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.2).

For promotion to senior lecturer, “a lecturer's portfolio will be evaluated based on highly effective accomplishments in two performance areas: 1) teaching; and 2) professional service (related to teaching assignments). For lecturers with primary responsibilities in professional service and/or administration and leadership, their portfolios will be evaluated based on highly effective performance in those areas” (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.10). This effectiveness includes refinement of skills, courses, and philosophy of teaching and learning; expansion of teaching repertoire; and value to the University in the area of teaching and student learning (or highly effective professional service for those with this primary responsibility).

The following sections outline satisfactory requirements and examples of noteworthy activities in each of the three categories of faculty performance (i.e., Teaching, SCA, and PS). The satisfactory components must be met for an evaluation of *satisfactory*. The noteworthy components represent examples of activities that may, dependent upon quality and significance, support an evaluation of *noteworthy*. In short, *noteworthy* can be achieved in a multitude of ways.

Faculty members should not view the components for *noteworthy* as checklists because quantity is not necessarily an indication of quality and significance, which are the primary determinants of noteworthy performance. Additionally, the components for *noteworthy* are not exhaustive lists. Furthermore, the nature of some activities may lead them to fit (*and count*) in multiple categories simultaneously or be a better fit in one of the other categories of faculty performance. Faculty members pursue activities in each of the categories via consultation with the Department Chair during the FPA process.

Special Note Regarding Annual Reviews

With respect to annual reviews, completion of any activity beyond those approved in the FPA or in addition to those required for an evaluation of *satisfactory* will be evidence of surpassing expectations and will be given full consideration when determining an evaluation of *noteworthy*. This does not preclude the achievement of *noteworthy* when engaging in only those activities noted/approved in the FPA. Single SCA products can span multiple annual review periods. During each review period, faculty are expected to produce a level of scholarship that demonstrates progress in terms of promotion in the area of scholarship.

Teaching

Given the historic mission of the University, College, and Department, all teaching faculty are expected to be *noteworthy* in this area. Note that teaching is broadly defined and the use of the word “teaching” in the department guidelines is meant to include a diverse array of teaching-related activities including teaching within and outside of the classroom, advising, supervision, and mentoring.

Faculty members are fulfilling requirements for a *satisfactory* evaluation by engaging in all of the following activities:

- development of a philosophy of teaching and learning that establishes educational goals
- establishment of course materials and assessments aligned with course objectives and a philosophy of teaching
- demonstration of practices of availability and responsiveness toward students
- systematic assessment and incorporation of student feedback to maintain or improve teaching
- employment of iterative techniques in the process of developing, delivering, and refining courses
- incorporation of regular revisions in course materials reflecting the current research and theory from the literature
- demonstration of evidence of effective teaching (e.g., evidence of student learning and/or accomplishments, formal or informal feedback, placement of students in academic or professional positions, external reports of student performance)

In addition to fulfilling all requirements for *satisfactory* in teaching, faculty members may achieve a *noteworthy* evaluation by engaging in and demonstrating the quality and significance of one or more of the suggested activities listed below.

- use and/or development of diverse and effective pedagogical strategies as evidenced by syllabi, lesson materials, teaching philosophy, peer observation, and/or student feedback
- use of a variety of materials and techniques that are designed to enhance student learning and engagement
- demonstration of commitment to continued improvement through reflection, participation in professional development courses or activities, attendance at conferences focused on teaching and learning, and/or solicitation of feedback from peers and students
- development of a new course and/or a course in a new format
- development of a teaching collaboration (e.g., interdisciplinary course)
- teach at another institution (e.g., a faculty exchange program)
- teach in a study abroad program
- leadership at a relevant faculty workshop focused on teaching
- presentation at a conference focused on teaching
- publication in a journal focused on teaching
- receipt of a grant focused on teaching
- engagement with students beyond the classroom (e.g., advising, supervision/mentoring of research or teaching, supervision/mentoring of a graduate thesis or dissertation, supervision/mentoring of honors work)
- involvement in a curriculum revision and/or curriculum assessment
- mentorship of faculty
- excellence in peer review of classroom teaching and/or course materials
- award/recognition of teaching

Scholarship and Creative Activities

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in activity that leads to scholarship. Although scholarship is broadly defined and can include diverse scholarly endeavors, and although this category of faculty performance is not defined by scholarship alone, the fulfillment of requirements at both the promotion to associate professor and promotion to professor levels is in part determined by meeting a minimum number of scholarship products. Importantly, faculty members rarely conceive, develop, execute,

disseminate, and evaluate the impact of a scholarship product within a single evaluation year. As a result, accurately and fully assessing performance in the SCA domain, especially for an annual review, accounts for the myriad of steps and the significant expenditure of time and effort preceding any potential scholarship product.

For the multiyear review of promotion to associate professor, the minimum number of authored or coauthored scholarship products required during the period under review is two or the equivalent for a *satisfactory* evaluation and three or the equivalent for a *noteworthy* evaluation. For promotion to professor, the minimum number of scholarship products required during the period under review is three or the equivalent for a *satisfactory* evaluation and four or the equivalent for a *noteworthy* evaluation.

Examples of scholarship products that count toward any noted minimums in evaluations of SCA include the following when published, or accepted, in/by a reputable outlet/source:

- peer-reviewed journal article
- discipline-related book
- book chapter
- edited volume
- textbook or instructional manual
- funded grants/contracts

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

- conference presentations
- conference proceedings
- articles in trade publications
- published commentary, newsletter article, or technical report
- manuscript under review
- instructional material published by reputable outlet
- external unfunded grants
- professional licensure and/or certification
- other research and creative activities for which the candidate can make a strong case regarding their quality and significance

It is incumbent upon the faculty to demonstrate the quality and significance of their scholarship as well as their contributions in multi-authored works. Following are examples (in no particular order) of indicators that can be used to establish the quality and significance of scholarship products:

- substantial contributions or leadership (e.g., first author, mentoring junior coauthors)
- a strategic/programmatic research agenda
- that the research conducted is particularly challenging or difficult (e.g., unique populations, complicated methodology, multiple studies)
- the impact of the scholarship (e.g., impact factors, use of work, citations, competitiveness of outlets, evaluation by other scholars)
- grant activity related to the scholarship (e.g., grant rating/feedback, amount of funding, competitiveness, significance)
- recognition of scholarship (e.g., awards, invited contributions)

Professional Service

Faculty members are fulfilling requirements for a *satisfactory* evaluation by engaging in both of the following activities:

- participation in activities that provide support for the functioning of the Department (e.g., participation in faculty meetings, responsiveness to departmental communications)
- active membership at the departmental, college, university, community, or professional level as part of a committee, task force, initiative, working group, etc.

Faculty members may achieve a *noteworthy* evaluation by fulfilling the requirements for *satisfactory* in PS and engaging in service activities that are greater in number and/or greater in quality and significance. Such activities may include, but are not limited to:

- effective leadership within a state, regional, national, or international professional or academic organization
- coordination of or leadership within an academic program
- effective leadership on departmental, college, or university committee
- serving in an editorial and/or production role for a professional publication
- serving as a reviewer for a journal
- contributing to a state, regional, national, or international professional or academic organization
- coordinating a professional conference/meeting or program for such conference/meeting
- authoring/coauthoring a report for the University, University System, a professional organization, or community organization
- evaluating a textbook or other instructional material
- serving as a reviewer for a conference
- serving in department, college, or university special initiative
- serving as an advisor to a student organization
- engaging in professionally-relevant consulting or community service, which includes ancillary activity necessary to provide such services (e.g., maintenance of professional licensure)
- award/recognition for professional service

SECTION III – PROCEDURES

Faculty Review Process

Performance evaluation of faculty is required at KSU. Evaluations occur regularly in the following ways in accordance with the governing policies of the Board of Regents (BOR) of the University System of Georgia and the policies and procedures established in university, college, and department guidelines. The timing of annual reviews is determined by the College Dean and Department Chair. The timing of multiyear reviews is determined by Academic Affairs.

Annual Review of Faculty Performance

Faculty performance is evaluated yearly by the Chair and the Dean through the annual review document (ARD). The ARD consists of an evaluation of performance with specific reference to the agreed upon activities established in the faculty performance agreement (FPA) approved at the beginning of the period of review. The ARD process incorporates elements of a faculty member's self-review as well as evaluative feedback from the Chair and Dean regarding the faculty member's performance relative to expectations delineated in the FPA. 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. As an agreement between the faculty member and University, the FPA must describe the faculty member's planned division of effort

among the three faculty performance categories and establish clear goals for each category. FPAs must indicate the faculty member's workload emphasis as well as reassigned time. A faculty member's FPA may change from year to year, and in-between years via a revised FPA as conditions warrant (Faculty Handbook, Sections 3.5.A and 3.12.B). Performance outcomes can be affected by a variety of external factors (e.g., class content or format, area of scholarship), so the ARD and the FPA must be reviewed with explicit awareness of the necessity for work-life balance.

Tenure-track faculty submitting a portfolio for tenure or promotion must notify their department chair of their intent to do so in their FPA and prepare a list of possible external reviewers by the end of the January preceding their August review.

Pre-Tenure Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to assist tenure-track faculty members in determining whether they are *making appropriate progress* towards their review for promotion and tenure. The pre-tenure review does not involve a tenure decision but instead provides feedback to the faculty member as to their strengths and weaknesses. This review takes place in the third year of a tenure-track faculty member's appointment (KSU Faculty Handbook, Sections 3.5.A. and 3.12.B.).

Third-Year Review

A third-year review is required for non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., Lecturers and Clinical Faculty) in the Department of Psychological Science. The purpose of the third-year review is to assist non-tenure-track faculty in determining whether they are *making appropriate progress* towards their next multiyear review. The third-year review does not involve a promotion decision but instead provides feedback to the faculty member as to their strengths and weaknesses. This review takes place in the third year of a non-tenure-track faculty member's appointment. (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.10.B.)

Review for Promotion

The purpose of the review for promotion is to make a formal decision about the elevation of a faculty member's professorial rank. For tenure-track faculty, the review for promotion to associate professor is concurrent with the review for tenure in that it must take place in the sixth year of appointment and not before the fifth year unless faculty opt to apply granted years of credit toward promotion. The awarding of promotion to associate professor must precede the awarding of tenure. For tenure-track faculty at the rank of associate professor, the review for promotion to professor is elective and cannot be pursued before the fifth year in rank as an associate professor including any granted years of credit towards promotion (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5.A. and 3.12.B.).

For lecturers, the review for promotion to senior lecturer is elective and cannot be pursued before the fifth year in rank as a lecturer (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.10.A.).

Clinical Faculty

In addition to annual reviews, clinical faculty may apply for an optional promotion review. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia requires a minimum of 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 the 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 clinical faculty with professorial rank must prepare a portfolio for the optional promotion consideration (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.6.A.). 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 Department of Psychological Science will follow the “general expectations for promotion and faculty performance for non-tenure track clinical faculty in professorial ranks” set forth in the *Faculty Handbook* Section 3.7. When submitting a portfolio for promotion in rank, clinical 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 in annual FPAs.

Review for Tenure (tenure-track faculty only)

The purpose of the review for tenure is to make a formal tenure decision at the end of the probationary period. This review must take place in the sixth year of a tenure-track faculty member’s appointment, if tenure has not already been awarded, and not before the fifth year (i.e., the minimum probationary period) unless faculty opt to apply granted years of credit toward tenure. The awarding of tenure for assistant professors can only be approved after a positive decision on promotion to associate professor has been made (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5.A. and 3.5.B.).

Post-Tenure Review (tenure-track faculty only)

The purpose of the post-tenure review is to examine, recognize, and enhance the performance of all tenured faculty members. The review is not a reconsideration of tenure status or rank. Instead, it is a comprehensive, five-year performance review providing both retrospective and prospective examination of performance that results in an outcome of either *achieving* or *not achieving expectations* in post-tenure performance.

Although the primary evidence to be considered consists of the five most recent annual evaluations and current curriculum vitae, the faculty member must submit all materials listed on the Portfolio Document Submission List in the Faculty Handbook. Supporting documentation is also submitted. “Three or more positive annual evaluations are necessary but are not sufficient to guarantee a positive decision... Faculty who have three or more unsatisfactory annual evaluations (not achieving/not meeting expectations) will be considered as candidates for remediation.” “To receive a positive PTR recommendation, the faculty member must be ‘noteworthy’ in teaching and be satisfactory in both scholarship and service.” These ratings will be relative to the workload described in the faculty member’s FPA (Faculty Performance Agreement).” This review takes place in the sixth year after the most recent personnel action (KSU Faculty Handbook, Sections 3.5.C. & 3.12.B.).

Joint-Appointments

Promotion and tenure reviews of a tenure-track faculty with a joint appointment in two or more departments must adhere to the terms of the faculty Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which clearly delineates the composition of the promotion and tenure (P&T) committee membership as well as any special consideration for what type of scholarship and creative activity is acceptable. “The joint appointment agreement must specify who can provide input into the faculty member’s annual review, promotion and/or tenure reviews, and who will write the review(s). Normally, the chair of the academic home department will be responsible for completing annual reviews” (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.5.E.).

Department Chair

Expectations of the department chair are outlined in the department bylaws. Annual evaluation of the Department Chair's performance follows procedures outlined at the college and university level. For the purpose of promotion and tenure, department and college guidelines are followed.

Portfolio Preparation and Content

All faculty members who are undergoing reviews for pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure must prepare a portfolio for consideration by all involved in the formal review process. Portfolios must be prepared in accordance with university, college, and departmental guidelines. Faculty must effectively use the portfolio to make a clear, coherent, and convincing argument for how their performance, including the quality and significance of both specific accomplishments and their overall body of work, should be evaluated within the framework of the relevant guidelines. Faculty are strongly encouraged to consult available portfolio preparation resources.

Portfolios must include the content required by university, college, and departmental guidelines. Beyond this, faculty make their own decisions as to what additional information to include. In general, materials that demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty member's work as described in the narrative should be included in the portfolio. Candidates may include materials that demonstrate accomplishments from prior institutions and accomplishments from before the start of their last tenure and/or promotion review at KSU. However, the quality and significance of accomplishments during the period under review are the primary focus in making review decisions. If included, the relevance of older materials to the quality and significance of the candidate's current work must be made clear. When candidates use probationary year(s) of credit toward promotion and tenure, inclusion of accomplishments from prior institution(s) is required. All levels of review should consider all of the materials included in the portfolio in making their recommendation (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.12.B.).

External Letters

The inclusion of external letters as part of the promotion and tenure process is required. External letters are not required for post-tenure review. External letters are also not required for non-tenure-track faculty unless research and scholarship expectations are 50% or more of their workload expectations. For faculty eligible for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and tenure and for faculty eligible for promotion from associate professor to professor and/or tenure, three external letters are required. Procedures for securing and handling external letters are outlined in university guidelines.

In the Department of Psychological Science, reviewers consider an external letter to be an additional piece of information in the portfolio. Specifically, reviewers are to utilize external letters as one component in their overall evaluation of the quality and significance of a candidate's performance in SCA. Because external letters are ultimately solicited and inserted into the portfolio by the Chair, they are different from letters of support, which the candidate solicits and inserts into the portfolio. Reviewers may take this distinction into account when deciding how to evaluate the content of these letters but cannot ignore or discount letters of support (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.12.B.).

Required Content

Portfolios for pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews in the Department of Psychological Science must include all content listed on the Portfolio Document Submission List in the Faculty Handbook (see KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.12.B.). In addition to that content, portfolios for these reviews must also include:

- a statement of teaching philosophy

- representative syllabi (i.e., most current syllabi from each course taught in the period under review)
- representative course materials (e.g., major assignment instructions, lectures, rubrics)
- all quantitative evaluations from all courses taught in the period under review and a clear, concise, and meaningful statistical analysis of the evaluations
- all qualitative evaluations from all courses taught in the period under review
- complete copies of scholarship products, including any noted manuscripts or works in progress
- a clear description of the nature of contribution for any co-authored scholarship product
- a clear and concise summary (e.g., paragraph in narrative, supplemental table) of scholarship products and any indicators of quality and significance (e.g., acceptance rates, times cited, impact indices)

When including content required by university and college guidelines, faculty in the Department of Psychological Science must also ensure that:

- all FPAs and ARDs from the period under review show the signatures of reviewers
- the vita provides clear and accurate identification of scholarship types [e.g., peer-reviewed vs. non-peer-reviewed (e.g., editor reviewed, publisher reviewed, invited); presentations (e.g., poster, paper, workshop, address, symposium) vs. publications (e.g., journal article, book chapter, book, newsletter, book review, encyclopedia entry, abstract, proceedings); authorship vs. faculty sponsorship]
- the vita provides a clear description of any service as a reviewer (e.g., years in which one served, number of reviews completed)

Relationship to Other Governing Rules and Regulations

Nothing in these guidelines should be construed to supersede provisions of the statutes of KSU as described in the Faculty Handbook and other appropriately and procedurally (per the Faculty Handbook) established guidelines or memorandums provided by the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

Amendments to the Guidelines

Amendments to these guidelines shall be approved by a majority vote of the permanent, full-time faculty of the Department of Psychological Science in accordance with procedures specified in the department's bylaws.

* All references to the KSU Faculty Handbook are from the 2019-2020 edition.

Approvals

This document was voted on and approved by the Faculty of the Department of Psychological Science on November 2, 2020.

DocuSigned by:
Sharon Pearcey
0AFE3669A39405...
Chair of Department Faculty Council, Dr. Sharon Pearcey
January 8, 2021
Date

DocuSigned by:
Corinne McNamara
BDFE7C83EAA24DD...
Chair of Department, Dr. Corinne McNamara
January 8, 2021
Date

DocuSigned by:
Emma Wertz
2F9792EE6D8840D...
Chair of RCHSS P&T Committee, Dr. Emma Wertz
February 4, 2021
Date

DocuSigned by:
Pam Cole
89817EEE305A48E...
RCHSS Dean
February 8, 2021
Date

DocuSigned by:
Kathy Schwaig
11EA3F49C7FD4B9...
Provost, Dr. Kathy Schwaig
February 9, 2021
Date