

Kennesaw State University
Norman J. Radow College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
For School of Government and International Affairs
Approved by SGIA Faculty Vote: October 17, 2023

Table of Contents

I.	Introductory School Characteristics	2
II.	General Statement on Faculty Reviews	2
III.	Workload Model, Guidelines, and Workload Adjustments	3
	A. General Statement	3
	B. Table 1 Common Workload Models	3
	C. Evidence of Satisfactory Performance for Various Workload Models	4
	D. Explanations of Workload Models	4
	E. Course Releases and Reassigned Times	5
IV.	Faculty Performance	6
	A. Faculty Performance Areas	6
	B. Detailed Expectations in the Faculty Performance Area	6
	1. Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring	6
	2. Scholarship and Creative Activity	7
	3. Service	10
V.	Faculty Performance Agreements	11
	A. Student Success Activities and Goals	12
	B. Professional Development Activities and Goals	12
VI.	Faculty Review Criteria and Processes	12
	A. Annual Review	13
	B. Pre-Tenure Review	13
	C. Promotion and Tenure of Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty	14
	D. Promotion of Lecturers	22
	E. Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks & Acad. Pr.	25
	F. Expectations for Post-Tenure Review of Tenure Track Faculty	26
VII.	Post-Tenure Review of Administrative Faculty	27
VIII.	Accreditation Standards	27
IX.	Tenure-track Faculty with a Joint Appointment in Two or More Departments	27
X.	Relationship to Other Governing Rules and Regulations	28
XI.	Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines	28
	Appendix 1: Five-Point Scale for Annual Reviews	29
	Appendix 2: Five-Point Scale for Post-Tenure Reviews	32

I. Introductory School Characteristics

The purpose of this document is to assist colleagues and Promotion and Tenure committees in interpreting and operationalizing the university's general criteria for faculty performance within the School of Government and International Affairs.

The School of Government and International Affairs (SGIA) offers two undergraduate majors (Bachelor of Science in Political Science and a Bachelor of Arts in International Affairs); three minors (Legal Studies, Political Science, and International Affairs); five certificates (Constitutional Studies, European Union Studies, Political Communication, Professional Politics, and Homeland Security). The SGIA also offers two graduate programs, one a Master of Arts in Public Administration and two, a Master of Science in International Policy Management. In addition, the SGIA maintains a presence in the General Education Program through courses such as POLS 1101, American Government and POLS 2401, Global Issues.

The faculty in the SGIA are trained in a variety of fields and collaborate with faculty from other disciplines in University programs such as African and African Diaspora Studies, Asian Studies, and American Studies. Faculty may also be affiliated with other programs or be jointly appointed with SGIA and another School/Department. Most faculty teach a 3/3 course workload with 3 courses in each of two academic semesters. Faculty must thus be prepared to meet many pedagogical and disciplinary challenges.

II. General Statement on Faculty Reviews

It is incumbent upon all RCHSS faculty undergoing review to be familiar with review procedures and faculty performance expectations and requirements. While more specific performance expectations and requirements can be found in this document, review procedures and general performance expectations are stated in the *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3 and the Norman J. Radow College of Humanities and Social Sciences (RCHSS) Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. In addition, as noted in the RCHSS P&T Guidelines, RCHSS faculty are required to include all quantitative and qualitative student evaluations in their portfolio. Tenure-track faculty submitting a portfolio for tenure or promotion must also notify their department chair/school director of their intent to do so in their FPA and prepare a list of possible external reviewers by the end of January preceding the review that begins in August.

These guidelines, as well as the individual Faculty Performance Agreements (FPAs) negotiated under them, will be established through KSU's shared governance process by bodies and officers detailed in the Faculty Handbook under "Governance and Colleges". 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.

III. Workload Model, Guidelines, and Workload Adjustments

A. General Statement (See Section 2.2. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*)

Workload distribution among faculty in the School of Government & International Affairs will vary depending upon the institutional needs of the School and the interests and strengths of individual faculty. The standard workload model for tenured and non-tenured faculty on the tenure track is 60% teaching (a 3/3 teaching load), 30% scholarship, and 10% service. A variety of other workload models are also possible. Examples of different workload models can be found below. Modifications to individual workload models – to include more or less teaching, scholarship, or service - can be made in consultation with the Director, and with approval by the Dean. Faculty preferences, past performance, and opportunities in teaching, scholarship, and service are considered in the development of workload models during the ARD/FPA process. A faculty member's strengths, interests, and past three years annual reviews will serve as the primary guide.

In case of appeal, a faculty member may appeal to the Dean in writing within ten business days. The Dean is encouraged to seek input from the School and/or College P&T Committee or equivalent.

The standard faculty workload for lecturers and senior lecturers is 90 percent teaching and 10 percent service (90/0/10). The standard workload model for tenured and non-tenured MPA faculty on the tenure track is 60/30/10. Course reassignment for MPA faculty can be granted during the AR process based on research output, mentoring of graduate students, etc., subject to approval by the Dean. The workload for Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks (Including Clinical Faculty and Research Faculty) and faculty with administrative appointments (when applicable) depends on situational context and must be defined in the FPA.

B. Table 1 Common Workload Models

Model	Teaching %	Scholarship %	Service %	Load
Standard Model *	60	30	10	3/3
Teaching I Model	70	20	10	4/3
Teaching II Model **	80	10	10	4/4
Teaching-Service Model **	70	10	20	4/3
Research I Model	50	40	10	3/2
Research II Model	40	50	10	2/2
Research-Service Model	50	20	30	3/2
Service Emphasis Model	60	20	20	3/3

* Faculty seeking tenure shall select the standard workload model – unless an alternative arrangement has been mutually agreed between the faculty member and the SGIA Director

and the arrangement is stipulated in the faculty member's FPA. In no case shall the faculty scholarship percentage be below 30%.

** Faculty seeking promotion shall not select this model.

C. Evidence of Satisfactory Performance for Various Workload Models

Below are the Basic Criteria for All Workload Models. General expectations for faculty are provided here in each Model and described more fully in Section III. Expectations of Faculty.

1. All faculty must be noteworthy in teaching and noteworthy in one other area (scholarship/research) or service to be eligible for tenure or promotion. "Noteworthy" means the faculty member has completed all of the duties for satisfactory teaching and achieved some combination of additional activities listed below in Section IV Expectations of Faculty, such that the faculty member's teaching is high quality and significant as demonstrated by the faculty member during the AR process.
2. Research expectations and criteria specific to each Model are spelled out below and in Section IV. All peer-reviewed or peer-reviewed equivalent scholarly products must be distributed in appropriate and competitive outlets that are considered quality venues within each faculty member's field.
3. Reliable and proficient service to the School, College, and/or University is expected in all Models. Specific criteria are explained below and in Section IV.

D. Explanations of Workload Models

Standard Workload Model

Assistant Professors and Associate Professors (non-tenured tenure-track and tenured faculty eligible for promotion) on the standard workload model (60/30/10) have a 3/3 course load. They are expected to produce a level of scholarship during the review period that would demonstrate progress toward "satisfactory" status in terms of promotion in the area of scholarship, as defined in the SGIA promotion and tenure guidelines.

Teaching I Model

Faculty on the Teaching I Model (70/20/10) will teach a 4-3 course load. Productivity expectations for scholarship would be two-thirds of the expectations for the standard model, as faculty would be devoting one-third less of their time on scholarship.

Teaching II Model

Faculty on the Teaching II Model (80/10/10) will teach a 4-4 course load. In order to meet expectations in SCA, a faculty member using this workload model should show evidence in annual review documents of on-going scholarly activities that enhance the content and currency of courses being taught and present research findings to an academic audience and/or professional conference at least once every five years.

Teaching-Service Model

Faculty on the Teaching-Service Model III (70/10/20) will teach a 4-3 course load. In order to meet expectations in SCA, a faculty member using this workload model should show evidence in annual review documents of on-going scholarly activities that enhance the content and currency of courses and present research findings to an academic audience and/or professional conference at least once every five years.

Research I Model

Eligible Faculty (non-tenured tenure-track, tenured faculty eligible for promotion, and Full Professors) on the Research Model I (50/40/10) model have a 3/2 course load and are expected to be very active in research and creative activity.

Research II Model

Eligible Faculty (non-tenured tenure-track, tenured faculty eligible for promotion, and Full Professors) on the Research Model II (40/50/10) are expected to maintain high research productivity.

Research-Service Model

Eligible Faculty (tenured faculty eligible for promotion and Full Professors) on the Research Model III (50/20/30) model have a 3/2 course load, and, while expected to have an active research agenda, are also expected to maintain a service load commensurate with thirty percent of their time, approximately 12 hours per week. Faculty should expect to devote at least 8 hours per week toward research and creative activity and maintain at least satisfactory progress in SCA over their review period.

Service Emphasis Model

Faculty on the Service Model I (60/20/20) will teach a 3/3 course load. Faculty would be expected to serve on at least two major committees or shared governance bodies, with a leadership (e.g., chair) position on one entity, or serve on a total of three committees or shared governance bodies.

Alternatively, to evidence a 20% service load, faculty can demonstrate that they devoted an average of 8 hours per week to service. Productivity expectations for scholarship would be two-thirds of the expectations for the standard model, as faculty would be devoting one-third less of their time on scholarship.

* Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure must not select any workload model that would make them ineligible for promotion and/or tenure per the Faculty Handbook.

**Faculty at the rank of Professor are not eligible for promotion, therefore promotion expectations contained in the School's P&T guidelines cannot be used to determine workload model expectations. Professors do, however, undergo post-tenure review. See the language in each section for expectations for Professors.

E. Course Releases and Reassigned Times

The School provides course releases for faculty with heavy mentoring responsibilities and reassigned time for certain positions to allow faculty members to perform significant administrative duties and/or non-instructional responsibilities that are

essential for the functioning and commitments of the School. Course reassignments are negotiated with the Director, subject to approval by the Dean.

Faculty positions that typically receive course reassignments include the Assistant/Associate Director, Undergraduate Degree Program Coordinators, Graduate Directors, Internship Coordinator, and the Simulation Team Faculty Advisors.

IV. Faculty Performance (See Sections 2.4 and 3.3 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*)

A. Faculty Performance Areas

The basic categories of faculty performance at KSU are teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service. The Faculty Performance Agreement delineates the relative emphasis of an individual faculty member's activities in these three areas. The typical faculty member will focus work in the specific areas that reflect their knowledge and expertise in advancing the University's mission.

Faculty are to highlight activities promoting student success in at least one of the three performance areas: Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and/or Professional Service Faculty are also asked to engage in professional development activities in at least one of the three areas of performance.

B. Detailed Expectations in the Faculty Performance Areas

1. Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring

Teaching is the primary focus for all faculty at Kennesaw State University and is the principal mission of the School of Government and International Affairs. Highly effective teaching is a necessary condition for satisfactory performance at Kennesaw State University and faculty are therefore expected to perform their teaching duties in a noteworthy fashion, as described below. The School encourages teaching excellence through effective classroom performance and by demonstrable evidence of continued instructional and scholarly development on the part of the faculty member. It is incumbent upon all faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure to document evidence that supports noteworthy teaching and to explain why their teaching is of high quality and significant. Candidates should be sure to include in their portfolios a demonstration of quality and significance. Evidence in support of noteworthy teaching includes, but is not limited to syllabi exams, course materials, evaluations, peer reviews, or other supporting materials.

Fundamental Activities:

- regularly meeting scheduled classes and/or interacting with students in online classes
- meeting the School's teaching needs
- making time outside of class to assist students in person and/or remotely
- documenting student learning and providing feedback to students on their performance through class-based exams and/or other types of class-based

- assignments
- maintaining currency of subject matter and/or integration of course content with theory and practice

Additional Activities:

- advising student organizations
- coaching student teams for regional, national, or international academic competitions
- mentoring and advising students
- mentoring peers
- engaging in pedagogical innovation and experimentation
- developing new courses
- guest lecturing, speaking, and making other in-house faculty presentations
- publishing in teaching newsletters
- engaging in curricular matters
- supervising students in practicums, internships, co-ops, service learning, directed studies, or theses and dissertations
- planning, administering, and/or teaching in study abroad programs
- enhancing effectiveness in teaching, supervision, and mentoring by taking part in teaching workshops or professional development programs
- earning recognition and awards for distinguished teaching
- writing proposals for grants to fund teaching innovation
- publishing in journals and/or presenting at conferences focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning
- teaching honors courses or supervising honors projects/experiences
- teaching overload credit(s) due to School/university need
- conducting research with students
- writing letters of recommendation for students seeking admission to professional or graduate programs, applying for scholarships, or pursuing career opportunities
- assisting students in applying for further educational or scholarship opportunities

In addition to student evaluations and course syllabi, evidence of the quality and significance of teaching performance may include some or all of the following: evidence of work with student groups, letters from students describing mentoring relationships, letters from external parties that are familiar with the candidate's teaching, documentation on curriculum development, student portfolios, peer evaluation, in-house publication of pedagogy.

2. Scholarship and Creative Activity [See Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*]

KSU and RCHSS measures research and scholarly activities aligning with academic units' expectations outlined in the annual, tenure, and promotion criteria. Scholarship and creative activity at KSU are broadly defined in the institution's mission statement as a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of

knowledge, understanding, application, problem solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy in the communities served by the University. For faculty members to acquire P&T, they must provide evidence of scholarship and creative activity productivity within a focused line of inquiry.

Scholarship and creative activity standards are minimum thresholds for tenure-earning faculty and do not guarantee promotion and/or tenure.

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to maintain an active and productive agenda of scholarship and creative activity. Disciplinary scholarship is an ongoing process requiring professional development, intellectual enhancement and interaction with the broader academic and professional community. It involves intellectual contributions by faculty members toward producing and disseminating **traditional, pedagogical, or service-oriented** scholarship. Traditional Scholarship is defined as scholarship that is focused upon programmatic scholarship and creativity aimed at building or contributing to a substantial body of work and whose product is subject to the usual process of peer review or appropriate review and publication/presentation. Pedagogical scholarship is defined as scholarship focused upon student learning in which the processes and outcomes are public and subject to appropriate review. Service-oriented scholarship is defined as scholarship that involves the use of knowledge and expertise in a service opportunity to the University, the community, or their profession. Such activity must clearly demonstrate the outcome or impact of the service activity.

“Peer Reviewed” and Equivalents The world of publishing is changing and publication of scholarly products that reflect traditional, pedagogical, and service oriented scholarship of inquiry and investigation may also include those products made public and shared with appropriate peers in a competitive review process that may include other than traditional professional journals. Such review may include scholarly products appropriately or editorially reviewed when it is evident that academic criteria applied to the work presented results in a selection process in which the candidate’s work is chosen for publication. Candidates must demonstrate the quality and significance of his/her work and *may* include measures such as impact factors, citation numbers, readership, “downloads,” and other evidence as appropriate.

Every tenure-track faculty member is expected to perform the “fundamental” activities listed below. As faculty progress upward through the ranks, he or she is expected to perform at a more advanced level to include demonstrated proficiency in both “fundamental” and “additional” activities listed below. Faculty whose performance is to be deemed noteworthy are those who consistently meet their fundamental job expectations and make noteworthy contributions to their greater academic communities. These faculty can demonstrate the quality and significance of their scholarly activity in their portfolios through the annual review process.

For promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, manuscripts and other scholarly products should be published, in press, or fully accepted for publication. They

should be published during the candidate's time at KSU unless probationary credit toward tenure and/or promotion was awarded at the time of hiring. In that case, reviewers must take into account scholarship and creative activities completed during that probationary period. Other scholarly work or creative activity will be taken into consideration in evaluating one's performance area as defined in these guidelines.

Fundamental Activities:

- Publishing scholarly products either peer-reviewed or appropriately reviewed in a variety of outlets is required. Examples of scholarly products that fall into the category of "peer reviewed" or "appropriately reviewed" may include:
 - A book, which is typically considered equivalent to a minimum of 2 to a maximum of four journal articles, depending upon its quality and significance, publishing house, and other factors, which the candidate should describe in his/her portfolio narrative
 - Law review articles
 - Journal Articles
 - Book chapters
 - Edited volumes
 - Funded grants
 - Online blogs, websites, or other hosted electronic forums with competitive moderation
 - Other research and creative activities for which the candidate can make a strong case regarding their quality and significance

Additional Activities:

- Publishing in excess of the minimum requirements in terms of a) the number of publications or b) the prestige of publishing outlet
- Giving scholarly presentations at professional meetings and/or enhancing effectiveness in scholarship by taking part in research-oriented development seminars or workshops
- Publishing in pedagogical journals or making educationally focused presentations at disciplinary and interdisciplinary gatherings that advance the scholarship of teaching and curricular innovation or practice
- Producing texts, scholarly books, ancillary text materials, software applications, and case study guides
- Earning recognition and awards for distinguished scholarly activities
- Submitting proposals for funded or unfunded internal or external research grants
- Publishing articles in trade publications
- Conducting scholarly research in the subfields of political science as required in one's service of professional, public or civic organizations or agencies, including but not limited to, discipline-related professional organizations, government institutions, courts, party offices, campaign organizations or international organizations. (Faculty must determine whether their activities might be better suited for inclusion as professional service activities or scholarship activities.)
- Serving as a reviewer or editor of professional publications

- Submitting year-end reports to funding agencies
- Reviewing and critiquing grant applications, or manuscripts
- Convening panels or discussing paper presentations at professional meetings
- Conducting professional workshops, seminars, and colloquia for colleagues

Faculty who claim to be noteworthy in research and creative activity must demonstrate the quality and significance of their combination of additional activities.

3. Service

Professional service includes (1) service to the institution, (2) service to the community, (3) service to the discipline, and (4) administration and leadership. Faculty members are expected to play an active role in contributing their academic and professional skills and knowledge to support and advance the mission and tasks of the School, the College, the University, and/or the external communities at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels.

Every tenure-track faculty member is expected to meet the “fundamental” expectations listed below. As a faculty member progresses upward through the ranks, he or she will be expected to perform at a more advanced level to included demonstrated proficiency within both the “fundamental” and “additional” expectations listed below. These are examples only, rather than an exhaustive list.

Candidates should be sure to include in their portfolios a demonstration of quality and significance of their service that includes, but is not limited to, documentation of achievement of the fundamental and additional activities listed below.

In all of the areas selected for evaluation, all faculty in the School are expected to:

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

Fundamental Activities:

- Attendance at School (SGIA) faculty meetings
- Attendance at program and committee meetings
- Contributing actively as a member of committees and task forces at the School, College, and/or University level, as negotiated with the School Director

Additional Activities:

- Leading committees and task forces at the School, College and/or University level, as negotiated with the School Director
- Serving as a member of faculty search or promotion and tenure committees
- Coordinating or administering accreditation or quality assurance activities within the School, college or university
- Coordinating programs for professional conferences/meetings, organizing symposia or bringing professional meetings to KSU
- Serving as an officer in professional or civic organizations
- Volunteering on community service or KSU organizations
- Writing grants for community organizations
- Conducting professional development and continuing education programs
- Serving as a guest speaker for on or off-campus events

- Assisting in university-related fundraising campaigns
- Establishing and/or maintaining newsletters or websites for on or off-campus organizations or departments
- Receiving recognition or awards for distinguished service contributions on or off campus
- Enhancing effectiveness in professional service by taking part in service-oriented workshops or seminars
- Conducting scholarly research in the subfields of Political Science or International Affairs as part of a service initiative for professional, civic or public organizations
- Receiving commissions and/or contracts for discipline related service activities
- Serving as a reviewer or editor of professional publications
- Preparing year-end reports to funding agencies
- Reviewing and critiquing grant applications, or manuscripts
- Convening panels or discussing paper presentations at professional meeting
- Conducting professional workshops, seminars, and colloquia for colleagues
- Participating in other School, college, community, or university level committees or service
- Contributing to statewide or regional professional or academic organization
- Advising student organizations
- Other service expectations as defined as relevant by the School
- Other service for which the candidate can make a strong case regarding its quality and significance

V. Faculty Performance Agreements (See section 3.2. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*)

Per Sections 3.2. and 3.12. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, each faculty member must develop an FPA in consultation with their chair/director. This document outlines goals and priorities for the period of time they note in the agreement. The FPA describes the relative emphasis of an individual faculty member's activities in Teaching, Supervising, and Mentoring; Scholarship and Creative Activity; and Professional Service.

A faculty member's FPA contains student success goals and professional development

goals in at least one of these three performance areas and addresses the mission and relevant guidelines of the RCHSS and the faculty member's school/department. Faculty members must submit their FPA to the SGIA director for review according to the deadline published in Section 3 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*.

A. Student Success Activities and Goals

Student success activities and goals may include (but are not limited to):

- advising student organizations
- coaching student teams for regional, national, or international academic competitions
- academic mentoring and advising students
- mentoring and advising students in career preparation
- engaging in pedagogical innovation and experimentation
- supervising students in practicums, internships, co-ops, service learning, or directed studies
- planning, administering, and/or teaching in study abroad programs
- enhancing effectiveness in teaching, supervision, and mentoring by taking part in teaching workshops or professional development programs
- writing proposals for grants to fund teaching innovation
- teaching honors courses or supervising honors projects/experiences
- conducting research with students
- writing letters of recommendation for students seeking admission to professional or graduate programs, applying for scholarships, or pursuing career opportunities
- assisting students in applying for further educational or scholarship opportunities
- engaging in School, College or University student success initiatives

B. Professional Development Activities and Goals

According to the *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.2: "effectiveness in any performance area requires a basic foundation of prerequisite degrees and credentials, as well as currency in one's field. At KSU, such credentials and currency are known as professional development and all members of the faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development opportunities both on and off campus. Faculty should address in their portfolio narrative how their continuing development activities influence, support, and/or shape their activities in their performance area(s) of emphasis."

VI. Faculty Review Criteria and Processes

Faculty performance is evaluated through two basic, interrelated processes: annual reviews and multi-year reviews. Annual reviews give an evaluation of the faculty member's performance over one year within the context of multi-year reviews. The multi-year reviews, involving multiple reviewers, are a more comprehensive examination of a faculty member's

role in and contribution to the Department/School, College, and University.

A. Annual Review (See section 3.12 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*)

The Director must provide the faculty member with a written evaluation that refers to the five-point scale established by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents and found in *the KSU Faculty Handbook*, Sections 3.5.C. & 3.12.A.2. Appendix 1 below provides an interpretation of the five-point rubric suitable for SGIA.

Per Section 3.12.A.5., “[i]f a tenured faculty member receives a ‘1 – Does Not Meet Expectations’ or ‘2 – Needs Improvement’ in any of the categories during an annual review, the chair of the department will develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) in consultation with the faculty member to remediate the faculty member’s performance.”

The five-point scale must be used to assess non-tenure track faculty members, but those faculty members will not be assigned PRPs.

Details of this five-point scale for ARDs are contained in Appendix 1.

PRPs for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (from the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, section 3.12.A.5): Note that while this section of the Handbook pertains to tenured faculty members, tenure-track faculty members will also be evaluated annually on the elements of teaching, student success activities, research / scholarship, and service, following the procedures described above. In the case of deficiency identified through an annual evaluation, they will be put on a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP).

B. Pre-Tenure Review (See Section 3.5 and Section 3.12 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*)

Sections 3.5. and 3.12. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* present the Pre-Tenure Review process and outline details for each step, beginning with the school/department P&T Review committee, continuing to the Director, and on to the Dean.

Unless granted probationary credit toward tenure and promotion, pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty members must have a Pre-Tenure Review that gives them a clear picture of the progress they are making toward tenure and promotion. Letters of review must identify specific strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member. Faculty hired with credit toward tenure may not be required to undertake pre-tenure review.

PRP for Pre-Tenure Reviews (from the *KSU Faculty Handbook* section 3.12.B.1): If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful / not

satisfactory, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP).

C. Promotion and Tenure of Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty (See *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.5 and Section 3.12)

1. Promotion and Tenure Review Process

Eligibility for tenure in the School of Government and International Affairs is available only to full time, tenure-track faculty members who have obtained the terminal degree. Tenure decisions are made in the context of those expectations according to a faculty member's rank, experience, position and workload. 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 successful candidate for will have a record of achievements deemed noteworthy in two of the three areas under evaluation (one must be *teaching*).

Recommendations regarding tenure are based on the accumulated merits of individuals, their academic accomplishments, and their potential for contributing to the success of the School. Timelines, procedures, and criteria for performance reviews, tenure applications, and promotion for faculty of all ranks and categories are detailed in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*.

1.2 Timeline of Review

In order to facilitate appropriate portfolio submission, P & T Committee development, and internal and external review processes, faculty shall follow the timeline outlined below and as shown on the Academic Affairs website.

1.2a Spring Notification

In January of each spring, when the FPA is due, any faculty members intending to submit materials for tenure and/or promotion in the fall shall notify the School Director and P & T chair of his/her intention to do so. The purposes of this notice are to: 1) ensure that the member is eligible to submit materials at that time; 2) begin the process of collecting external letters of support as outlined in the Faculty Handbook 3) ensure appropriate Peer Teaching Review; and 4) ensure appropriate P & T committee formation with joint programs/departments other than SGIA.

1.2b Soliciting External Letters

All tenured and tenure-track faculty who are seeking promotion and/or tenure are required to have external review letters in P&T portfolios following the policy and procedures outlined in the Section 3.12 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*.

1.2c P & T Committee Peer Teaching Visits

Every year, typically in the Spring semester, two members of the P & T Committee (except the P & T chair) shall visit (once) the classroom of every pre-tenured faculty member and lecturer. The visit should take place within the first 50 minutes of a class session. The purpose of this visit is to provide constructive feedback on the classroom teaching capabilities of faculty members. (In the event that the faculty member teaches online, he/she should provide online access to course materials to the faculty visitor).

The faculty visitor writes a report (using a one-page form approved by the SGIA faculty) addressing the faculty member's teaching based on the following criteria: 1) classroom management; 2) communication and organization; 3) interaction with students; 4) areas of strength; 5) areas for improvement, if any are identified, and 6) additional comments, if any. Though not required, visitors are encouraged to discuss their report with candidates. These forms are collected by the P & T committee chair by the last day of spring semester classes. They are forwarded to the faculty member and the School Director and must be included in the candidate's portfolio for tenure and/or promotion.

In addition, a candidate may seek out a School colleague (or a colleague from another appropriate University department such as CETL) to visit his/her class. A candidate may also request an additional person (for instance, from his/her graduate program or joint- appointed department) to visit his/her class. Additional visits must utilize the SGIA faculty approved form if included in the candidate's portfolio for tenure and/or promotion. The P & T committee chair is responsible for coordinating these classroom visits in consultation with candidates and the visitors.

1.2d Submission of Materials

All materials shall be submitted to the P & T committee by the time and date outlined by Academic Affairs Tenure and Promotion material submission guidelines for each academic year.

1.3 Documenting Performance

The tenure and/or promotion portfolio should contain materials that document the success and trajectory of the candidate in all of the relevant areas.

1.4 Promotion & Tenure Narrative

The P & T Committee relies on evidence from the candidate to judge his/her record using the SGIA guidelines. The evidence provided by the candidate in the

portfolio is of utmost importance in the committee's assessment. However, the burden is on the candidate to provide the appropriate context and explanation of the included documentation in the portfolio [including the quality and significance of materials in his or her portfolio]. Members of the P & T Committee may be unfamiliar with the courses taught, candidate's conference and journal outlets, committee assignments, etc. It is incumbent on the candidate to familiarize the P & T committee with the details of their record.

1.4a Evidence of Improvement and Modification

There are a variety of assessments used during the review processes that should guide faculty members to improve in all areas of their tenure at Kennesaw State. Candidates should use the narrative to explain how they have used these reviews to modify various aspects of their performance. These assessments can be found in annual reviews, pre-tenure reviews, annual peer teaching reviews, student evaluations, editorial reviews of manuscripts, conference feedback, and informal advice from mentors, among other things. Candidates are expected to provide evidence that they have responded to these reviews and explain how and why they have adjusted various aspects of their professional responsibilities to address areas of weakness and expanded strengths outlined in reviews.

1.4b Quality and Significance of Scholarship

The SGIA guidelines indicate that publishing peer-reviewed or "appropriately reviewed" scholarship is a fundamental activity. Other forms of scholarship and creative activity are also encouraged as additional activities. The portfolio narrative should explain how the faculty member's record meets these standards.

Candidates must discuss the quality and significance of their record of scholarship and creative activity and document and explain why their scholarship is noteworthy if they claim to be noteworthy in Scholarship and Creative Activity. This may include an explanation of the review processes their scholarship has undergone, including review and publishing timelines, journal acceptance rates, review processes, and editorial feedback. For instance, candidates could describe review processes for publications, especially online journals, open-access journals, and non-traditional book presses, in an effort to explain to P & T committee members how publications meet the criteria of "appropriately" and/or "peer" reviewed. Candidates should also discuss publication schedules for manuscripts accepted for publication. Journal articles that have been "accepted" by the editor for publication at the time of portfolio submission will count as a publication. Books shall be counted as publications by the P & T committee if the final manuscript has been accepted by reviewers and editors, and a publication timeline is

communicated by the publisher. Finally, candidates should explain their level of contribution to multi-authored works, and when appropriate include letters from co-authors corroborating their level of contribution.

Scholarly activity not yet accepted for final publication, but that demonstrates progress in on-going scholarly activities, should be considered as an important part of the candidate's record of scholarship and creative activity. The candidate should describe the progress and contributions of this work in his/her narrative, even if the work cannot be included by the P & T Committee as a publication.

1.5 P & T Committee Operation

Five faculty comprise a SGIA P & T Committee, and one faculty member shall be designated as Chair either by appointment of the Director, by membership vote or by self-appointment. Committee operation shall be in accordance with the Faculty Handbook and the RCHSS Guidelines. Committee members must abide by rules of confidentiality in their handling of and communication about portfolios. Letters of Review from P & T Committee should highlight candidates' strengths and weaknesses.

1.6 Explanation of Unique Circumstances

Candidates should explain in the narrative how their professional and personal circumstances may have contributed to their records. Though not central to the assessment of a candidate's record, there are circumstances that could prove vital to understanding the context of conference travel, publication timelines, teaching assignments, service choices, and other choices both within and not within the candidate's control.

1.7 School Director

Expectations and evaluations of the School Director are outlined in the SGIA Bylaws and in "Post-Tenure Review for Administrative Faculty" below. For the purpose of promotion and tenure, the School Director follows all school, college, and university guidelines.

2. Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

2.1 Teaching, Supervision and Mentoring (TSM)

2.1a Assistant Professor

Early in Rank: New Assistant Professors should meet School needs quickly, with an understanding of how their particular area of expertise fits into School curriculum. Faculty at this rank should establish rapport with students and colleagues, set appropriate times aside for advisement, and

update materials for instruction as needed.

Midway in Rank: As teaching experience is gained, faculty should maintain portfolios for School assessment. Self-assessment should also be conducted, through the use of student evaluations and documentation of student learning. To prepare for a successful Pre-Tenure Review, faculty should maintain currency in subject matter and seek to engage in "additional" (noteworthy) activities listed above.

Assistant Professor Ready for Promotion to Associate Professor: According to the KSU Faculty Handbook Assistant Professors ready for promotion should be performing "fundamental" and "additional activities" at a level associated with "early in rank" Associate Professors. Faculty demonstrate this through attendance and participation in teaching workshops, portfolios and evaluations. Faculty should be involved in discussion and interpretation of curriculum at least at the School level. Faculty should also become more adept at the integration of new teaching techniques, and pedagogical innovation. Candidates should demonstrate, through documentation in the portfolio, the quantity, quality, and significance of their efforts and achievements.

2.1b Associate Professor

Early in Rank: Faculty should begin to mentor peers at this stage of an academic career and should add to their teaching repertoire by developing new courses.

Midway in Rank: Faculty should be involved in curricular matters above the School level and should participate in program evaluation, updating instructional programs, courses and other materials, attend teaching workshops, publish improved teaching materials, and advise student groups. Documentation and maintaining teaching portfolios is expected at a high level of quality.

Associate Professor Ready for Promotion to Professor: Associate Professors ready for promotion should be performing "fundamental" and "additional activities" at a level associated with "early in rank" Professors. Faculty should continue to hone teaching skills through attendance at workshops and seminars and should also share their expertise with others in the field through guest lecturing, team teaching, and development of programs and curriculum. Faculty at this level should have close contact with peers and students as part of a regular routine and should be recognized by students and by their peers. Candidates should demonstrate, through documentation in the portfolio, the quantity, quality, and significance of their efforts and achievements.

2.1c Professor

Professors must maintain the highest quality of teaching effectiveness through continuous development of pedagogy, courses, and programs. All professors are expected to mentor peers and students, to be involved in curricular matters, to innovate in teaching, and to be recognized for one's teaching and leadership as a role model for others. Professors should perform additional activities in TSM as fits their expertise and the needs of the School. Professors should be able to demonstrate the quality and significance of their work in the AR process.

2.2 Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)

2.2a Assistant Professor

Early in Rank: New Assistant Professors should embark on scholarly and creative activities early, perhaps as an extension of dissertation research. Adequate documentation of early scholarship activity is especially important prior to publication.

Midway in Rank: Faculty should enhance their effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities by attending research workshops and scholarly meetings. Faculty should take part in scholarly meetings at the regional or national level to present research and should seek peer or appropriate review of their research in formal and informal settings. Faculty should also be available to comment on the work of their peers and assist others in research efforts.

Assistant Professor Ready for Promotion to Associate Professor: Assistant Professors ready for promotion perform fundamental and additional activities at a level associated with "early in rank" Associate Professors. Faculty at this stage should be able to document their progression through publication of scholarly research, attendance and participation in professional meetings, and by maintaining a research portfolio. Vitae should include some presentation of scholarly efforts.

Assistant professors ready for promotion to Associate professor, must have, for satisfactory performance, a minimum two peer-reviewed/appropriately reviewed published scholarly products during the review period. To be considered noteworthy, a faculty must have three or more peer-reviewed/ appropriately reviewed scholarly products. Scholarly products published before arriving at KSU are considered if published during a time counted toward promotion and tenure. If the individual under review believes that he/she has the equivalent of this minimum (such as a book or monograph), this must be clearly explained/justified in the portfolio. Candidates must demonstrate, through documentation in the portfolio, the quantity, quality, and significance of their scholarly output.

2.2b Associate Professor

Early in Rank: Faculty should continue to be involved in research efforts. Mentoring of research efforts of peers should become more regular. Participation in research should be a regular component of activity.

Midway in Rank: Faculty should be able to document that research efforts are contributing to the discipline and/or subfields of the discipline. Faculty should be regularly involved in release of findings from research and the development of scholarship through mentoring and public meetings.

Associate Professor Ready for Promotion to Professor: Associate Professors ready for promotion should be performing “fundamental” and “additional activities” at a level associated with “early in rank”-Professors. Faculty at this stage should be recognized by peers and by colleagues who are not members of the KSU community as contributing to scholarship. Presentation, publication and review of the work of others are evidence that faculty members are recognized as scholars.

Scholarship should contribute to teaching effectiveness. Associate professors demonstrating noteworthy performance on the standard workload model who are ready for promotion to Professor must have as a minimum (as a sole, second, or third author) four peer-reviewed/appropriately reviewed scholarly products published after promotion to Assistant.

Associate Professors on the Research I workload model are ready for promotion to Professor when they have as a minimum four (4) peer-reviewed/appropriately reviewed scholarly products published after promotion to Associate. Associate Professors on the Research II workload model are ready for promotion to Professor when they have a minimum five (5) peer-reviewed/appropriately reviewed scholarly products published after promotion to Associate.

Associate Professors on Teaching or Service emphasis models are ready for promotion to Professor when they have as a minimum four (4) peer-reviewed/appropriately reviewed scholarly products published after promotion to Associate. Candidates must demonstrate, through documentation in the portfolio, the quantity, quality, and significance of their scholarly output. These expectations parallel the expectations noted in the RCHSS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Scholarship and Creative Activity.

If a faculty member’s workload changes during the review period, their performance expectations will reflect the average of their workload during

the review period.

2.2c Professor

Professors must be engaged in high quality scholarship. The level of scholarship activity is dependent on their workload model. Scholarship should be peer or appropriately reviewed and should be presented and/or academically or professionally distributed. Contact with off campus members of the discipline or sub-disciplines must be continued.

2.3 Professional Service (PS)

2.3a Assistant Professor

Early in Rank: New Assistant Professors should seek out opportunities to serve the KSU community through committee work, keeping in mind the demands of teaching and scholarship faced by those new to the University. Most new faculty will find service opportunities at the School level.

Midway in Rank: Faculty should take on additional committee work, seeking out service opportunities above the School level and within discipline-related community and professional organizations.

Assistant Professor Ready for Promotion to Associate Professor: Assistant Professors ready for promotion should be performing “fundamental” and “additional activities” at a level associated with “early in rank” Associate Professors. This includes a demonstrated record of engagement in appropriate School committees as well as some service at the college or university levels, or relevant disciplinary organizations. Faculty at this stage may seek out increasingly challenging service activities on and off campus. Faculty should make the most of on-campus opportunities for service by taking part in KSU service organizations and should continue to seek out service opportunities within community and professional agencies and organizations.

2.3b Associate Professor

Early in Rank: Faculty should be involved in service above the School level. They should seek to enhance their service effectiveness through the use of mentoring of peers as well as workshop participation and development.

Midway in Rank: Faculty should be involved in service above the School level. Faculty at this level should be contributing to service both on and off campus. Documentation of service is expected, and faculty are expected to take larger, leadership roles in service organizations on and off campus.

Associate Professor Ready for Promotion to Professor: Associate Professors ready for promotion should be performing “fundamental” and “additional activities” at a level associated with “early in rank” Professors. Faculty at this stage should be noted by others for their service contributions. Faculty should have a demonstrated record of engagement at the School level. Significant contributions to college, or university committees, or relevant professional or disciplinary organization beyond the university are also expected. This may include:

- Leadership in department, college, or university-level, or community engaged service
- Leadership in a regional, national, or international academic organization
- Editor of regional, national or international-level publications and conferences

*Associate professors on Service workload model who are ready for promotion to Professor will have held leadership positions on at least three committees or shared governance bodies, at least one of which should be outside the School.

2.3c Professor

At this level, Professors should be able to demonstrate that their service is recognized on and off campus. Taking leadership roles in service activities is required of those at the rank of professor.

2.3d Administrative Capacity

Some SGIA faculty (e.g., Assistant Director and Program Directors) engage in significant administrative tasks that are evaluated as part of their Service workload as documented in their FPA and ARD.

D. Promotion of Lecturers

1. Lecturer Promotion Process

See *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.10.

2. Expectations for Promotion of Lecturers

2.1 Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring (TSM)

2.1a Lecturer

Early in Rank: New lecturers should meet School needs quickly, with an understanding of how their particular area of expertise fits into School curriculum. Faculty at this rank should establish rapport with students and colleagues and set appropriate time aside for course preparation.

Midway in Rank: Lecturers should refine teaching techniques by attending teaching workshops and revising courses based upon feedback from students, colleagues, and the School Director. As teaching experience is gained lecturers should continually develop a teaching portfolio for School

assessment. Lecturers should maintain currency in the subject matter taught.

Lecturer Ready for Promotion to Senior Lecturer: Lecturers at this stage should have a high level of teaching effectiveness and should be able to document progression in teaching effectiveness through attendance and participation in teaching workshops, maintenance of a teaching portfolio, and continuous reassessment of teaching effectiveness. Lecturers should integrate new teaching techniques and pedagogical innovations into their courses.

2.1b Senior Lecturer

Senior lecturers must maintain a high level of teaching effectiveness through continuous development of pedagogy and courses. In addition, a teaching portfolio must be maintained documenting teaching effectiveness. Senior lecturers demonstrating noteworthy performance consistently meet their fundamental job expectations and make notable contributions to their greater academic communities.

2.2 Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)

2.2a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Track

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in scholarship and creative activity. However, the school will endeavor to provide support (e.g., travel funding) to those who do, and Lecturers can mention their SCA accomplishments in their ARD, especially as they relate to their teaching.

2.3 Professional Service (PS)

2.3a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Track

Per university guidelines, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are required to perform professional service activities related to teaching assignments. The regular course load for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers may be lowered for service activities beyond regular expectations. The teaching/service responsibilities and load should be clearly laid out in the annual Faculty Performance Agreement.

Early in Rank: New lecturers should discuss with the School Director the teaching and service needs of the School. Lecturers choosing to complete service activities beyond regular expectations will likely be directed to service opportunities at the School level.

Midway in Rank: Lecturers should engage in highly effective School service activities as a member of a committee (or committees).

Lecturer Ready for Promotion to Senior Lecturer: Lecturers at this stage are expected to serve as members of School committees and perform in a highly effective manner, and to seek out increasingly challenging service activities within the School.

2.3b Senior Lecturer

Senior lecturers are expected to serve as highly effective members of committees and to seek out increasingly challenging service activities within the School.

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 of the 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.

Promotion Criteria

(listed items of evidence under each criterion are intended to be examples of the criterion, and not an exhaustive list of requirements)

Evidence of creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices:

- creation of effective instructional practices leading to highly effective teaching.
- updating courses to include new and/or updated instructional practices or exercises.
- providing evidence that the course updates have had a positive impact on student success.
- incorporating instructional practices that have improved and/or contributed to highly effective teaching.
- undertaking professional development activities and providing evidence of incorporating these practices into courses (contributing to student success).

Positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings:

- Coaching/mentoring academic teams (e.g., Model UN) and/or other student organizations.
- presentation or publication of instructional innovation, with a demonstration of positive instructional impact.
- led trainings to promote the professional development of other instructional faculty.
- presented work and evidence of effectiveness at appropriate conferences.
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) products

Impactful and highly effective professional service:

- serving effectively in an official or unofficial mentorship capacity for other lecturers inside and/or outside the School.
- providing assistance to other lecturers inside and/or outside the School pertaining to assigned workload responsibilities.
- promoting the professional development of other lecturers inside and/or outside the School.
- leadership and/or impactful, constructive involvement/citizenship in assigned service responsibilities inside and/or outside the School.
- involvement in assigned service responsibilities that have been consistently constructive, helpful, forward-moving, and aligned with expectations.
- consistently demonstrated constructive, helpful, forward-moving leadership behavior or engaged in leadership practices inside and/or outside of the School.
- being a reliably constructive and involved citizen of the School.
- engaging appropriately and constructively with colleagues and students in the School.
- consistently promoting and contributing to a climate and culture of constructive citizenship within the School.

Additional items for Principal Lecturers:

- Faculty seeking promotion to principal lecturer must also provide evidence of highly effective teaching over their time as senior lecturer.
- There is a time-in-rank minimum. "Board of Regents policy allows for consideration of early promotion. According to USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.6, strong justification must be provided to support any consideration of "early" promotion wherein the individual has served fewer than the minimum number of five years in rank at the current institution." Also, promotion to principal lecturer is not a function simply of time in rank. Portfolios are "evaluated based on highly effective accomplishments."

E. Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks & Academic Professionals

1. Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks Promotion Process

See *KSU Faculty Handbook* Sections 3.7, 3.8, 3.9.

2. Expectations for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks

See *KSU Faculty Handbook* Sections 3.7, 3.8, 3.9. Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Professorial Ranks must have FPAs and ARDs detailing their workload distribution and performance expectations, which will serve as the basis for promotion reviews.

3. Academic Professionals

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.

F. Expectations for Post-Tenure Review of Tenure Track Faculty (See Section 3.5 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook*)

1. Post-Tenure Review Process

See Sections 3.5 and 3.12 of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* for a detailed description of the PTR process.

School P&T Guidelines articulate faculty performance expectations in each area. These are contained in Appendix 2.

2. Expedited Post-Tenure Review

As outlined in *KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12*: “As the annual review documents constitute the “primary evidence” for multi-year reviews, faculty members receiving ratings of “3” (“meeting expectations”) or above in all areas of faculty review, as well as in their overall annual reviews during the 5-year period under PTR consideration, may submit an expedited PTR review. Expedited PTR reviews will contain all annual reviews (along with any rebuttal or response documentation) for the period under review, along with a shorter narrative (3-6 pages recommended with a 12-page maximum). No additional materials will be required for the portfolio to be considered complete. Faculty receiving a “1” or “2” rating in any area of review or in their overall annual reviews during any given year under PTR consideration, will submit the standard (full) set of portfolio materials.”

3. Monetary PTR Reward

As outlined in *KSU Faculty Handbook Section 3.12*: “If the final rating on the five-point scale in a regularly scheduled post-tenure review is a 4 or 5, the faculty member will receive a one-time monetary award. Faculty will then be

eligible for the same award in five years (and no sooner than five years) at their next post-tenure review. Faculty who undergo a corrective or voluntary post-tenure review, on the other hand, are not eligible for this one-time award.”

4. Performance Improvement Plan

In the event of a PTR that results in ratings of Does Not Meet Expectations (1) or Needs Improvement (2), the faculty member’s appropriate supervisor(s) and the faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the review committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the PTR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the PTR. See Sections 3.12.B.4.II. and III. of the KSU Faculty Handbook for PIP implementation and follow-up actions and due process.

5. Faculty Appeal of the PIP Action Plans

See *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.12

6. Corrective Post-Tenure Review

See *KSU Faculty Handbook* Section 3.12

7. Due Process for PTR and Unsuccessful PIP

The Board of Regents of the USG in 2023 formulated additional due process mechanisms related to PTR. A description of the process is in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, section 3.12.B.4.III.

VII. Post-Tenure Review of Administrative Faculty

See Section 3.12.B.5. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* for processes and procedures that apply to PTR for administrative faculty.

VIII. Accreditation Standards

The MPA program maintains professional accreditation with NASPAA and MPA faculty are subject to the standards therein.

IX. Tenure-track Faculty with a Joint Appointment in Two or More Departments

Promotion and tenure review of 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 P&T committee membership as well as any special consideration for what types of Scholarship and Creative Activity are acceptable. Unless otherwise specified in the MOU, faculty with a joint appointment must follow the Home Department/School P&T Guidelines requirements for promotion and tenure.

See Sections 3.5.E. and 3.6.C. of the *KSU Faculty Handbook* for policies and procedures about annual reviews, pre-tenure review, promotion-and-tenure ,

promotion, and PTR for faculty members with a joint appointment in two or more schools/departments.

X. 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.

XI. Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Amendments to these School P&T Guidelines shall be approved by a majority vote of the permanent, full-time faculty of the School of Government and International Affairs. A secret ballot system may be used, if requested. Revisions will be drafted by a task force representing all faculty ranks established by the School Director in consultation with the School Faculty Council.

Appendix 1
Five-Point Scale for Annual Reviews

Annual Review: Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring (TSM)*

Scale	TSM (all workloads)
5 – Exemplary	Fulfilling all “fundamental activities”** of TSM <u>AND</u> at least two items listed under “additional activities” or equivalent. For example, coaching a student organization for competitions fulfills the “at least two items” requirement.
4 – Exceeding Expectations	Fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM <u>AND</u> at least one item listed under “additional activities.”
3 – Meeting Expectations	Fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM.
2 – Needs Improvement	Not fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM.
1 – Not Meeting Expectations	Not fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM and unwilling to address deficiencies.

*A three (3) credit hour course is assumed to count as 10% of a faculty member's annual workload unless otherwise negotiated in the annual FPA between the School Director and faculty member. The annual workload value for courses that are not three (3) credit hours should be clearly laid out in the FPA.

** Fundamental and Additional Activities in TSM are listed in Section IV.B.1.

Annual Review: Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)

Scale	SCA (all workloads)
5 – Exemplary	Evidence of engagement with research* during the year that if repeated in all other years of the multi-year review period would lead the faculty member to <i>substantially</i> exceed their P&T and/or PTR expectations (given their SCA workload %).
4 – Exceeding Expectations	Evidence of engagement with research* during the year that if repeated in all other years of the multi-year review period, would lead the faculty member to <i>modestly</i> exceed their P&T and/or PTR expectations (given their SCA workload %).
3 – Meeting Expectations	Evidence of engagement with research* during the year.
2 – Needs Improvement	No evidence of engagement with research* during the year.
1 – Not Meeting Expectations	No evidence of engagement with research* during the year, and no specific plan to engage in research in subsequent years.

*“Engagement with research” might include (but is not limited to):

- literature review
- seeking feedback on work in progress from colleagues/peers
- data collection and/or analysis
- manuscript progress or completion
- submission of work for review
- invited talks/presentations on or off campus
- applying for grants
- management of grants
- presentation of work in progress

Annual Review: Professional Service (PS)*

Scale	PS (all workloads)
5 – Exemplary	Meeting expectations for this Professional Service workload percentage AND evidence of service contributions that are <i>exceptionally beneficial*</i> to KSU and/or its units, the profession, or the community**.
4 – Exceeding Expectations	Meeting expectations for this Professional Service workload percentage AND evidence of service contributions that are <i>beneficial*</i> to KSU and/or its units, the profession, or the community**.
3 – Meeting Expectations	Fulfilling all "fundamental activities" of Professional Service as well as any other service duties as agreed upon in the FPA.
2 – Needs Improvement	Evidence of engagement in service but not meeting expectations for this Professional Service workload percentage.
1 – Not Meeting Expectations	No evidence of engagement in service.

*Beneficial or Exceptionally Beneficial could include (but is not limited to): documentation of high quality formal or informal leadership, innovation, initiative, or coordination within service effort.

Exceeding Expectations or Exemplary in PS **does not require exceeding one's workload percentage for PS in terms of time and hours. Exceeding Expectations or Exemplary in PS should generally correspond to the quality and significance of service *within the limits* of one's FPA/workload percentage for PS.

Appendix 2
Five-Point Scale for Post Tenure Review

Post Tenure Review: Teaching, Supervision, and Mentoring (TSM)*
[Note: Same as Annual Review TSM Scale in Appendix 1]

Scale	TSM (all workloads)
5 – Exemplary	Fulfilling all “fundamental activities”** of TSM <u>AND</u> at least two items listed under “additional activities” or equivalent. For example, coaching a student organization for competitions fulfills the “at least two items” requirement.
4 – Exceeding Expectations	Fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM <u>AND</u> at least one item listed under “additional activities.”
3 – Meeting Expectations	Fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM.
2 – Needs Improvement	Not fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM.
1 – Not Meeting Expectations	Not fulfilling “fundamental activities” of TSM and unwilling to address deficiencies.

*A three (3) credit hour course is assumed to count as 10% of a faculty member's annual workload unless otherwise negotiated in the annual FPA between the School Director and faculty member. The annual workload value for courses that are not three (3) credit hours should be clearly laid out in the FPA.

** Fundamental and Additional Activities in TSM are listed in Section IV.B.1.

Post Tenure Review: Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA)

Scale	SCA 50% (e.g. 40/50/10)	SCA 40% (e.g. 50/40/10)	SCA 30% (e.g. 60/30/10)	SCA 20% (e.g. 70/20/10)
If a faculty member's workload changes during the review period, their performance expectations will reflect the average of their workload during the review period.				
5 – Exemplary	At least three publications in appropriately reviewed venues (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least three regional or national conference presentations.	At least two publications in appropriately reviewed venues (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least two regional or national conference presentations.	At least one publication in an appropriately reviewed venue (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least two presentations of research findings to an academic audience <u>OR</u> at least two publications in appropriately reviewed venues (or equivalent**).	At least one publication in an appropriately reviewed venue (or equivalent**) <u>OR</u> at least two presentations of research findings to an academic audience.
4 – Exceeding Expectations	At least two publications in appropriately reviewed venues (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least two regional or national conference presentations.	At least one publication in an appropriately reviewed venue (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least two regional or national conference presentations <u>OR</u> at least two publications in appropriately reviewed venues (or equivalent).	At least one publication in an appropriately reviewed venue (or equivalent**) <u>OR</u> at least one presentation of research findings to an academic audience.	Evidence of engagement with research* including at least one presentation of research findings to an academic audience.

See next page for PTR SCA 3-1 scores.

Post Tenure Review: Scholarship and Creative Activity (SCA) Continued

Scale	SCA 50% (e.g. 40/50/10)	SCA 40% (e.g. 50/40/10)	SCA 30% (e.g. 60/30/10)	SCA 20% (e.g. 70/20/10)
If a faculty member's workload changes during the review period, their performance expectations will reflect the average of their workload during the review period.				
3 – Meeting Expectations	At least one publication in an appropriately reviewed venue (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least two presentations of research findings to an academic audience <u>OR</u> at least two publications in appropriately reviewed venues (or equivalent**).	Evidence of engagement with research* including at least one publication in an appropriately reviewed venue (or equivalent**) <u>AND</u> at least one presentation of research findings to an academic audience <u>OR</u> at least two presentations of research findings to an academic audience.	Evidence of engagement with research* including at least one presentation of research findings to an academic audience.	Evidence of engagement with research* including documented progress towards a completed product.
2 – Needs Improvement	Evidence of engagement with research* but not meeting expectations for this SCA %	Evidence of engagement with research* but not meeting expectations for this SCA %	Evidence of engagement with research* but not meeting expectations for this SCA %	Evidence of engagement with research* but not meeting expectations for this SCA %
1 – Not Meeting Expectations	No evidence of engagement with research*.	No evidence of engagement with research*.	No evidence of engagement with research*.	No evidence of engagement with research*.

**“Engagement with research” might include (but is not limited to):

- literature review
- seeking feedback on work in progress from colleagues/peers
- data collection and/or analysis
- manuscript progress or completion
- submission of work for review
- invited talks/presentations on or off campus
- applying for grants
- management of grants
- presentation of work in progress

***“Equivalent” can refer to both type and quantity of outputs. Faculty may make the case that their research activities are of a quality and significance that should be considered equivalent to the “publication in an appropriately reviewed venue” and/or “presentation of research

findings to an academic audience” requirements described above. As noted above under Section IV.B.2 “SCA Fundamental Activities”, examples of scholarly products that fall into the category of “peer reviewed” or “appropriately reviewed” may include:

- A book, which is typically considered equivalent to a minimum of 2 to a maximum of four journal articles, depending upon its quality and significance, publishing house, and other factors, which the candidate should describe in his/her portfolio narrative
- Law review articles
- Journal Articles
- Book chapters
- Edited volumes
- Funded grants
- Online blogs, websites, or other hosted electronic forums with competitive moderation
- Other research and creative activities for which the candidate can make a strong case regarding their quality and significance

Post Tenure Review: Professional Service (PS)*
[Note: same as Annual Review PS Scale in Appendix 1]

Scale	PS (all workloads)
5 – Exemplary	Meeting expectations for this Professional Service workload percentage AND evidence of service contributions that are <i>exceptionally beneficial*</i> to KSU and/or its units, the profession, or the community**.
4 – Exceeding Expectations	Meeting expectations for this Professional Service workload percentage AND evidence of service contributions that are <i>beneficial*</i> to KSU and/or its units, the profession, or the community**.
3 – Meeting Expectations	Fulfilling all "fundamental activities" of Professional Service as well as other service duties as agreed upon in the FPA.
2 – Needs Improvement	Evidence of engagement in service but not meeting expectations for this Professional Service workload percentage.
1 – Not Meeting Expectations	No evidence of engagement in service.

*Beneficial or Exceptionally Beneficial could include (but is not limited to): documentation of high quality formal or informal leadership, innovation, initiative, or coordination within service effort.

Exceeding Expectations or Exemplary in PS **does not require exceeding one's workload percentage for PS in terms of time and hours. Exceeding Expectations or Exemplary in PS should generally correspond to the quality and significance of service *within the limits* of one's FPA/workload percentage for PS.

DS
OS

DS
PC

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 / 17 / 2023, were approved by the faculty of the School of Government and International Affairs in accordance with department bylaws:

David Shock
Name (printed or typed) / DFC or P&T chair

DocuSigned by:
David Shock November 8, 2023
9445D47E26F0488... Signature/ Date

Department Chair Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Kerwin Swint
Name (printed or typed)

DocuSigned by:
Kerwin Swint November 8, 2023
95A8F44243E9485... Signature/ Date

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

Anja Bernardy
Name (printed or typed)

DocuSigned by:
Anja Bernardy November 29, 2023
B37AA100F4654C2... Signature/ Date

College Dean Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Catherine Kaukinen
Name (printed or typed)

DocuSigned by:
Catherine Kaukinen November 5, 2023
4E4CB0582A0A43E... Signature/ Date

Provost Approval - I approve the attached guidelines:

Ivan Pulinkala
Name (printed or typed)

DocuSigned by:
Ivan Pulinkala January 25, 2024
02FA0CC7B24D4B3... Signature/ Date